

**Ethics Tipline Incident #120074221**  
**Metro Animal Service Donation Fraud Allegation**  
**Review**  
**Meeting Notes – (MAS) Robinson, Brosko and Helm 9/9/14**

Introduction

A meeting was held in the Office of Internal Audit (OIA) offices on September 9, 2014. The purpose was to discuss how MAS' animal care system, Chameleon, could be used to possibly assist with identifying the customer's intended use of their donated funds, if applicable. Further, there was more discussion regarding the accepting and recording of donations at MAS. Attendees included Ingram Quick (Director) of OIA and Donald Robinson (Assistant Director), Margaret Brosko (Assistant Director) of Metro Animal Services (MAS) and Betsy Helm of Metro Technology Services(MTS).

1. To clarify, whether by mail, internet or walk-in, if the donor does not specify which fund and / or specifically how the funds should be used, it is MAS management's discretion to determine the best use of the funds? *Donald stated that management determines what the funds should be used for when unspecified donations are sent by mail. Betsy did state that the renewal forms that are mailed out give prospective donors the option of where they want their donated funds to go; animal care, building fund or SPOT fund. Donald stated that with online donations the system requires the donor to specify what the donated funds are intended for prior to making the donation. However, for online license payments, if a donor wants to donate funds, the funds can only be donated to the animal care fund. Donald stated that when a donor walks in to the MAS (Animal Shelter) and makes a donation, the clerk asks the donor which fund they would wish to donate to. If the donor does not specify where the funds should go, it is management's decision to determine where funds can best be used. There are no internal desktop policies and procedures for their donation process.*
2. You stated there was no formal agreement with MAS and the ex-employee and / or the SPOT Board regarding raising funds for Sadie's surgery? *Donald stated there was no formal agreement between MAS and the ex-employee and / or the SPOT Board regarding raising funds for Sadie's surgery.*
3. When were the funds raised for Sadie's surgery sent to the SPOT Board? When were they made aware that funds submitted to them were earmarked for the Sadie surgery? *Donald did state that he believed that the funds were raised by both MAS (\$200) and the ex-employee (\$60). Margaret stated that OMB identified two other donations that were specified for medical expenses and these were included in the total amount (apprx. \$340) sent to the SPOT Board for Sadie's surgery. Margaret stated that it is normal protocol*

IQ

9/9/14

*that when the SPOT Board receives funds from LMG earmarked for specific purposes, the Board is not made aware until all of the funds have been raised to complete the task, in this case the surgery. Margaret and Donald acknowledged that the Spot Board was not made aware of the funds earmarked for Sadie until after the dog had been euthanized.*

4. Can you give us any receipt information from the Chameleon system related to Sadie?

*Betsy stated that we have been provided all documentation for Sadie from the Chameleon system. Betsy stated that any receipt information related to donations for Sadie's surgery have already been provided to OIA (Mayria Porter). Betsy stated that the only further information we may receive from the receipt other than what we have been provided is a line item breakdown for the transaction amount.*