

## **Section 1.2: Animal Acquisitions and Dispositions**

- ◆ **The San Francisco Zoo has an excellent animal acquisition and loan policy. In fact, the Zoo's policy is used as an example in the American Zoological Association's "Suggestions for Implementation of the AZA Animal Disposition Guidelines."**
- ◆ **The Zoo's acquisition/disposition practices have resulted in a significant reduction in the number of animals in the Zoo's collection. Excluding fishes and invertebrates, the number of Zoo animals decreased from 1,371 in 1972-73 to 895 in 1988-89 to 630 in 1997-98, a total decrease of 54 percent. The mammal count included in the total decreased from 558 in 1972-72, to 438 in 1988-89, to 276 in 1997-98, a total decrease of 51 percent. The General Curator has stated that the Zoo currently holds the species and specimens that it can care for properly and that the Zoo's collection of mammal and bird specimens will be increasing with implementation of Phase II of the Master Plan.**
- ◆ **In June of 1997, the Director of the San Francisco Zoo decided to request that the Asian elephant "Calle" be relocated to the San Francisco Zoo from the Los Angeles Zoo prior to obtaining the final results of a general health blood profile and a blood test to screen for tuberculosis. The decision to request shipment of the elephant prior to completion of health testing was a mistake; further tests revealed that Calle had contracted tuberculosis. As of August 1999, the cost of treating Calle's tubercular condition has been \$115,177, not including staff time. The Los Angeles Zoo has contributed \$30,000 toward that cost.**
- ◆ **The Zoo's practices governing animal acquisition, loan, and disposition actions should be amended to assure that such transactions fully provide for the well being of the animals. In that regard, we found that:**
  1. **The Zoo does not require AZA facilities requesting Zoo animals to complete an application form. Further, the Zoo does not require non-AZA members to notify the Zoo of the death or relocation of an animal that had been previously relocated to the non-AZA member by the Zoo. These provisions are recommended in the AZA Guidelines.**
  2. **The Zoo's "Animal Disposition Agreement," which is the contract form used to bind both AZA and non-AZA recipients of Zoo animals, does not include reference to the AZA's Code of Professional Ethics nor does the Agreement contain the AZA's recommended language requiring the acquiring organization not to sell, trade, loan, or donate the acquired animal to any inhumane research program.**
  3. **The Zoo's Animal Acquisition/Disposition Guidelines contain evaluation forms with appropriate questions for evaluating proposed acquisition/disposition actions. However, Zoo management does not currently complete the evaluation forms in writing.**

As part of our performance audit of the San Francisco Zoological Gardens, we examined the Zoo's policies and practices for acquiring and disposing of animals. Zoos acquire, loan, trade, gift, and sell animals in order to enhance the genetic pool of species they hold, to improve their exhibits, and for other purposes. The process of acquiring and disposing of animals must be managed so as to insure that the animals are treated humanely. For this purpose, the American Zoological Association has developed guidelines for the disposition of animals for zoos and aquariums. Accordingly, the San Francisco Zoo has a responsibility to manage its animal collection in a humane manner and to develop controls that reasonably insure that recipients of their animal dispositions meet or exceed AZA requirements.

Another aspect of managing animal acquisitions and dispositions is the need for population control so as to reduce the incidence of surplus animals. One result of the process of developing and maintaining an animal collection to further the recreational, educational, and conservation goals of any Zoo is the generation of animals that are surplus to the Zoo's particular needs. One of the foremost challenges of zoos is to minimize surplus animals through such population control measures as hormonal implants for females and separation of sexes.

The primary risks that must be controlled are disposition policies and practices that could result in animals being sold at auction, being hunted on enclosed ranches, being used for human medical research or other non-sanctioned research purposes, or being given less than adequate care because of a lack of expertise or wanton disregard. To determine whether the San Francisco Zoological Society has been meeting its responsibilities in the acquisition and disposition of animals, we performed the following tasks:

- Interviewed the Curator of Collections, who is responsible for effecting animal acquisitions and dispositions at the Zoo. Also, interviewed the Animal Management Department's secretary who maintains the animal acquisition and disposition records;
- Reviewed the following documents published by the American Zoological Society (AZA): (1) "Disposition of Wild Animals from Zoological Parks and Aquariums," and (2) "Suggestions for Implementation of the AZA Animal Disposition Guidelines."
- Reviewed the following documents published by the City: (1) San Francisco Zoological Gardens Acquisition, Loan, and Disposition Policy (Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No.15944, adopted February 21, 1991); and (2) San Francisco Zoological Gardens Animal Acquisition/Disposition Guidelines (Recreation and Park Commission Resolution No.16327, adopted March 19, 1992).

- Reviewed the series of articles on animal dispositions published by the *San Jose Mercury News* in February of 1999;
- Reviewed the Zoo's animal acquisition and disposition files and documents and performed certain audit tests on those files and documents.

### **Animal Acquisitions and Dispositions**

Each year, the San Francisco Zoo acquires numerous animals through birth, loan, purchase, or gift and disposes of numerous animals through sale, loan, gift, or the death of animals. Table 1.2.1 lists such Zoo acquisitions and dispositions for calendar years 1991 through 1998, and for the first six months of calendar year 1999. The figures include all classes of Zoo animals except invertebrates (The Zoo began including invertebrate acquisitions in 1996 but not births, deaths, or dispositions. We have excluded the invertebrate acquisitions in Table 1.2.1).

**Table 1.2.1**  
**Animal Acquisitions and Dispositions**  
**1991 - June, 1999**

| <b>Year</b>   | <b><u>Births</u></b> | <b><u>Acqui-<br/>sitions</u></b> | <b><u>Deaths</u></b> | <b><u>Dispo-<br/>sitions</u></b> | <b><u>Net</u></b> | <b><u>Cumulative<br/>Net</u></b> |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1999 (6 mos.) | <b>40</b>            | <b>83</b>                        | <b>72</b>            | 20                               | 31                | -210                             |
| 1998          | 54                   | <b>99</b>                        | 85                   | 44                               | 24                | -241                             |
| 1997          | 37                   | 63                               | 83                   | 61                               | -44               | -265                             |
| 1996          | 30                   | <b>107</b>                       | 80                   | 36                               | 21                | -221                             |
| 1995          | <b>18</b>            | 72                               | 87                   | 64                               | -61               | -242                             |
| 1994          | 42                   | 47                               | 75                   | 58                               | -44               | -181                             |
| 1993          | 34                   | 39                               | 84                   | 73                               | -84               | -137                             |
| 1992          | 93                   | 57                               | 90                   | <b>104</b>                       | -44               | -53                              |
| 1991          | <u>97</u>            | <u>41</u>                        | <u>77</u>            | <u>70</u>                        | <u>-9</u>         | <u>-9</u>                        |
| Total         | 445                  | 608                              | 733                  | 530                              | -210              |                                  |

\*Large variances shown in bold.

The totals for the eight and one-half year period covered show that the number of Zoo accessions through births and acquisitions was 1,053 and the number of losses through deaths and dispositions was 1,263, a difference of 210.

A review of Table 1.2.1 reveals that for certain periods, the variances in the number of births and acquisitions and deaths and dispositions are greater than the general averages for those statistics. In response to our request for explanations concerning those variances, the Zoo's General Curator has provided the following information:

- The 40 births for the first six months of calendar year 1999, which yields an annualized 80 births for all of 1999, is due to the seasonality of breeding. A straight line relationship does not exist in nature.
- The small number of births (18) in calendar year 1995 was due to a planned reduction, through birth control, in species housed in older exhibits that were slated for removal.
- The large number of acquisitions for calendar years 1996, 1998, and the first six months of 1999 is due to the need to fill new exhibits coming online and to fulfill the goals as stated in the Zoo's Collection Plan.
- The 72 deaths for the first six months of calendar year 1999, which yields an annualized 144 deaths for all of 1999, is due to the large number of birds and barnyard animals that were born in 1991 and 1992 that are reaching the end of their life expectancy.
- The large number of dispositions in calendar year 1992 (104) was due to the closure of a number of inadequate exhibits and the need to place the animals housed in those exhibits in other institutions.

As a result of our overview of the material concerning animal acquisition and disposition issues, we determined that the risks facing the Zoo in this area are (1) inadequate policies and procedures concerning animal acquisitions and dispositions, and (2) lack of adherence to adequate policies and procedures. Therefore, our first step was to compare the Zoo's animal acquisition and disposition policies and procedures to the AZA's documents concerning animal acquisitions and dispositions, "Disposition of Wild Animals from Zoological Parks and Aquariums," and "Suggestions for Implementation of the AZA Animal Disposition Guidelines."

The AZA "Guidelines" are not strict rules and regulations that must be adhered to by member zoos and aquariums, but suggested methods for implementing policies and procedures for enhancing the probability that an institution's animals will receive humane treatment. However, in the absence of a valid reason not to follow a particular guideline, we recommend that the Zoo adhere to the AZA Guidelines. The Zoo's Acquisition, Loan, and Disposition Policy, adopted by the Recreation and Park Commission in February of 1991, is used as an example in the AZA's "Suggestions for Implementation of the AZA Animal Disposition Guidelines."

The AZA specifies its animal acquisition and disposition policy guidelines under subject headings, such as "The Need for Education." We have followed that method in reporting on the Zoo's adherence to the AZA guidelines."

**Adherence to AZA Animal Acquisition and Disposition Policy Guidelines****The need for education.**

AZA guideline -- It is in the best interest of the animals, staff and public to make every effort to improve an awareness of surplus animal issues.

*The San Francisco Zoo's Acquisition and Loan Policy does not address the need to improve an awareness of surplus animal issues, nor have we noted any other Zoo animal acquisition and disposition document that does. However, we consider the implementation of a policy of public awareness of surplus animal issues a sensitive subject that should be handled within the management discretion of the Zoological Society and make note of the issue here only to bring it to management's attention.*

**The need for application/ agreement forms.**

AZA guideline -- When surplus specimens to recipients, whether or not they are AZA member facilities or animal suppliers, institutions should develop application and agreement forms which require the potential recipient to adhere to the AZA Code of Professional Ethics, all relevant AZA and member policies, procedures and guidelines.

*The Zoo does not require AZA institutions requesting Zoo animals to complete an application form. The Zoo does require that non-AZA institutions complete an "Animal Recipient Profile" form for each type species applied for. The "Animal Recipient Profile" requires information concerning the institution's facilities, staffing, sources of financial support, professional affiliations and memberships, etc.*

*In the opinion of the Budget Analyst, the Zoo's agreement form adequately satisfies the AZA guidelines with two exceptions. The agreement does not include specific language regarding the AZA's Code of Professional Ethics nor does it include the AZA's recommended wording requiring the acquiring institution not to sell, trade, loan, or donate to any inhumane research program. These items should be added to the Zoo's agreement form.*

**The Need for Population Control and Disposal Procedures**

AZA guidelines describe several ethical and legal methods of population control or disposal of animals.

*The Zoo's Animal Acquisition and Disposition Policy adequately covers population control and disposition options.*

**Need for documents to be kept on file and policies to be included in members' written policy on animal dispositions.**

AZA guidelines cover documents to be kept of file, readily accessible to personnel responsible for animal dispositions, and certain policies to be included in the member's written policy on animal dispositions. In the opinion of the Budget Analyst, the Zoo's documents conform to the AZA guidelines with the following three exceptions:

*The AZA policy on Hunting Ranches was not kept on file.*

*The Zoo's Guidelines do not refer to the AZA Animal Disposition Guidelines or to the Code of Professional Ethics.*

*The Zoo does not require non-AZA members to notify the Zoo in the case of death of an animal or for the purpose of requesting relocation of an animal. The Zoo's "Animal Disposition Agreement," which is the contract form for both AZA and non-AZA institutions, requires that the "Recipient shall inform the San Francisco Zoo of the destination of the subject animal(s) upon sale, donation, loan, or trade to a subsequent recipient."*

*We recommend that the Zoo (1) amend its guidelines to specifically refer to the AZA Animal Disposition Guidelines and to the Code of Professional Ethics, (2) amend the "Animal Disposition Agreement" to require non-AZA members to notify the Zoo in the case of the death of an animal and for the purpose of requesting relocation of an animal, and (3) maintain the AZA policy on Hunting Ranches on file readily accessible to personnel responsible for animal dispositions.*

**Animal Acquisition/Disposition Forms**

The Zoo's Animal Acquisition/Disposition Guidelines contain appendices for (1) new species acquisition evaluation (Appendix I), (2) Animal Acquisition Form for species already in the collection (Appendix II), and (3) Animal Disposition Form (Appendix III). The appendices contain sets of well-designed questions for evaluating acquisition and dispositions. According to the Animal Management Department, although acquisition and dispositions are evaluated the forms are not completed.

We recommend that for each acquisition/disposition the appropriate form be completed and kept in the record.

As previously stated, the Zoo does not require institutions seeking to acquire Zoo animals to complete an application form. We recommend that such a form be developed and used for dispositions to all institutions. Furthermore, we recommend that the animal application form include the following questions, which are contained on page three of the Zoo's Animal Acquisition/Disposition Guidelines.

- a) Do they have expertise with species being shipped or a similar species? Are they able to handle species being shipped?
- b) Are their facilities adequate for this species including space and amenities for climatic seasonal changes? Are they able to provide species with proper diet, social and behavioral conditions?
- c) Review recipient's past history with species including reasons for mortality, propagation successes, birth rate, survival of young, hand-rearing experience.

### **Calle – Elephant Tuberculosis**

**Note:** *The following evaluation of the Zoo's accepting a Asian elephant named "Calle" from the Los Angeles Zoo prior to the completion of all health tests has been excerpted from Dr. Parrott's report in Section 1.1 of this audit report.*

"In 1995, one of the two SF Zoo's Asian elephants died. For the next two years, zoo management attempted to find a companion for the remaining elephant, "Tinkerbelle." Because elephants are highly social animals, they should not be kept in a solitary environment. In 1997, "Calle," an Asian elephant at the Los Angeles Zoo, was relocated to the San Francisco Zoo. Calle was tested in Los Angeles for tuberculosis with preliminary screening tests and a trunk wash culture. She was shipped to San Francisco prior to the results of those tests being finalized. After arrival in San Francisco, the test results subsequently were found to be positive.

"Upon review of this case and discussion with zoo management, several important points emerge. First of all, everyone in management acknowledged that it was a mistake not to wait until the final test results arrived prior to sending Calle to the San Francisco Zoo. The mistake was not in deciding to bring Calle to San Francisco; the mistake was not waiting until final test results were in before she went to San Francisco. Whether this turns out to be a fatal mistake remains

to be seen. Following treatment, Calle now appears to no longer be shedding. The central issue is not whether Calle becomes an active clinical case, but whether through her shedding Tinkerbelle contracts the disease. Tinkerbelle may yet live a full life, without contracting TB or TB ever becoming an issue.

“Other points must be considered. There was no report of prior exposure to TB in the LA herd (this was documented in the record). The LA Zoo was unaware that Calle was shedding. SF Zoo management had the opportunity to return Calle to Los Angeles. Management decided that it was in Calle’s best interest to treat her in San Francisco.

“The decision to bring Calle to San Francisco prior to final test results was a mistake, but it was not indicative of general mismanagement, nor does it create a pattern of mismanagement at the San Francisco Zoo. In fact, it is far more telling about management that, rather than correcting the mistake simply by sending Calle back to be the problem of the Los Angeles Zoo, Zoo management decided to rise to the challenge to treat her at considerable cost of time, money, and energy. Meanwhile, Calle has stopped shedding and is now living with Tinkerbelle.”

As of August 1999, the cost of treating Calle’s tubercular condition has been \$115,177, toward which the Los Angeles Zoo has contributed \$30,000. Neither Animal Keeper nor veterinary staff costs are included in the treatment costs.

### **Size of the San Francisco Zoo Animal Collection**

One complaint recorded in Zoo marketing surveys and voiced by numerous visitors to the San Francisco Zoo is that there are not enough animals. In order to compare recent numbers of animals in the San Francisco Zoo with such numbers in past years, and to compare those numbers with other zoos, we extracted collection counts from AZA Directories for the years shown in Table 1.2.2 on the following page.

Table 1.2.2 shows for the San Francisco Zoo that the total number of specimens for classes of zoo animals (e.g., mammals and birds) has decreased over the years as have the numbers of mammals and birds. When asked to explain why the numbers have declined over the years, the General Curator has stated that the Zoo currently holds the species and specimens that it can care for properly and that the Zoo’s collection of mammal and bird specimens will be increasing with implementation of Phase II of the Master Plan.



**Table 1.2.2**  
**Size of the San Francisco Zoo Animal Collection**

| Visitors             | Budget    | MAMMAL       |           | BIRDS   |           | REPTILE |           | AMPHIBIA |           | FISHES  |           | Totals, exclusive of<br>Invertebrates & Fish |           |       |
|----------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------|-----------|--|-----------|-------|
|                      |           | Species      | Specimens | Species | Specimens | Species | Specimens | Species  | Specimens | Species | Specimens | Species                                      | Specimens |       |
| <b>San Francisco</b> |           |              |           |         |           |         |           |          |           |         |           |  |           |       |
| 1997-98              | 870,962   | \$12,799,626 | 90        | 276     | 73        | 291     | 23        | 43       | 6         | 20      | 5         | 24   | 192       | 630   |
| 1996-97              | 850,000   | \$12,125,500 | 88        | 288     | 79        | 291     | 21        | 42       | 4         | 14      | 6         | 43   | 192       | 635   |
| 1994-95              | 850,000   | \$10,000,000 | 82        | 345     | 82        | 298     | 24        | 36       | 6         | 16      | 0         | 0  | 194       | 695   |
| 1988-89              | 1,142,386 | \$4,143,941  | 103       | 438     | 150       | 405     | 23        | 38       | 8         | 14      | 0         | 0  | 284       | 895   |
| 1984-85              | 752,973   | \$4,100,000  | 93        | 402     | 138       | 337     | 15        | 34       | 7         | 9       | 0         | 0  | 253       | 782   |
| 1980-81              | 589,263   | \$1,400,000  | 108       | 481     | 160       | 440     | 10        | 22       | 5         | 5       | 0         | 0  | 283       | 948   |
| 1972-73              | 1,315,672 | \$1,000,000  | 128       | 558     | 246       | 803     | 2         | 10       | 0         | 0       | 0         | 0  | 376       | 1,371 |
| <b>Oakland</b>       |           |              |           |         |           |         |           |          |           |         |           |  |           |       |
| 1997-98              | 350,000   | \$3,000,000  | 37        | 180     | 28        | 84      | 15        | 24       | 1         | 1       | 0         | 0  | 81        | 289   |
| 1996-97              | 350,000   | \$3,200,000  | 37        | 180     | 28        | 84      | 15        | 24       | 1         | 1       | 0         | 0  | 81        | 289   |
| 1994-95              | 350,000   | \$2,019,909  | 36        | 186     | 32        | 152     | 13        | 22       | 1         | 1       | 0         | 0  | 82        | 361   |
| 1988-89              |           |              |           |         |           |         |           |          |           |         |           |  | 0         | 0     |
| 1984-85              | 1,000,000 | \$453,000    | 49        | 153     | 52        | 163     | 15        | 58       | 1         | 1       | 8         | 8  | 117       | 375   |
| 1980-81              | 800,000   | \$276,500    | 28        | 117     | 26        | 72      | 12        | 49       | 0         | 0       | 0         | 0  | 66        | 238   |
| 1972-73              | 2,000,000 | \$525,337    | 107       | 490     | 197       | 778     | 89        | 164      | 0         | 0       | 0         | 0  | 393       | 1,432 |
| <b>Denver</b>        |           |              |           |         |           |         |           |          |           |         |           |  |           |       |
| 1997-98              | 1,560,134 | \$14,908,105 | 122       | 655     | 167       | 510     | 94        | 317      | 24        | 102     | 228       | 1,641  | 407       | 1,584 |
| 1996-97              | 1,756,373 | \$12,479,656 | 120       | 634     | 155       | 529     | 92        | 338      | 24        | 73      | 214       | 1,437  | 391       | 1,574 |
| 1994-95              | 1,342,136 | \$7,546,266  | 113       | 564     | 160       | 618     | 75        | 178      | 13        | 52      | 142       | 115  | 361       | 1,412 |
| 1988-89              | 1,148,478 | \$4,720,000  | 96        | 382     | 167       | 669     | 15        | 37       | 11        | 23      | 0         | 0  | 289       | 1,111 |
| 1984-85              | 963,139   | \$2,800,000  | 97        | 474     | 227       | 974     | 21        | 35       | 2         | 3       | 0         | 0  | 347       | 1,486 |
| 1980-81              | 815,680   | \$1,800,600  | 99        | 484     | 215       | 928     | 30        | 73       | 4         | 16      | 0         | 0  | 348       | 1,501 |
| 1972-73              | 775,073   | \$595,000    | 87        | 372     | 185       | 576     | 14        | 36       | 0         | 0       | 0         | 0  | 286       | 984   |
| <b>Seattle</b>       |           |              |           |         |           |         |           |          |           |         |           |  |           |       |
| 1997-98              | 1,107,824 | \$9,469,033  | 80        | 296     | 105       | 303     | 47        | 359      | 9         | 64      | 18        | 61   | 241       | 1,022 |
| 1996-97              | 1,000,000 | \$11,500,000 | 79        | 294     | 111       | 309     | 49        | 329      | 9         | 70      | 20        | 75   | 248       | 1,002 |
| 1994-95              | 1,000,000 | \$9,000,000  | 77        | 306     | 120       | 323     | 48        | 262      | 9         | 162     | 16        | 133  | 254       | 1,053 |
| 1988-89              | 941,365   | \$4,300,000  | 85        | 366     | 114       | 430     | 46        | 178      | 9         | 103     | 1         | 6  | 254       | 1,077 |
| 1984-85              | 735,021   | \$3,200,000  | 87        | 527     | 148       | 584     | 66        | 250      | 15        | 57      | 2         | 2  | 316       | 1,418 |
| 1980-81              | 725,000   | \$1,365,000  | 87        | 458     | 130       | 437     | 72        | 346      | 6         | 63      | 0         | 0  | 295       | 1,304 |
| 1972-73              | 2,000,000 | \$525,337    | 107       | 490     | 197       | 778     | 89        | 164      | 0         | 0       | 0         | 0  | 393       | 1,432 |

We recommend that the Zoo endeavor to increase the number of mammals and birds in the collection commensurate with being able to properly care for the animals.

## CONCLUSIONS

The Zoo's acquisition/disposition practices have resulted in a significant reduction in the number of animals in the Zoo's collection. Excluding fishes and invertebrates, the number of Zoo animals decreased from 1,371 in 1972-73 to 895 in 1988-89 to 630 in 1997-98, a total decrease of 54 percent. The mammal count included in the total decreased from 558 in 1972-72, to 438 in 1988-89, to 276 in 1997-98, a total decrease of 51 percent. The General Curator has stated that the Zoo currently holds the

species and specimens that it can care for properly and that the Zoo's collection of mammal and bird specimens will be increasing with implementation of Phase II of the Master Plan.

In June of 1997, the Director of the San Francisco Zoo decided to request that the Asian elephant "Calle" be relocated to the San Francisco Zoo from the Los Angeles Zoo prior to obtaining the final results of a general health blood profile and a blood test to screen for tuberculosis. The decision to request shipment of the elephant prior to completion of health testing was a mistake; further tests revealed that Calle had contracted tuberculosis. As of August 1999, the cost of treating Calle's tubercular condition has been \$115,177, not including staff time. The Los Angeles Zoo has contributed \$30,000 toward that cost.

The Zoo's practices governing animal acquisition, loan, and disposition actions should be amended to assure that such transactions fully provide for the well being of the animals. In that regard, we found that:

1. The Zoo does not require AZA facilities requesting Zoo animals to complete an application form. Further, the Zoo does not require non-AZA members to notify the Zoo of the death or relocation of an animal that had been previously relocated to the non-AZA member by the Zoo. These provisions are recommended in the AZA Guidelines.
2. The Zoo's "Animal Disposition Agreement," which is the contract form used to bind both AZA and non-AZA recipients of Zoo animals, does not include reference to the AZA's Code of Professional Ethics nor does the Agreement contain the AZA's recommended language requiring the acquiring organization not to sell, trade, loan, or donate the acquired animal to any inhumane research program.
3. The Zoo's Animal Acquisition/Disposition Guidelines contain evaluation forms with appropriate questions for evaluating proposed acquisition/disposition actions. However, Zoo management does not currently complete the evaluation forms in writing.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Zoological Society should:

- 1.2.1 Require all institutions requesting an animal from the San Francisco Zoo to complete an animal acquisition application form.

- 1.2.2 Amend the “Animal Disposition Agreement” to require that all recipients of Zoo animals notify the Zoo upon the death of an animal and to require that non-AZA recipients obtain the Zoo’s approval prior to dispositioning the animal to a subsequent recipient.
- 1.2.3 Increase the number of mammals and birds in the Zoo’s animal collection, commensurate with providing animal care that meets or exceeds AZA standards. Zoo management reports that the Zoo intends to increase its animal collection as facilities are rebuilt and added during implementation of Phase II of the Master Plan.

**COSTS/BENEFITS**

Although there are no direct savings that can be attributed to strengthening the Zoo’s animal acquisition and disposition policies and procedures, by doing so, the Zoo will lessen the possibility of animals being ultimately transferred to an unsuitable facility, or used for an unsuitable purpose.

As the Zoo implements Phase II of its Master Plan, increasing the number of animals on exhibit will enhance the experience of Zoo visitors and should ultimately increase Zoo attendance and revenues.