

Final Report Of The Visiting Committee To The Accreditation Commission

SENECA PARK ZOO Rochester, New York

UNDER REVIEW FOR ACCREDITATION

Date(s) Visited: June 6 - 8, 2018 Final Review & Hearing on: September 24, 2018

ACCREDITATION COMMISSION PRIMARY REVIEWER

Nancy McToldridge, Director, Santa Barbara Zoo, CA

VISITING COMMITTEE INSPECTORS

signatures on file

TEAM CHAIR

Operations Inspector: William Foster, DVM, CEO, Birmingham Zoo, AL

Husbandry Inspector: Adam Felts, Curator, Heart of Africa, Columbus Zoo and Aquarium, OH

Veterinary Inspector: Jennifer D'Agostino, DVM, Director of Veterinary Services, Oklahoma City Zoo, OK

Elephant Inspector: Dale Leeds, Curator of Toyota Elephant Passage, Denver Zoo, CO

This Visiting Committee recommends that the next team allow at least 3 day(s) to inspect this institution and that the team consist of 4 number of inspectors.

NOTE: This is an official document of the Association of Zoos & Aquariums and becomes an intrinsic part of the institution's accreditation processing. The accreditation program is conducted in confidence; only the Accreditation Commission, related AZA staff, Director/CEO of the applicant institution, and Chair of the institution's governing authority shall be provided copies by AZA.



VISITING COMMITTEE REPORT 2018 EDITION

1. STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE SECTION:

A/Q/U NOTATIONS: All questions are answered with "Yes", "No", or "N/A". Except for questions answered "N/A", all questions will also indicate either "A", "Q", or "U" (Acceptable, Questionable, or Unacceptable), in the far right-hand column. If "Q" or "U", a brief explanation of why this is so should be included in the "Comments" area at the end of that section, and again in greater detail in the Narrative section of this report.

${f A}$ - Acceptable (Normal within
the profession and requires no
immediate action.)

Q - Questionable (Should be improved or corrected as soon as possible, but is not a critical matter.)

U - Unacceptable (Must be corrected immediately, does not meet professional standards, may be unsafe or detrimental to the institution, its staff, its collection, or its visitors.)

KEY TO NOTATIONS APPEARING WITH QUESTIONS:

< A >: When the notation "< A >" appears following a question it indicates that the question could be answered by reviewing the materials submitted by the facility.

< A + >: When the notation "< A + >" appears following a question it indicates that the question could be answered by reviewing the materials submitted by the facility in conjunction with additional investigation during the actual inspection.

No Notation: Questions without an < A > or < A + > could *only* be answered by questioning appropriate personnel, obtaining additional documentation, and/or by observances made during the actual inspection.

Appearing On Institution Questionnaire Only: The Visiting Committee Report Form is numbered to sequentially correspond with the institution's questionnaire/application. Often consecutive questions appearing in the questionnaire/application relate to the same basic issue. When this happens redundant or similar questions are deliberately left out of the Visiting Committee Report Form. The "Appearing On Institution Questionnaire Only" notation is provided to avoid the impression that questions in a sequence are erroneously missing from this report form.

2. VISITING COMMITTEE'S LIST OF CONCERNS & POINTS OF ACHIEVEMENT: The list of concerns and points of particular achievement noted by the team during the inspection are included at the end of this document. This list was presented to the institution's Director during the exit interview.

3. NARRATIVE SECTION: The narrative section of this report follows the List of Concerns. It contains details of items appearing in this report and on the List of Concerns.



PREAMBLE TO THE ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

Zoos and aquariums accredited by the Association of Zoos & Aquariums (AZA) are continuously evolving. A primary goal of AZA institutions is to achieve the highest standard of welfare for the animals in our care. Standards are constantly being raised, ensuring that animals in AZA institutions are receiving the best possible care from highly qualified staff, in modern facilities that represent best practice in our profession. 21st century AZA-accredited institutions and certified related facilities are expected to be leaders in the field and to embrace the highest quality facilities, programs, and staff available. Animals must be well cared for and housed in appropriate settings that provide an educational experience for visitors, and meet the animals' physical, psychological, and social needs. Animals must be managed as appropriate for long-term genetic viability of the species, which means careful planning of resource allocation, ex-situ breeding, and ex-situ/in-situ conservation and research.

The phrase "modern zoological practices and philosophies" refers to practices and philosophies that are commonly accepted as the norm by the profession. The word "practices" represents the tangible while "philosophies" refers to an overall perspective. AZA-accredited institutions and certified related facilities must be incorporating modern zoological practices and philosophies as basic tenets.

All AZA-accredited institutions and certified related facilities must follow all local, state, and federal laws and/or regulations. Some AZA standards may be more stringent than existing laws and/or regulations and, in these cases, the AZA standards must be met.

Primarily, AZA standards are performance standards (i.e., measuring the level of achievement considered acceptable to fulfill a performance characteristic, and choice in method for meeting the goal). This differs from engineering standards, where exact and precisely measured steps are required to fulfill an engineering characteristic, with little or no variation in method for meeting the goal.

GENI	ERAL INFORMATION (GI)	<u>YEŞ</u>	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
GI-1 to	GI-4. Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
GI-5.	Does the historical record of the institution reflect an accurate record of continued progressive growth? < A >	\boxtimes			A
GI-6.	Does the institution appear to be fulfilling its mission statement? $\langle A + \rangle$	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GI-7.	Is the institution approved by USDA for importing ruminants (PPEQ)? < A >		\boxtimes		<u>A</u>
GI-8 to	GI-9. Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
GI-10.	Are operations adequately altered for seasonal (cold weather) changes?	\boxtimes			A
сомм	ENTS:				
ANIN	IAL WELFARE, CARE, & MANAGEMENT (AC)	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
AC-1.	Is the institution in compliance with all relevant local, state, and federal wildlife laws and regulations (e.g., USDA, AWA, etc.)? [1.1.1] < A +>	\boxtimes			A
AC-2.	Does the institution follow appropriate taxon-specific AZA Animal Care Manuals (ACMs) when renovating old exhibits and/or designing and developing new exhibits? [1.2.1, 1.2.2] < A +>	\boxtimes			A
AC-3.	Does the institution's Institutional Collection Plan (ICP) conform to the institution's mission and vision? [1.3.1] < A >				A
AC-4.	Is the institution's ICP re-evaluated and updated at minimum every five years? [1.3.1] < A >	\boxtimes			A

			YES	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
AC-5.		the institution's ICP incorporate the suggested elements outlined in AZA's editation standards? [1.3.1] < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-6.		nimals presented in a manner that reflects modern zoological practices in exhibit throughout the institution? [1.5.1]				Q
	a.	Are all animals housed in enclosures and groupings which meet their physical, psychological, and social needs? $[1.5.2] < A + >$	\boxtimes			A
	b.	Is the ratio of males to females for the individual animals being maintained? [1.5.2.1]	\boxtimes			A
	c.	Are all animals kept in appropriate groupings which meet their social and welfare needs? [1.5.2.1] < A + >				A
	d.	Are all animals provided the opportunity to choose among a variety of conditions within their environment? [1.5.2.2]				A
	e.	Are the animals well cared for? [1.5.1] < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-7.	Do tl	ne species within the institution fulfill the institution's stated objectives? [1.5.0]	\boxtimes			A
AC-8.		all endangered, CITES I, SSP®, and studbook species maintained by the facility tered with Species360 (formerly ISIS)? [1.4.8] < A >				A
AC-9.	Is the	e animal cataloging system adequate? [1.4.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.3, 1.4.7, 1.4.8] < A + >	\boxtimes			A
AC-10.	Does	the animal marking system meet the needs of the institution? [1.4.3] < A + >	\boxtimes			A
AC-11.	Are a	nimal records duplicated? [1.4.4] < A >	\boxtimes			A
AC-12.		he animal records protected from fire, flooding, and other natural hazards?	\boxtimes			Q
AC-13.	Are o	luplicate records stored in an appropriate separate location? [1.4.4] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-14.		paid staff member designated as being responsible for the institution's animal recording system? [1.4.6] $<$ A $>$	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	a.	Does at least one member of the institution's paid staff responsible for animal record keeping have the proper training (AZA's Institutional Records-Keeping course is one option)? [1.4.9] < A >	d- ⊠			A
AC-15.	Are i	records kept current with up-to-date information? [1.4.7]				<u>A</u>
AC-16.	with	e institution's Policy on Responsible Population Management (RPM) in accordance relevant legislation, AZA's RPM Policy, and AZA's conservation policies?	\boxtimes			A
AC-17.		the management of the animals appear to conform with the stated Policy on onsible Population Management? [1.3.2]				A
AC-18.		ere an adequate system for the preservation of important data on acquisition, fer, euthanasia and reintroduction? [1.3.2]				A
AC-19.	Does	the institution surplus animals to non-AZA facilities? [AZA's RPM Policy] < A + >	\boxtimes			A
	a.	If yes, does the institution have an appropriate method for assessing the	ΙΣΊ			Δ

		2018 Accreditation Visiting Com	mittee Report		Page 4	
AC-20.	Is a	mimal welfare a top priority at the institution? [1.5.0, 1.5.1, 1.5.2, 1.5.2.1, 1.5.7, 1.5.8]	YES ⊠	<u>NO</u>	N/A	<u>A/Q/U</u> <u>A</u>
AC-21.	Do	es the institution have a process for assessing animal welfare and wellness? [1.5.0]	\boxtimes			A
	a.	If yes, is the process transparent to stakeholders?	\boxtimes			A
	b.	If yes, does the institution's staff receive training in assessing animal welfare?	\boxtimes			A
	c.	If yes, does the assessment process include an evaluation of welfare/wellness as well as the events and/or changes that may impact the animal or group of animals?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	d.	If yes, are assessments being done on a regular basis?	\boxtimes			A
AC-22.	Is t	he welfare of all animals residing at the institution being considered and assessed?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-23.	unp	es the institution have a process for reporting animal welfare concerns by paid and paid staff, without retribution, that meets the requirements outlined in the A standard? [1.5.8] < A + >	\boxtimes			A
	a.	If yes, do paid and unpaid staff appear to have adequate knowledge of the process for reporting a welfare concern? < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	b.	If yes, does the institution look into each reported concern in a timely manner? < A + >				A
	c.	If yes, does the institution provide feedback to the reporting individual? $< A + >$	\boxtimes			A
	d.	If yes, does the process supplement the normal chain-of-command to assure that personal conflicts do not have influence over the process or outcomes? $<$ A + $>$	\boxtimes			A
AC-24.	with	ne institution maintains elephants, are its facilities and procedures in compliance in AZA's Standards for Elephant Management and Care (see pages 33-68 of the 2018 creditation Standards and Related Policies" booklet)? [1.5.6] < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-25.		the institution's written elephant management protocols meet the requirements as lined in AZA's Standards For Elephant Management and Care? [1.5.6] < A >	\boxtimes			A
AC-26.		es the facility have an elephant restraining device? [AZA's Standards for Elephant nagement and Care] < A >	\boxtimes			A
	a.	If "no", are the facility's alternative methods acceptable in terms of meeting AZA standards of veterinary care and examination, method of restraint, and the ability to safely manage dominance and aggression, or the introduction of a new animal? < A >				A
AC-27.		es the institution have protocols for training new paid or unpaid staff in the elephant nagement program? [AZA's Standards for Elephant Management and Care] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-28.		elephant behavior profiles appear to be acceptable? [AZA's Standards for Elephant nagement and Care] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-29.		es the institution have a designated, qualified elephant "manager"? [AZA's Standards Elephant Management and Care] < A >			\boxtimes	<u>A</u>
AC-30.	with	ne institution maintains cetaceans, are its facilities and procedures in compliance in AZA's Standards For Cetacean Care & Welfare (see pages 69 – 77 of the 2018 creditation Standards and Related Policies" booklet)? [1.5.6.1] < A + >			\boxtimes	A
AC-31.	Doe	es the institution offer cetacean and guest interactive programs? < A + >			\boxtimes	A

	a. If "y	res" to AC-31, are the animals given a choice to participate? [Cet. 4.1] < A + >	YES □	NO	N/A ⊠	<u>A/Q/U</u> <u>A</u>
AC-32.	If "yes" to	AC-31, are the animals and supervising staff properly trained? [Cet. 4.3]				A
AC-33.		nstitution have a behavior management program for cetaceans that includes nts required in the standards? [Cet. 6.1] < A + >			\boxtimes	A
AC-34.	Does the i	nstitution have a designated, qualified cetacean manager? [Cet. 4.2, 4.3,] < A >			\boxtimes	<u>A</u>
AC-35.	USDA Instorms (or	stitution adequately addressed the concerns/deficiencies noted on the pection of Animal Facilities, Sites or Premises (VS form 18-8) report the equivalent for those not inspected by USDA)? Please provide details ment section on this form and, if necessary, in your narrative report. < A + >	\boxtimes			A
AC-36.		nstitution offer demonstrations of animal behavioral training to the public?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	anin	es", are the demonstrations performed in accordance with appropriate nal training protocols that provide for the overall health and psychological being of the animals participating? < A + >	\boxtimes			A
AC-37.		n pools" and "petting environments" adequately managed and supervised for tion of the animals involved? [1.5.4, 1.5.5, 1.5.13, 11.3.3] < A + >			\boxtimes	A
AC-38.	where the	washing stations and appropriate signage available and visible in all areas public may come into contact with animals? [11.1.2, AZA's Policy on Animal ith the General Public]			\boxtimes	A
AC-39.		taff and/or volunteers who handle animals during demonstrations/programs rained to handle the animals before this activity occurs? A >	\boxtimes			A
AC-40.	used outsi physical co domestic a	nstitution use animals for education purposes on site (animals that are de their normal exhibit or holding areas or are intended to have regular, ontact with the public within their normal exhibits, e.g., contact area with animals, browse feeding programs with giraffes, lorikeet feeding, etc.)?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	a. If "yes", please respond to the following: < A + >					
	1.	Does the institution's written policy on the use of live animals in programs incorporate the elements in AZA's "Recommendations For Developing an Institutional Ambassador Animal Policy" [pages 86-91, 2018 Standards]	\boxtimes			A
	2.	Are the species utilized appropriate?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	3.	Are both the animals and public provided adequate protection?	\boxtimes			A
	4.	Does the institution make certain that handlers are properly trained, and that the way in which the animals are handled causes them no undue stress?	\boxtimes			A
	5∙	Are isolation/quarantine facilities adequate?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	6.	Are the animals used kept separate from the rest of the institution's animals?	\boxtimes			A
	7.	Are the animals used being rotated sufficiently?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-41.		effort been made to provide ambassador animals with housing conditions exhibit animals?	\boxtimes			A



2018 Accreditation Visiting Committee Report Page 6 YES N/A A/Q/U NO Are ambassador animals provided with sufficient social, physical, behavioral and nutritional opportunities to meet their needs? < A + > \boxtimes П A AC-42. Does the institution utilize ambassador animals in off-premises situations (i.e., shopping malls, sporting/events, school programs, theatrical productions, etc.)? [1.5.5] < A > \boxtimes П A a. If "yes", please respond to the following: $\langle A + \rangle$ Are the species utilized appropriate? \boxtimes A Are both the animals and public provided adequate protection? X 2. A Does the institution make certain that handlers are properly trained, and that 3. the way in which the animals are handled causes them no undue stress? \boxtimes П П A Is sufficient transportation and care provided when animals are off the 4. \boxtimes premises? A Are isolation/quarantine facilities adequate? X 5. A Are the animals used kept separate from the rest of the institution's animals, 6. especially following an appearance off institution grounds? \boxtimes A Are life support systems, designed for aquatic animals shown off-site, П \Box X adequate? A 8. Are the animals used being rotated sufficiently? \boxtimes Α AC-43. Does the institution use animals for photo opportunities with the public? [1.5.3, 1.5.4, 1.5.5] < A > 冈 A a. If "yes", please respond to the following: < A +> Are the species utilized appropriate? X A Are both the animals and public provided adequate protection? \boxtimes Α Does the institution make certain that handlers are properly trained, and that 3. the way in which the animals are handled causes them no undue stress? П 冈 Α П X Are isolation/quarantine facilities adequate? П 4. A 5. Are the animals used kept separate from the rest of the institution's animals? X A 6. Are the animals used being rotated sufficiently? П П X A \boxtimes Are animals being taken off site for photo opportunities? <u>A</u> AC-44. Does the water quality methods and controls program appear to be adequate for the aquatic exhibits? [1.5.9] \boxtimes П П A AC-45. Are all exhibit and holding area air and water inflows and outflows securely protected to prevent animal injury or egress? [1.5.15] \boxtimes П Α AC-46. Is appropriate UV spectrum provided for animals housed either long-term or permanently in indoor facilities? [1.5.14] \boxtimes A AC-47. Are the animals protected from weather and adverse environmental conditions? [1.5.7] \boxtimes A \boxtimes AC-48. Does it appear that the animals' sociobiological needs are being met? [1.5.2] A

AC-49.	Are the animal enclosures clean and well maintained? [10.1.1]	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	N/A	<u>A/Q/U</u> <u>A</u>
AC-50.	Does the institution's pest control program appear adequate? [2.8.1, 10.1.1]	\boxtimes			A
AC-51.	Are enclosure substrates, design features, and "furniture" sufficient, and adequate to meet the needs of the animals, including those in multi-species exhibits? [1.5.1, 1.5.2]	\boxtimes			A
AC-52.	Do all animals have access to adequate shelter sufficient to protect them from heat, cold, and all forms of precipitation? [1.5.7]	\boxtimes			A
AC-53.	Is sufficient shade (in addition to shelter structures) provided for animals in outdoor enclosures? [1.5.16]		\boxtimes		<u>U</u>
AC-54.	Are all holding areas sufficient in size and structure to comfortably contain the animals for extended periods due to inclement weather? [1.5.7]	\boxtimes			A
AC-55.	Does the institution allow the public to feed the animals?		\boxtimes		<u>A</u>
AC-56.	Are the animals adequately identified for the public? [4.3.3]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-57.	Are endangered species appropriately identified as such? [4.3.3]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-58.	Does the institution experience significant seasonal changes (hot, cold, etc.)? < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	a. If yes, are operations adequately altered for those changes where appropriate? $<$ A $+$ $>$	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-59.	Does the institution have a written animal enrichment program that incorporates the elements outlined in AZA's Accreditation Standards? [1.6.1] < A >	\boxtimes			A
	 a. If yes, has a specific paid staff member or committee been assigned program oversight? [1.6.2] 	\boxtimes			A
	b. Does the staff member or committee with program oversight have authority to manage and further develop the enrichment program?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	c. Does the staff member or committee with program oversight have adequate interactions with curators, managers, veterinary staff, nutrition staff and researchers to ensure a comprehensive, institution-wide implementation of the enrichment program?	\boxtimes			A
AC-60.	Are there sufficient resources and paid or unpaid staff available to implement the animal enrichment program? [1.6.2, 1.6.3] < A+ >				<u>A</u>
	a. Is there adequate involvement by all applicable departments?	\boxtimes			A
	b. Is enrichment being provided on a regular basis?	\boxtimes			A
	c. Is the provided enrichment developed to meet the behavioral needs of the animals?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	d. Is the provided enrichment documented and regularly assessed?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	e. Are refinements made based on documented results and assessments?	\boxtimes			A
AC-61.	Does the institution have a written animal training program that incorporates the elements noted in AZA's Accreditation Standards, and enhances the overall health and psychological well-being of the animals? [1.6.4] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>

	2018 Accreditation visiting Comm	iittee K	ерогт	1	rage o
AC-62	Does the institution have an adequate water quality monitoring program that outlines	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
NC-02.	parameters tested, allowable tolerances, frequency of testing, methods of testing, and data interpretation protocol for each major aquatic system? [1.5.9] < A + >	\boxtimes			A
AC-63.	Does management carefully scrutinize the origins of collected aquatic animals to minimize environmental damage caused by unacceptable collection techniques (e.g., cyanide collection, etc.)? [1.7.1, 1.7.2] < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
AC-64.	Does the institution have current and complete copies of all applicable local, state, federal and/or international permits to collect the animals purchased (including aquatic animals) from all commercial animal collectors utilized? [1.7.2] < A + >				<u>A</u>
AC-65.	In the last five years have any animals shipped to or from the institution died or been seriously injured in transport? $[1.5.11] < A + >$	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	 a. If yes, did the institution take appropriate action after the event, and were changes made in procedures as a result? < A + > 	\boxtimes			Α
AC-66.	Does the institution use temporary, seasonal, or traveling live animal exhibits, pony rides, etc.? [1.5.10]				
	<a>		\boxtimes		A
	a. If yes, are those exhibits or rides, etc., maintained at the same level of care as the institution's permanent resident animals? < A + >			\boxtimes	A
	b. If yes, is the institution's process adequate for assuring that the vendor has the expertise, resources, and facilities to properly care for the animals both onsite and at the location where the animals permanently reside? < A >			\boxtimes	A
AC-67.	NON AZA-ACCREDITED ONLY: Does the institution permit hunting of captive wildlife? < A + >			\boxtimes	A
AC-68.	NON AZA-ACCREDITED ONLY: Does the institution utilize auctions, the pet industry, or hunting ranches for the disposal of captive wildlife? < A + >			\boxtimes	A
current event	ENTS: AC-6: The exhibits displays for hyena, raccoon, red tailed hawk, black vulture, and sr zoological standards. AC – 12: Daily animal records are inconsistently duplicated, stored or AC-53: Limited shade is provide for red panda and snow leopards, along with the sea lion exland only for the spring and summer season.	protec	ted fro	om cata	<u>astrophe</u>
VETE	RINARY CARE (VC)	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	A/Q/U
VC-1.	Does the institution follow the Guidelines for Zoo and Aquarium Veterinary Medical Programs and Veterinary Hospitals, and the policies supported by the American Association of Zoo Veterinarians (AAZV)? [2.0.1] < A >	\boxtimes			A
VC-2.	Is the institution's preventative medicine program adequate and implemented; i.e., TB tests and appropriate vaccinations annually, etc.? [2.0.2] < A >	\boxtimes			A
VC-3.	Has the institution developed plans for periodic disease outbreaks in wild, domestic, or exotic animal populations that outline steps to be taken to protect their animals in the event of such a situation? [2.0.3] < A >	\boxtimes			A
VC-4.	Is there a full-time veterinarian? [2.1.1] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	a. If not, indicate the frequency of regularly scheduled visits made by the part-time or consulting veterinarian:				A

X

A

standards and guidelines of AZA and AAZV? [2.7.3]

	2018 Accreditation Visiting Com	mittee i	Report	4	Page 10
		YES	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
VC-22.	Are written quarantine procedures available and familiar to all paid and unpaid staff working with quarantined animals? [2.7.2]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
VC-23.	Do veterinarians have access to radiographic equipment? [2.3.2]	\boxtimes			A
VC-24.	Is the institution's animal food nutrition, acquisition, and preparation program adequate? [2.6.1, 2.6.2] < A >	\boxtimes			A
VC-25.	Are the animal diets of adequate quality and quantity and suitable for the type of species within the institution? [2.6.2]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
VC-26.	Are the animal diets prepared and stored hygienically? [2.6.1]				<u>A</u>
VC-27.	Overall, are food items provided in a way that promotes the physical and psychological well-being of the animals? [2.6.2]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	a. Is the timing and location of food provisioning biologically appropriate and stimulating?	\boxtimes			A
VC-28.	Are animal food preparation areas physically separated from other functions (animal treatment, isolation, holding, deceased animal storage, employee lounges, etc.)? [2.6.4]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
VC-29.	Does the institution use browse as part of the diet or enrichment of the animals? [2.6.3]	\boxtimes			A
	 a. If yes, is a qualified individual assigned to oversee the selection of appropriate browse? 				<u>A</u>
VC-30.	Are the institution's protocols adequate for identifying and reviewing safe browse items? $[2.6.3] < A + >$				<u>A</u>
VC-31.	Are the institution's protocols adequate for ensuring that the animals are not exposed to toxic plants in and around their exhibits? $[2.6.3] < A + >$	\boxtimes			A
VC-32.	Does the institution have a written euthanasia policy? [2.9.1] < A >	\boxtimes			A
	a. If yes, does it follow current AVMA or AAZV guidelines? < A >	\boxtimes			A
	 If yes, are all paid and unpaid animal care staff members familiar with the policy? < A +> 	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
COMM informa	ENTS: Throughout the SPZ, animal prescription bottles were labeled inadequately. The lastion required by the New York State Veterinary Board.	bels die	l not c	<u>ontain</u>	all of the
CONS	SERVATION (C)	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
C-1.	Is conservation a key element in the mission and messaging of the institution? [3.1.1]	\boxtimes			A
C-2.	Does the institution have a written conservation action plan or strategy? [3.2.1] < A >	\boxtimes			Q
	 a. If yes, is the plan or strategy adequate and in line with AZA standards given the size of the institution's budget and staff? < A+ > 	\boxtimes			A
	 If yes, is the institution involved in energy and natural resource conservation, and other green practices in an appropriate manner? < A > 				A
	c. If yes, does the plan or strategy include defined outcomes and a goal of demonstrating continuous improvement in each area? < A >				A

		YES	NO	N/A	A/Q/U
C-3.	If the institution is currently AZA-accredited, has it shown increased involvement in field conservation over the last five years since the previous inspection?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
C-4.	Are the conservation efforts of the institution evaluated in an appropriate and timely manner? [3.2.2] $< A >$				<u>A</u>
C-5.	Is the institution actively participating in AZA animal programs? [3.3.2]	\boxtimes			A
C-6.	Is the institution's level of participation in AZA animal programs in line with similar-sized institutions? [3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.4] < A >	\boxtimes			A
	a. Does the institution participate in or support an appropriate number of conservation programs?	\boxtimes			A
C-7.	Is the institution participating in every SSP® that pertains to an animal belonging to the institution? [3.3.1] < A >	\boxtimes			A
C-4. A C-5. Is C-6. Is C-6. Is c-7. Is th a. C-7. Is C-7. Is C-10. D C-10. D C-10. D C-11. D C-12. Is C-12. Is C-14. A si C-14. A si COMMEN was being created a the Societ Zoo and S Conservat of Animal appear to	a. If "no", please list those in which it should, but is not participating:				
C-8.	Is the institution cooperative in providing pertinent information in a timely fashion to AZA program leaders such as Studbook Keepers, SSP Coordinators and Chairs, etc.? [3.3.2]	\boxtimes			A
C-9.	Is the institution cooperative in following agreed upon recommendations (e.g., Breeding and Transfer Plans; acquisitions, transfers, and transitions, etc.? [3.3.2]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
C-10.	Do the institution, governing authority, and paid or unpaid staff members actively participate in local, regional, state/province, academic, national, and international wildlife conservation programs? [3.3.4] < A >	\boxtimes			A
C-11.	Does the institution initiate or participate in appropriate conservation initiatives (e.g., Educational programs/materials that increase public awareness on the importance of preserving ecosystems, training programs that provide field experiences, habitat restoration, local community participation, etc.)? [3.2.1, 3.3.4] < A >	\boxtimes			A
C-12.	Is conservation the foundation of the institution's overall message to the general public? [3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.3.4]	\boxtimes			A
C-13.	Are the institution's contributions to elephant research and conservation in line with similar sized institutions? [AZA's Standards For Elephant Management & Care] < A >				A
C-14.	Are the institution's contributions to cetacean research and conservation in line with similar sized institutions? [AZA's Standards For Cetacean Care & Welfare] < A >			\boxtimes	A
was be created the Soc Zoo an Consei of Anii	IENTS: C-2: The SPZ does have a written conservation strategy; however, the inspection teading followed. The written program states that "in 2018, embracing a commitment to consert a full-time Director of Animal Health & Conservation position to lead the SPZ's conservation ciety's Director of Programming & Conservation Action. In recognition of our shared conservation Action Park Zoo Society, for the first time, have developed this unified Conservation Action Committee is now responsible for implementing our shared vision." In practice, it dimal Health & Conservation was involved in the SPZ's conservation efforts much, if at all. All to be administered solely through the Seneca Park Zoo Society with little to no input from the senecal park Zoo Society with little to the senecal Park Zoo Society with little to no input from the senecal Park Zoo Society with little to no inpu	vation, on effor vation on on Plan d not a of the	Monr rts in c missio & Stra ppear conse	oe Cou ollabor n, Sene itegy. A that th vation	nty ration with eca Park A joint ee Director efforts
EDU	CATION AND INTERPRETATION (EI)	YES	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	A/Q/U
EI-1.	Is education a key element in the mission of the institution? [4.1.1]	\boxtimes			A



		2018 Accreditation Visiting Com	mittee F	Report		Page 12
ELo	Dan		<u>YES</u>	NO	N/A	A/Q/L
EI-2.		s the institution have a written education plan for the education gram? [4.2.1] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	a.	If yes, does this plan address the goals and objectives of the department? < A+ >	\boxtimes			A
EI-3.		ne education department under the direction of a paid professional trained in cation programming? [4.2.2] < A >				<u>A</u>
EI-4.	App	earing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
EI-5.		the institution's educational programs clearly tied to AZA conservation messages? 1, 4.3.1, 4.3.3] < A+ >				<u>A</u>
	a.	If "yes", do the institution's education programs address local <i>and</i> global conservation issues, and the role of zoos/aquariums in conservation?	\boxtimes			A
	b.	Do the institution's conservation and education messages relate to its overall mission?				A
	c.	Do the institution's conservation and education messages address AZA's cooperative management programs (e.g., SSPs and TAGs)?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
EI-6.	App	earing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
EI-7.	Do t	he institution's educational programs meet the needs of its visitors? [4.3.2] < A >	\boxtimes			A
	a.	If yes, has the institution adequately assessed the needs of under-represented groups and visitors with special needs? < A+ >	\boxtimes			A
EI-8.	natio mus	s the institution have educationally focused collaborative partnerships with local/ onal groups, (universities/colleges, nature centers, conservation organizations, eums, governmental agencies, etc.) and are the arrangements/agreements copriate? [4.2.3] < A+ >	\boxtimes			A
EI-9.		the education programs evaluated regularly and effectively (including assessment apact as well as satisfaction)? [4.3.1] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
EI-10.	Are	the animals identified and interpreted for the public? [4.3.3]	\boxtimes			A
	a.	If yes, are exhibit labels and other graphics legible and in good condition?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	b.	If interactive exhibits are used, are they in working order?	\boxtimes			A
	c.	If volunteers or staff are utilized in interpretive programs, do they appear to be well-trained in both content and interpretive abilities?	\boxtimes			A
	d.	Are the institution's messages clearly conveyed by the interpretation?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	e.	Does the institution address conservation issues in their interpretation (e.g., programs, graphics, etc.) such as, among other choices, referencing in situ conservation efforts for select species, utilizing AZA SSP and/or other logos, etc., as appropriate to the institution's conservation messages?	\boxtimes			A
EI-11.		e volunteer program adequate for the needs of the institution's education rams? [7.10]	\boxtimes			A
EI-12.		aid and unpaid staff members have an adequate library available at the institution? 4] < A+ >		\boxtimes		Δ

AGUAN	NUMBER 5				
EI-13.	Do paid and unpaid staff members have access to Internet resources at the institution?	YES	NO	N/A	A/Q/U
	[4.2.4] < A+ >	\boxtimes	Ш		A
COMM	ENTS:				
SCIE	NTIFIC ADVANCEMENT (SA)	YES	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	A/Q/U
SA-1.	Does the institution have a commitment to scientific study proportionate to the size and scope of its facilities? [5.0] $< A + >$				<u>A</u>
SA-2.	Does a qualified individual or committee have appropriate oversight of the institution's scientific studies and related projects? [5.1] < A >				<u>A</u>
SA-3. A	Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
SA-4.	Is the institution's written policy on the evaluation and approval of proposals for scientific study adequate and in line with AZA standards, given the size of the institution's budget and the number of paid and unpaid staff? [5.2] < A >	\boxtimes			A
SA-5.	Does the institution have an adequate process of monitoring approved and in-progress scientific studies? [5.2] < A >	\boxtimes			A
SA-6.	Is the institution's participation in scientific studies in line with similar-sized institutions? [5.0, 5.3] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SA-7.	Are research philosophies and activities consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the institution? [5.0]	\boxtimes			A
SA-8.	Does the institution publish or otherwise share the results of studies within the profession and/or scientific community? [5.3] < A >	\boxtimes			A
SA-9/S	A-10. Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
COMM	ENTS:				
GOVI	ERNING AUTHORITY (GA)	YES	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
GA-1.	Is the institution operated or directly maintained by a parent institution, society, business, organization, or agency? < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GA-2 to	GA-5. Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
GA-6.	Are the lines of communication between the director and governing authority clearly defined? $[6.5]$ < A + >				<u>A</u>
GA-7.	Is the governing authority supportive of the institution's goals and objectives? [6.2]	\boxtimes			A
GA-8.	Does the governing authority support the institution's abiding by the AZA Code of Ethics and Bylaws? [6.1]				<u>A</u>
GA-9.	Does the governing authority leave the day-to-day management of the institution to the CEO/Director? [6.3, 6.4] < A + >	\boxtimes			A
GA-10.	Does the governing authority make any decisions regarding the animals? [6.4]	\boxtimes			A



	AQUARIUMS				
	2018 Accreditation Visiting Comm	nittee R	eport	1	Page 14
GA 11	Does the governing authority recognize the CEO/Director as the sole official	YES	NO	N/A	A/Q/U
GA-11.	liaison between itself and the paid and unpaid staff? [6.5]	\boxtimes			A
GA-12.	Does the governing authority recognize the right of the CEO/Director to originate all paid and unpaid staff appointments, promotions, and terminations? [6.3, 6.4]	\boxtimes			A
GA-13.	Does the governing authority recognize that the CEO/Director's responsibilities are to the entire governing authority, not to its individual members?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GA-14.	Does the CEO/Director have the opportunity to attend meetings of the governing authority that would affect operations of the institution? [6.6]	\boxtimes			A
GA-15.	Do the terms of service for those on the governing authority overlap to provide continuity? $< A + >$				A
team's	ENTS: GA -6: Special note- Larry Sorel, CEO for 21 years retired between submittal of accre nspection. Larry Staub, Director of Monroe County Parks, is serving as Zoo Director. The Gntative and Zoo Director are simultaneously duties of Larry Staub. The newly configured administration of past hierarchy.	<u>overni</u>	ng au	thority	
STAF	F (S)	YES	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
S-1.	Is there a sufficient number of paid and unpaid staff to properly care for the animals and to conduct the institution's programs? [7.3]	\boxtimes			A
S-2.	Do the salaries of the paid staff appear to be within acceptable limits? [7.4] < A >	\boxtimes			A
S-3.	Are current job descriptions on file? < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	a. Have job descriptions been distributed to paid staff?	\boxtimes			A
S-4.	Do paid and unpaid staff members have a clear understanding of their jobs?	\boxtimes			A
S-5.	Do the CEO/Director and paid staff members have training and/or experience which makes them capable of decisions consonant with the experience of their peers? [7.3] < A >				<u>A</u>
S-6.	Does the organization of paid staff authority lines appear to cause any problems? $[7.6] < A + >$	\boxtimes			A
S-7.	Are paid and unpaid staff members provided an opportunity to discuss work-related problems and possible solutions?	\boxtimes			A
S-8.	Is there a good working relationship between management and paid and unpaid staff? [7.6]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
S-9.	Is there a good working relationship between the zoo/aquarium paid and unpaid staff and the governing authority? [6.5]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
S-10.	Is the CEO/Director available to the institution on a full-time basis? [7.1]	\boxtimes			A
S-11.	Are paid full-time staff members provided an opportunity and encouraged to seek continuing education? [7.5] < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
S-12.	Is the training provided for the paid full-time staff adequate? [7.5]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	a. Are paid full-time staff members offered training to qualify them for management positions?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>

S-13.	Does the institution have a diversity and inclusion program? [7.9]	YES	NO	N/A	A/Q/U A
S-14.	Is the volunteer program adequate for the needs of the institution? [7.10]	\boxtimes			A
S-15.	Are volunteers adequately trained and evaluated for the services they perform? [7.10] < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
S-16.	Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
S-17.	Do the CEO/Director and paid and unpaid staff members have access to and knowledge of the literature in the zoological or aquarium field? [4.2.4, 7.8]	\boxtimes			A
S-18.	Is the level of paid and unpaid staff involvement in AZA committees and activities and other professional organizations in line with that of similar-sized institutions? [7.7] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
S-19.	Is the institution encouraging an appropriate number of paid staff to assume leadership roles in AZA animal programs (i.e., SSP coordinators, TAG Chairs, etc.)? [7.12]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
S-20.	If the institution has paid staff in leadership roles in AZA animal programs (i.e., SSP coordinators, TAG chairpersons, etc.), is adequate support being provided to the staff members involved to assure that the program and related communication is managed efficiently and in a timely manner? [7.12]	\boxtimes			A
S-21.	Do paid and unpaid staff members appear to have adequate knowledge of the AZA accreditation standards and the accreditation process? [7.8] < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
S-22.	Does leadership review AZA standards and related policies at least annually to stay current and ensure compliance? $[7.8.1] < A + >$	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
S-23.	S-23. Does the institution have a staff diversity statement and/or program? [7.9]				<u>A</u>
S-24. A	Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
COMM	ENTS:				
SUPF	PORT ORGANIZATION (SO) (If not applicable, please mark N/A and move to nex	t sectio	on.)	□ N/A	
SO-1 to	SO-4. Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.	YES	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	A/Q/U
SO-5.	Are the bylaws of the support organization adequate? < A >	\boxtimes			A
SO-6.	Do the stated purposes of the support organization meet the needs of the institution? [8.2] < A +>	\boxtimes			A
SO-7.	Are the purposes being furthered?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SO-8.	Does the support organization share the institution's goals and objectives? [8.2] $<$ A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SO-9.	Does the formal agreement between the institution and the support organization clearly delineate the current roles and responsibilities of the support organization? [8.3]				A
SO-10.	Is the formal agreement between the institution and the support organization adhered to in practice? [8.3]				A
SO-11.	Does the support organization exercise unwarranted influence on the institution, its officers, or paid and unpaid staff? [8.1]	\boxtimes			A



	2018 Accreditation visiting Comm	nittee r	ceport		rage 10
SO-12	Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.	YES	NO	N/A	A/Q/U
	Does the support organization raise funds for the institution? < A + >	\boxtimes			Q
SO-14.	Does the support organization participate in the decision-making process on how the fundare utilized?	S 🖂			A
SO-15.	Are activities sponsored by the support organization appropriate and meeting the goals of both it and the institution? $\langle A+\rangle$	\boxtimes			A
	ENTS: <u>SO-13: The Society's Development Plan is not yet fully implemented in their Capital confidence of their future success.</u>	<u>Fund</u>	Raisin	g Cam	paign, but
FINA	NCE (F)	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
F-1/F-2	2. Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
F-3.	Does the institution meet all state and federal laws regarding financial reporting and auditing?				Δ
F-4.	Does the institution have continuing financial support? [9.1] < A >	\boxtimes			A
F-5.	Is the total financial support adequate to meet the needs of the institution? [9.1]				A
F-6.	Is financial support the recognized responsibility of the governing authority? < A >				A
F-7.	Is the institution's written contingency plan adequate should significant decreases in operating income occur? [9.5] < A >	\boxtimes			A
F-8.	If the institution is owned by an individual, is the written contingency plan (or financial succession plan) adequate should the owner(s) become incapacitated or deceased? [9.6] < A >	\boxtimes			A
F-9.	Does the insurance protection appear to be adequate for visitors, governing authority, paid and unpaid staff, society, animals, and physical facilities? [9.3] < A+ >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
F-10.	Is there a separate budget for capital improvements and major repairs/replacements? [9.4] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
F-11.	Are sufficient amounts allocated for capital improvements and major repairs/replacements? [9.4, 10.1.2] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
F-12.	Are sufficient amounts allocated for conferences, continuing education, training/seminars, etc.? [7.5] < A >				A
F-13.	Are sufficient amounts allocated for maintenance and supplies? [9.4, 10.1.2, 10.1.3]	\boxtimes			A
сомм	ENTS:				
pHV	SICAL FACILITIES (PF)	VES	NO	N/A	۵/Ω/ΙΙ

PF-1/PF-2. Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.

PF-3.		all animal enclosures of sufficient size and complexity to provide for the animals' ical, social, and psychological well-being throughout the year? [10.3.3]	YES	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
	a.	Exhibits	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	b.	Holding areas	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	c.	Hospital	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	d.	Quarantine/isolation				<u>A</u>
PF-4.		quatic exhibits provide sufficient space or sufficient volume of water for the physical, al, and psychological well-being of the inhabitants? [10.3.3]	\boxtimes			A
PF-5.	Is th	e institution in good repair overall? [10.1.0]	\boxtimes			A
PF-6.		ere an adequate program of both building and mechanical maintenance? .0, 10.1.2, 10.1.3, 10.2.0, 10.2.1] < A >				A
PF-7.		the institution have a written maintenance plan that includes a schedule of overments, cost, timetable, and funding plan? [10.1.3] < A >				<u>A</u>
PF-8.	Does [10.1	the institution identify and address major repairs in a timely manner? -3]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
PF-9.	If off	-premises facilities are operated, did the team visit the site?			\boxtimes	A
	a.	Are the conditions at the off-site facility acceptable?			\boxtimes	A
	b.	Does the institution appear to be meeting the same criteria at the off-site facility as at the institution?				A
PF-10.		the institution's hours of operation convenient so that the institution is readily saible for visitors?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
PF-11.	Is he	ating adequate? [1.5.1, 10.2.1, 10.3.3]	\boxtimes			A
PF-12.	Is lig	hting adequate? [1.5.1, 1.5.14, 10.3.1, 10.3.3, 10.4.1]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
PF-13.	Is pl	umbing adequate? [1.5.1, 10.2.1, 10.3.3]	\boxtimes			A
PF-14.	Is the	e method for disposal of sewage adequate?	\boxtimes			A
PF-15.	Is ele	ectrical service and the number of electrical outlets adequate? [10.1.1]	\boxtimes			A
PF-16.		there adequate provisions for the proper storage and disposal of garbage and all waste?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
PF-17.	Are t	the buildings in good repair? [10.1.0, 10.1.2]	\boxtimes			Q
PF-18.		plantings well-maintained and used to the best advantage in animal exhibits and ughout the facilities?				<u>A</u>
PF-19.	Is the	e institution equipped with emergency life support systems for the animals? [10.2.1]	\boxtimes			A
	a.	If yes, are there enough alarms or indicators in the event of environmental and life-support system failures? $< A + >$	\boxtimes			A
PF-20.	Are t	the aquatic water circulation and life support systems adequate? [10.2.1]	\boxtimes			A

SS-19. If yes to SS-18, does this take place in public view?

	AQUARIUMS				
	2018 Accreditation Visiting Comm	ittee R	eport	Page 18	
PF-21.		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	N/A □	<u>A/Q/U</u> <u>A</u>
PF-22.	Are alarms for fire, security, and other safety alerts in place and functional? [10.2.2]	\boxtimes			A
	a. Are they sufficient to provide a reasonable level of safety for the animals on a 24-hour basis? [10.2.2]	\boxtimes			A
	ENTS: <u>PF-17: the Main Zoo Building (MZB) is still functioning as a public building, but does zoological standards.</u>	s not a	dequa	tely me	<u>eet</u>
SAFE	TY/SECURITY (SS)	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	A/Q/U
SS-1.	Does the institution appear to be in compliance with local, state, and federal laws regarding employee and volunteer training for safety in the workplace? [11.1.1] < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-2.	Is first-aid readily available to paid and unpaid staff and the public? [11.2.3] $<$ A + $>$	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-3.	Is the paid and unpaid staff adequately trained in first-aid? [11.2.3] $<$ A $>$	\boxtimes			A
SS-4.	Is the paid and unpaid staff adequately trained in CPR? [11.2.3] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-5 to	SS-7. Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
SS-8.	Are fire extinguishers and alarms readily available [10.2.2, 11.2.2]? < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-9.	Is the paid and unpaid staff sufficiently trained in the use of fire extinguishers? [11.2.2] < A + >	\boxtimes			A
SS-10.	Are adequate procedures and training regarding common zoonoses in place for paid and unpaid staff who handle animals? $[11.1.2] < A + >$	\boxtimes			A
SS-11.	Is the occupational health and safety program adequate? [11.1.2.1]				A
SS-12.	Is the institution's tuberculin (TB) testing/surveillance program for appropriate paid and unpaid staff adequate? [11.1.3]	\boxtimes			A
SS-13.	Are paid and unpaid staff adequately trained in the handling and storage of HazMat and bio-toxic materials? $[11.1.4] < A + >$	\boxtimes			A
SS-14.	Is the method for disposal of toxic/hazardous materials adequate? [11.1.4]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-15.	Do paid and unpaid staff members have access to and knowledge of Safety Data Sheets? [11.1.5] < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-16.	Does the institution have an active, in-house safety committee?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-17.	Is the Risk Management or Safety Audit Plan adequate? [11.4.1] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-18.	Does paid or unpaid staff have direct contact or enter enclosures with potentially dangerous animals? [11.4.1, 11.5.3] < A + >		\boxtimes		A
	a. If yes, does the institution's risk management plan include a risk assessment of the species and individual animals with which contact may, or must not, occur? [11.4.1]			\boxtimes	<u>A</u>

Α

 \boxtimes

SS-20.	Are the alarm systems and/or emergency procedures and protocols adequate in the event of an attack or injury by a venomous animal? [11.4.1, 11.5.1, 11.5.2, 11.5.3] < A +>	YES	NO 	N/A	A/Q/U
	a. Are the alarm systems and/or emergency procedures and protocols adequate in the				Δ
	event of an attack or injury by a potentially dangerous animal? [11.4.1, 11.5.2, 11.5.3] < A+>				<u>A</u>
SS-21.	Have there been any major injuries by a venomous or dangerous animal in the last five* years? [*NOTE: in the last <i>ten</i> years for institutions that are not currently accredited.] [11.5.3] < A >			\boxtimes	A
	a. If yes, did the institution take appropriate action after the event, and were changes made in procedures as a result?			\boxtimes	A
SS-22.	Does the institution conduct adequate alarm system drills annually for venomous and/or dangerous animal bite/attack/escape? [11.5.2] < A + >				<u>A</u>
SS-23.	If the institution maintains venomous animals, is appropriate antivenin readily available? [11.5.1]		\boxtimes		A
SS-24.	Are all animal exhibits and holding areas sufficiently secured to prevent unintentional animal egress? [11.3.1] < A +>				<u>A</u>
SS-25.	Is the institution's written procedure and recapture plan adequate? [11.2.4, 11.2.5] < A>	\boxtimes			A
SS-26.	Have there been any major animal escapes at the institution in the last five years? [11.2.4, 11.3.1] < A +>		\boxtimes		A
SS-27.	If yes to SS-26, did the institution handle the incident(s) in an appropriate manner both during and after the event (i.e., changes made in procedure/policy)? [11.2.4, 11.2.5] < A + >			\boxtimes	<u>A</u>
SS-28.	Is the written procedure adequate in the event of an emergency, including natural disasters? [11.2.4, 11.2.5] < A >				<u>A</u>
SS-29.	Are paid and unpaid staff members trained for emergency situations? [11.2.4, 11.2.5] < A + >				<u>A</u>
SS-30.	Is a paid staff member or committee responsible for ensuring that all drills are conducted, recorded, and evaluated in accordance with AZA standards? [11.2.0] < A >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-31.	Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
SS-32.	Are the four basic types of live-action emergency drills (fire; weather, or other environmental emergency appropriate to the region; injury to paid or unpaid staff or a visitor; animal escape) being conducted, recorded, and evaluated annually?				
	[11.2.5] <a+></a+>	\boxtimes			A
SS-33.	Is the communication system quickly accessed in the event of an emergency? [10.2.2, 11.2.6]	\boxtimes			A
SS-34.	If paid or unpaid staff are working within the vicinity of ozone generation or hypochlorite (chlorine) systems, are they properly trained to handle emergency conditions involving release of these chemicals? $\langle A+\rangle$	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-35.	Do OSHA-mandated confined space entry and lock out/lock in procedures appear to be followed? $<$ A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-36.	Appearing on institution Questionnaire only.				

	2018 Accreditation Visiting Com	g Committee Report			Page 20
SS-37.	Is ground fault interrupt electrical service supplied to all wet environments and	YES	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
55 37.	aquatic exhibits? [11.3.4] < A + >	\boxtimes			A
SS-38.	Is the dive safety program adequate for this institution? [11.7.1, 11.7.2, 11.7.3, 11.7.4, 11.7.5]				A
SS-39.	Appearing on institution Questionnaire only.				
SS-40.	Does the institution comply with the appropriate OSHA dive safety standard(s) for its underwater diving programs? [11.7.1]			\boxtimes	A
SS-41.	Does the institution have an appropriately qualified and empowered dive safety officer? [11.7.2]			\boxtimes	A
SS-42.	Does the institution's dive manual contain adequate provisions for dive safety, and is the manual adequate for the underwater diving program(s) of the institution? [11.7.3] $< A + >$			\boxtimes	A
SS-43.	Does the institution conduct, record, and evaluate at least one live-action emergency dive safety drill annually? [11.7.4] < A >			\boxtimes	<u>A</u>
SS-44.	Is the institution's dive emergency plan adequate? [11.7.5] < A >			\boxtimes	A
SS-45.	Does the institution provide emergency procedure training for divers for all of the institution's tanks in which they dive? $[11.7.5] < A + >$			\boxtimes	<u>A</u>
SS-46 t	o SS-49. Appearing on institution Questionnaire only.				
SS-50.	Is service from fire and police departments, as well as ambulance services readily available? [11.2.7]	\boxtimes			A
SS-51.	Are all animal exhibits, gates, doors, chutes, shift boxes, holding areas, etc. secured in such a way so as to prevent escape? [11.3.1]	\boxtimes			A
SS-52.	Are the locks and associated hardware of sufficient strength for each species? [11.3.1]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-53.	Are procedures and facilities adequate to allow for safe exhibit servicing by paid and unpaid staff? [11.3.2]	\boxtimes			A
SS-54.	Are service areas sufficiently protected from visitor access? [11.3.6]	\boxtimes			A
SS-55.	Are sufficient barriers in place to deter public entry into exhibits or holding areas, and to prevent contact with animals when such contact is not intended? [11.3.6]	\boxtimes			A
SS-56.	Are there adequate facilities for crating and transporting animals? [1.5.11]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-57.	Are all exits clearly marked? [11.3.5]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-58.	Do all building exits open outward? [11.3.5]	\boxtimes			A
SS-59.	Are all building exits equipped with panic hardware? [11.3.5]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-60.	Are the animals protected from natural and human hazard, including cover and escape areas? [1.5.7, 11.3.6]	\boxtimes			A
SS-61.	Is the public protected from the animals? [11.3.1, 11.3.6]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SS-62.	Is the security program providing sufficient protection? [11.6.1] < A +>	\boxtimes			A

AQUA	RIUMSOL	5 E1 601011601601001011715	iting coi		o repor	
SS-63.		tection for the animals and grounds provided 24 hours a day?] < A >	YES	NO	N/A	A/Q/U A
SS-64.	If yes	to SS-63, is the protection for the animals adequate during those hours when stitution is closed? [11.6.1] < A >				A
SS-65.		e institution's security personnel utilize firearms? [11.6.3] < A >		\boxtimes		_ <u>A</u>
SS-66.	Are fi	rearms kept in a secured area? [11.6.3] < A +>	\boxtimes			A
	a/b.	Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
	c.	Are authorized personnel adequately trained in the use of firearms?	\boxtimes			A
SS-67.	Does th	ne institution use guard dogs?		\boxtimes		A
	a.	If yes, are the dogs utilized in a manner that is safe for the institution's animals?			\boxtimes	A
SS-68.		institution enclosed by a perimeter fence at least 8' in height, or a viable, etrable barrier? [11.8.1] < A + >				A
		If yes, is it free of gaps along the base-line and at gates to deter entry by feral animals?		\boxtimes		A
SS-69.	Is the	perimeter fence independent of all animal enclosures? [11.8.1] < A +>	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
COMM	ENTS:					
GUE	ST SE	RVICES (GS)	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	A/Q/U
GS-1.	Is parl	ting adequate on most days (exceptionally high volume days excluded)?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-2.		he institution have amusement rides/playground areas near or on the tion grounds?	\boxtimes			Α
	a.	If yes, are they located a sufficient distance from animal exhibits?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-3.	Does t	he institution have animal rides? [1.5.10, 1.5.12, 1.5.13, 1.5.16] < A + >		\boxtimes		<u>A</u>
	If yes: a.	Is the institution's animal ride policy adequate?			\boxtimes	<u>A</u>
	b.	Are the animals rotated or replaced regularly?			\boxtimes	A
	c.	Are adequate safety precautions in place to protect visitors, paid and unpaid staff, and the animals?				A
GS-4.	Is the [[12.2]	number and location of refreshment stands and food service facilities adequate?	\boxtimes			A
GS-5.	Is the	selection and quality of food items adequate? [12.2]	\boxtimes			A
GS-6.	Is the	number and location of drinking fountains adequate? [12.6]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-7.	Are dr	inking fountains clean and operating properly? [12.2]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-8.	Are gif	t facilities adequate and reflective of the institution's mission? [12.3]	\boxtimes			A

2018 Accreditation Visiting Committee Report						Page 22
GS-9.	Is the	number and location of restrooms adequate? [12.2]	<u>YES</u>	NO	N/A □	A/Q/U A
GS-10.	Are the	e restrooms maintained in a sanitary condition? [12.2]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-11.	Are the	e restrooms wheelchair accessible? [12.1]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-12.		gate handout map (whether paper and/or electronic) adequate to guide guests h the institution? [12.3]	\boxtimes			A
GS-13.		rectional signs and maps adequate in number, location, and clarity to guide through the institution? [12.3]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-14.	Is gues	t transportation on institution grounds available and adequate? [12.3]				A
GS-15.	Is the	number and location of benches and rest areas adequate? [12.2]				A
GS-16.	Are the [12.1, 1	ere adequate, well-maintained strollers and wheelchairs available to guests? 2.3]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-17.	Does th	ne institution have a guest services training program for front-line staff? [12.5]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	a.	If yes, does it include the elements outlined in the standard?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
	b.	Does it include communicating with guests about the importance and meaning of AZA accreditation?	\boxtimes			Α
GS-18.	Does tl	ne institution have a process to acquire and evaluate guest feedback? [12.6]	\boxtimes			A
GS-19.	Are pa	id and unpaid staff welcoming and friendly towards guests? [12.4]	\boxtimes			A
GS-20.	Are the	grounds neat and clean? [12.4]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-21.	Are the	e sidewalks and roadways in good repair? [12.4]	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-22.		the exhibits aesthetically pleasing and reflective of modern zoological ophies and design? [1.5.1, 1.5.2, 10.1.0, 10.3.3, 12.4]	\boxtimes			Q
GS-23.		overall general impression given by the institution and its animal exhibits e? [12.4]				A
GS-24.	Are the	animal exhibits arranged to demonstrate an education theme?	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
GS-25.		exhibits presented in a professional, modern, and aesthetically pleasing r? [12.4]	×			<u>A</u>
	ENTS: standar	GS-22: In the MZB the hyena, red tailed hawk, raccoon, and black vulture exhibits ds.	do not	meet r	nodern	zoologica
STRAT	regic :	PLANNING (SP)	YES	NO	N/A	<u>A/O/U</u>
SP-1.		ring on Institution Questionnaire only.				
SP-2.	Are the	e brochures, reports, newsletters, and other publications produced by the facility priate and adequate? < A + >	\boxtimes			<u>A</u>
SP-3.	Is the f	facility reasonably following the goals included in the master plan? [13.2] < A + >	\boxtimes			A

Rev: 4/18

SP-4.	If the facility has a strategic plan, are the goals being evaluated and met? [13.1] < A +>	YES	NO	N/A	A/Q/U A
COMM	IENTS:				
MISC	CELLANEOUS (M)	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	N/A	A/Q/U
M-1/M	-2/M-3. Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only				
M-4.	Has any member of the institution's paid or unpaid staff ever been found guilty of violating wildlife regulations enacted by any of the various states of any agency of the U.S. Government or those of a foreign country? $\langle A + \rangle$				A
M-5.	Is any member of the institution's paid or unpaid staff currently under investigation for alleged violation of any wildlife regulations enacted by any of the various states or any agency of the U.S. Government or those of any foreign country? $<$ A + $>$	\boxtimes			A
M-6.	Appearing on Institution Questionnaire only.				
COMM	ENTS:				

SEE NEXT PAGE FOR VISITING COMMITTEE'S LIST OF CONCERNS AND POINTS OF PARTICULAR ACHIEVEMENT

List of Achievements/Concerns

PART I: Points of Particular Achievement

INSTITUTION DIRECTOR: During the inspection the Visiting Committee was particularly impressed with the items listed below, which are especially well done and of notable mention.

The County invested \$37 M in expanded facilities for red panda and snow leopard. Construction is nearing completion for additional new exhibits featuring giraffe, rhino, and zebra plus support facilities.

The County created and fully funded a full time veterinarian position. Dr. Louis DiVincenti started January 1, 2018 and has been a tremendous asset to the zoo.

The zoo continues to lead and participate in several local conservation initiatives: hellbender, lake sturgeon, snails, and local pollinator initiatives.

The zoo's elephant program is impressive and is clearly focused on safety, excellence in animal training, and welfare.

The zoo has developed a comprehensive animal welfare program that meets and exceeds new accreditation standards. The program focuses on providing the animals complete choice and control in their environment and routine welfare assessments.

The zoo has made an impressive investment in professional staff development. For example, all staff members have access to San Diego Zoo Global Academy.

Transitional leadership seems to have improved overall staff morale and has improved transparency in communication between senior leadership and staff.

The zoo has a wide variety of excellent play opportunities targeted to their key demographic.

PART II: Items of Concern

INSTITUTION DIRECTOR: •IMPORTANT• Below is the list of items that were noted by the inspection team during the inspection. This list was provided to you by the inspectors at the conclusion of their visit.

CONCERNS REMAINING FROM PREVIOUS INSPECTION

As a concern cited in the past four inspections, the Main Building continues to exhibit a limited number of animals and remains partially open to the public. Plans are in place for demolition and an update will be provided to the Commission in September. (1.5.1)

At the sea lion exhibit, there is limited shade provided which is only in place for the spring and summer season. (1.5.16)

MAJOR CONCERNS FROM CURRENT INSPECTION

There is limited shade provided for red panda and snow leopards. (1.5.16)

LESSER CONCERNS FROM CURRENT INSPECTION

The perimeter fence meets the height requirement standard, but overgrown vegetation prevents an adequate inspection. (11.8.1)



Some paper records are not duplicated or stored in electronic form. These records are subject to loss due to fire or water damage. (1.4.4)

First Aid kits throughout the zoo have outdated supplies. (11.2.3)

Secondary chemical containers throughout the zoo are not labeled properly. Prescription labels for veterinary drugs in animal areas are not labeled properly. (1.1.1)

The hyena holding building, behlen cages housing raccoons, turkey vultures and red-tailed hawk, and the tiger holding building are all antiquated and do not meet modern zoological practices. (1.5.1)

The snowy owl is secured in an inadequate shelter for prolonged periods of the day. A welfare assessment has been completed and concluded that welfare is compromised. A plan for resolution is in progress but has not yet been completed. (1.5.2)

The zoo has a written conservation strategic plan; however, upon further inspection, it does not appear that the plan is being followed. (3.2.1)

Although staff stated that one was conducted, the Visiting Committee saw no documentation of a venomous animal drill being conducted. All drills must be appropriately documented. (11.5.2)

Seneca Park Zoo AZA Accreditation Narrative Report June 6 – 8, 2018

The Visiting Committee consisting of team Chair William R. Foster, DVM (President & CEO, Birmingham Zoo, Inc.), Adam Felts (Curator of Heart of Africa & Asia Quest, Columbus Zoo & Aquarium), Dale Leeds (Curator of Large Mammals, Denver Zoo) and Jennifer D'Agostino, DVM, DACZM (Director of Animal Health, Oklahoma City Zoo) inspected the Seneca Park Zoo (SPZ) from June 6 to 8, 2018.

The inspection team thoroughly reviewed the previous Visiting Committee Report and found that two areas of concern remain: 1) the Main Zoo Building (MZB) remains open to the public and houses animals in less than modern zoological standards***, and 2) limited shade is provided at the sea lion exhibit and it is only in place during the spring and summer seasons.

***The AZA Accreditation Commission notified the Seneca Park Zoo in writing after granting accreditation in 2013 that: "This building does not reflect modern zoological practices and has been listed as an item of concern for the last 4 accreditation cycles (1998, 2003, 2008, and 2013). This must be addressed before the next cycle or the zoo's accreditation will be in jeopardy." The Visiting Committee noted this during the exit interview and was informed that the zoo fully expects the building to be empty and in the process of being demolished before the hearing in September.

As part of the inspection, the Visiting Committee interviewed the following individuals, and all were encouraged to speak freely and in complete confidence:

County

Cheryl Dinolfo Monroe County Executive

Society Board of Trustees

Gavin Brownlie Chair

Peter Lutz Vice-Chair Keith Wilson Treasurer Christopher Stern Secretary

Leonard Bayer Board Member
Stephen Brown Board Member
Ralph Code, III Board Member
Shelly Doran Board Member
Michael Rainbow Morse Board Member
Kevin Nowack Board Member

Senior Management

Larry Staub, Jr. Director of Monroe County Parks & Director

Dave Rinaldo Deputy Director of Parks & Zoo

John Adamski Assistant Curator Lindsay Brinda Elephant Manager

Louis DiVincenti, DVM Director of Animal Health & Conservation

Robin English Veterinary Technician
David Hamilton General Curator
Sarah Hanson Director of Marketing

Richard Mikiciuk Assistant Director of Facilities

Kristen Miles-Pavia Supervisor of Aquatic Life Support & Facilities

Sharon Peterson VP/ COO, Seneca Park Zoo Society
Pamela Reed Sanchez President/CEO, Seneca Park Zoo Society

Tom Snyder Director, Programming & Conservation Action

Kelly Ulrich Director of Education & Visitor Studies

Kellee Wolowitz Assistant Curator

Jeff Wyatt, DVM Environmental Justice Advocate & University Professor

Joint General Staff Open Meeting - Seneca Park Zoo & Seneca Park Zoo Society Coworkers

Jean Aurio Administrator for Education & Conservation

Heidi Biefus Zookeeper
Jenna Bovee Zoologist
Garrett Caulkins Registrar
Hannah Comstock Zookeeper
Randi Conway Zookeeper
Brenna De Angelis Zookeeper

Lee Gray Manager of Institutional Giving, SPZS

Caitlin Gordnier Zookeeper
Kevin Grant Seasonal Laborer
Aimee Hoffman Executive Assistant

Mina Johnson Communication Coordinator

Hanna Kaiser Zookeeper

Rhonda K McDonald Program Manager

Nicole McEvily Zookeeper
Ruth Northrop Data Manager
Andrew Paulsen Park Foreman

Laura Pennington Events & Experiences Sales Coordinator

Zachary Sechrist Seasonal Laborer

Brian Sheets Zoologist

Derek Smith Seasonal Laborer

Gretchen Spencer School Group & Programs Coordinator

Ryan Statt Zoologist
Gail Tabone Zookeeper

Tina Trimer Volunteer Manager

James Weinpress Elephant Handler/Keeper

Mike Wemett Zookeeper

Annie Wheeler Catina Wright Lead Naturalist, Programs Zookeeper

SPZ Volunteers

The Visiting Committee spoke informally with a few volunteers (and some visitors) throughout the inspection. Everyone seemed to enjoy being associated with the institution.

General Information

Monroe County has long held a vision for grand parks and greenways. In 1891, County officials commissioned the famous Frederick Law Olmsted to design Seneca Park. Animals were introduced shortly thereafter in 1893. SPZ now resides on Upper Ridge and borders Olmstead Park. SPZ is challenged by its small footprint, as it is surrounded by a private residential area and the Olmsted Park.

Larry Sorel served as the Director of the Seneca Park Zoo for the past 21 years. He directed the preparation for the current AZA accreditation application but retired prior to the Visiting Committee's onsite inspection.

In an April 13, 2018 press release, County Executive Cheryl Dinolfo asked current Monroe County Parks Director Larry Staub to simultaneously assume both County Parks and Zoo Director duties effective April 28 of this year. The County Executive has full confidence in his abilities, experience, and expertise needed to see SPZ through this critical phase in its history. Larry Staub is knowledgeable and values the importance of the AZA accreditation process. He has regularly attended the AZA Annual Conference for the past 12 years and hosted the Visiting Committee throughout the inspection.

Just days prior to the inspection, the Seneca Park staff and volunteers had been working hard to prepare for the community opening of Cold Asia. Cold Asia features snow leopards and red pandas and is Phase I of SPZ's newest capital construction project. This opening was then followed by Zoobilation, SPZ's annual fundraiser, just four days before the inspection team's arrival, which was a huge undertaking and one of their most successful events. The staff showed no signs of fatigue or exhaustion and was generous, cheerful and looking forward to showcasing their new additions to the facility.

Monroe County's total capital investment since the last inspection is \$37.7 million. The "A Step into Africa" expansion is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2018.

Animal Welfare, Care & Management

The animals are in good health and physical condition, and animal husbandry is exemplary and meets the criteria of AZA accreditation standards. The animal care staff has embraced the animal welfare standards including new standard 1.5.0 and is performing all competencies at this time. Their devotion to providing choice and control to the majority of their animals is evident. It was clear to the inspection team throughout the three-day inspection that the

animals are extremely well cared for and the overall state of animal welfare at the zoo is quite good. One exception is the snowy owl, which is secured in an inadequate shelter for prolonged periods of the day. The zoo completed a welfare assessment and concluded that welfare is indeed compromised. A plan for resolution is in progress but has not yet been completed.

The majority of the animal areas and exhibits were well-maintained and provided opportunities for species-specific behaviors. There are some areas that are antiquated, do not meet modern zoological practices, and are eye-sores. The hyena holding building, behlen cages (housing raccoons, turkey vultures and a red-tailed hawk), as well as the tiger holding buildings are all in this category. However, the animals in these areas are provided with appropriate care and their overall day-to-day welfare is a priority for staff. Nonetheless, the zoo should make replacement or renovation of these areas a priority.

Most exhibits provide animals with the opportunity for self-maintenance and thermoregulation. However, there is limited shade at the red panda and snow leopard exhibits. In addition, shade is provided at the sea lion exhibit only during spring and summer months, and it is limited even then. These issues need to be addressed.

The SPZ is following a responsible acquisition/disposition policy and maintains an up-to-date good recordkeeping system with necessary backups.

Education program animals are used by animal staff only and are taken off site. The education program has a strong relationship with many outside entities and is impacting local conservation messaging. The use of the computer program Humanity is a unique solution to making certain that the use of animals in the education program is scheduled appropriately. The education animals are housed in a separate location and vehicles used for transportation are suitable for off ground venues.

The keepers are aware of the location of all current Animal Care Manuals and operation manuals, and utilize paper logs and schedules for animal records as well as communication. These records are complete and maintained regularly. It is important to note that many of these documents are not duplicated and are subject to fire, loss, or damage. ZIMS 360 is utilized for more pertinent animal records and staff has access to computers, although in a centralized location.

There is an impactful and successful keeper-driven operant conditioning program in place which is led by the veterinarian. An enrichment coordinator also plays the role of leading the browse program. These individuals assure that training plans and enrichment processes are written out and appropriately approved. Classes and updates are provided to staff on browse identification and many of the species are provided with browse on a regular basis.

<u>Elephants</u>. The Seneca Park Zoo elephant program complies with both the AZA Standards for Elephant Management and Care and the policy on Maximizing Occupational Safety of Elephant Care Professionals at AZA Accredited and AZA Certified Related Facilities. Safety, animal welfare, and

training are the highest priorities of the program. The staff has strong leadership with Lindsay Brinda and appeared to have good communication with one another. All staff members were interviewed and the inspector spent at least six hours observing the day-to-day operation of the program, comparing it to the documents mentioned above.

The program meets or exceeds all of the requirements in regards to abiotic variables. The exhibit, both indoors and outdoors, exceeds the space requirements. All areas of the exhibit, again both indoors and outdoors, were visually inspected and are more than adequate for containment of the four female African elephants housed at the zoo. There is a focus on providing soft substrates across the entire exhibit, except some dry areas that are appropriately used for activities such as bathing. Feeding strategies, including overhead feeding opportunities, are evident and used routinely. SPZ performs semi-annual safety assessments although some of the forms appeared to lack all of the appropriate signatures. That may be the result of some executive team changes and an internal re-organization that occurred near the time of the inspection.

Biotic variables were inspected as well. Adequate clean drinking water is always available. The food is predominately hay, which is appropriate. That said, there is variety in the types of food offered, including produce that is primarily used during training sessions. There was evidence of a strong browse program and an adequate enrichment program. The limiting factor on the enrichment program is likely due to the staffing level. The staffing level minimally meets the zoo's current needs. The group composition meets the needs of the animals but the four elephants cannot be together all of the time, mostly due to issues related to food competition. The Seneca Park Zoo is encouraged to re-visit this regularly in an attempt to strategize ways to minimize or potentially eliminate the amount of time the animals are separated from one another in smaller groups.

Health and nutrition topics were also reviewed. As stated above, the food and feeding strategy meet the animals' needs. The animals are weighed but body condition scoring is not performed. The SPZ is encouraged to develop a program for routine body condition scoring, as the actual weight is only one component for evaluating what is appropriate for each animal. There appears to be an excellent relationship between the staff and Louis DiVincenti, DVM, the veterinarian, which was great to observe. The elephants are inspected daily and are behaviorally assessed. That said, the documentation of this was confusing and somewhat difficult to identify. Records are kept in different formats ranging from paper notes to digital notes, making record review in this and other areas of the program cumbersome to find. The Visiting Committee strongly recommends that the zoo consider adopting a more consistent record keeping system in this area.

There is evidence of a solid program for foot and skin care. Training is a heavy focus for this team. The staff was able to easily demonstrate all of the required behaviors that were reasonable to accomplish in one day. In all but one situation, the program is based on positive reinforcement training. Three staff members still routinely do a bathing routine with two of the animals by tethering one front and one hind leg, entering the stall, and bathing the animals.

While this activity fits within the standards, it creates a situation where the training is more negative reinforcement based. There is some value in keeping the animals used to this activity. However, this occurs multiple times a week, new staff is not being trained for this activity, and it is being phased out. Based on this, it is recommended by the Visiting Committee that SPZ either eliminate this activity entirely, or decrease its frequency but train new staff how to safely conduct the activity. The SPZ maintains an elephant restraint device and demonstrated its uses. They also demonstrated the ability to tether the animals in an appropriate manner.

Seneca Park Zoo provided an elephant management policy to the inspection team in their application materials, and hard copies were available in the barn. The policy manual had most, but not all, of the required sections. The required policies that were available to review are clear and understandable. There appears to have been some progress made with this since the last inspection. There are some missing pieces, most notably the required section outlining the policy for when unrestricted contact would be acceptable. SPZ is encouraged to review their elephant management policy to make sure it is up-to-date and includes all of the required sections. Having all of this stored in one format and one location would benefit the program as well.

The elephant barn staff treated the inspection team in an open, cordial, and professional manner. The programs' greatest strengths are the attention to safety and animal welfare, the outstanding training program, and the substrate management program. The areas in need of some additional work are updating the policies (including making sure all sections required are covered), implementing a body condition scoring program, and re-evaluating the tethered bathing program.

Veterinary Care

The most significant change to the veterinary department since the last inspection is the addition of a full time veterinarian. Dr. Louis DiVincenti was hired approximately five months prior to the inspection and has already made a tremendously positive impact on SPZ along with veterinary technician Robin English. It was evident in talking with animal care staff that the increased stability and access to veterinary care has been a positive change. The working relationship between animal care staff and veterinary staff appears to be strong and productive with an emphasis on preventative care and medical behavior training.

The veterinary clinic has been maintained well and remains in excellent condition. The space is adequate for the collection size and has a public educational component. The public space of the hospital appears to be under-utilized due to inadequate signage directing guests to the hospital. Since the last inspection, SPZ has acquired a digital radiography system, which has been a major improvement for the care of the animals. The quarantine and holding facilities are adequate and proper protocols are in place to prevent cross-contamination between hospitalized patients and quarantine animals. There were several tanks of cichlids housed in the hospital kitchen area. These animals are scheduled to be moved in the new Africa exhibit as soon as it is completed. Although housing animals in a kitchen area is not an ideal situation, a

risk assessment was performed and strict protocols were put in place to prevent crosscontamination.

Throughout the SPZ, animal prescription bottles were labeled inadequately. The labels did not contain all of the information required by the New York State Veterinary Board.

Conservation

Seneca Park Zoo participates in several local, regional, national and international conservation initiatives. Their long-term participation in conservation efforts, including the Genesee River Project (one cubic foot project), lake sturgeon, hellbenders, Chittenango ovate amber snail and local pollinators, is commendable. The SPZ also employs several local green initiatives to reduce overall carbon footprint, including composting and the use of locally sourced water in eco-friendly bottles. Conservation messaging was prominent throughout SPZ and was a key element at each animal exhibit.

The SPZ participates in several Species Survival Plan® (SSP) programs and is an active participant in the African penguin SAFE (Saving Animals From Extinction) program with veterinary technician Robin English serving as Coordinator for the Health Monitoring and Rehabilitation Project.

The SPZ does have a written conservation strategy; however, the inspection team did not observe that the plan was being followed. The written program states that "In 2018, embracing a commitment to conservation, Monroe County created a full-time Director of Animal Health & Conservation position to lead the SPZ's conservation efforts in collaboration with the Society's Director of Programming & Conservation Action. In recognition of our shared conservation mission, Seneca Park Zoo and Seneca Park Zoo Society, for the first time, have developed this unified Conservation Action Plan & Strategy. A joint Conservation Committee is now responsible for implementing our shared vision." In practice, it did not appear that the Director of Animal Health & Conservation was involved in the SPZ's conservation efforts much, if at all. All of the conservation efforts appear to be administered solely through the Seneca Park Zoo Society with little to no input from the Monroe County Zoo staff.

Education and Interpretation

The education programs are well managed under Kelly Ulrich, Director of Education & Visitor Studies, and have a positive impact on their local community with a large number of programs off grounds and on grounds. The educators participate in presentations throughout the day on SPZ property with valuable conservation messaging.

Graphics throughout SPZ are well presented and maintained and have the most up-to-date information about each species, along with valuable interactive opportunities for the guests (i.e. how far a lion can jump graphic). The education staff was positive and outgoing, and excited to share their message.

Scientific Advancement

Dr. Louis DiVincenti chairs the scientific review committee, which includes several members of SPZ staff as well as an outside representative. Requests that deal with biomaterials only are vetted through Dr. DiVincenti and more invasive projects are reviewed by the entire committee. SPZ supports research efforts originating within SPZ as well as in collaboration with outside researchers/institutions. The scientific review process is appropriate and adequately assesses any animal welfare concerns.

Governing Authority

The Seneca Park Zoo operates in a traditional municipal zoo profile. The physical asset and its operation are the responsibility of Monroe County, administered by Director Larry Staub. The revenue streams and associated activities are outsourced to an aligned organization, the Seneca Park Zoo Society, with the capable oversight of Pamela Reed Sanchez, President /CEO. The Seneca Park Zoo Society has an oversight Board of Trustees that represents the community which they serve. A County – Society Operating Agreement is in place and reflects the defined roles and responsibilities of each entity, as well as cost obligations and revenue sharing going forward.

The relationship seems to be working well with regular routine communication and mutual respect. New investments and marketing seem to have renewed interest in SPZ as reflected in the enhanced attendance.

Monroe County and the Seneca Park Zoo undertook updating their strategic approach which resulted in the Seneca Park Zoo 2015 Strategic Plan & Master Plan. This mutually endorsed plan is now being implemented.

The Monroe County portion of the Capital Investment is being completed on schedule and on budget of \$37,000,000. Expansion includes the addition of charismatic animals like giraffe, zebras and rhinos. New guest services include a train and child friendly play areas.

The Seneca Park Zoo Society is committed to raising \$20,000,000 for Capital Improvements for Guest Experience and Enhancements Phase I A, including a guest services building, new concession buildings and an education building. The current County/Society contract term will expire later this year.

Staff

The staff deserves credit for being positive and well organized during a time of transition. The staff at Seneca Park is in the middle of leadership change, which can be hard, but the majority of staff appeared to be excited for the future and have a great professional attitude. One thing that was impressive was the amount of professional development opportunities the keepers and other staff have for an institution of this size. A large number of the staff has had an opportunity to participate in outside events (e.g., conferences, workshops, and continued education) and they all have access to San Diego Zoo Global online education. These opportunities were accessible from the Society and the Parks.

Support Organization

The Seneca Park Zoo Society, led by Pamela Sanchez, has a solid track record of operational success. Under contract with Monroe County, the Society has generated, through a variety of traditional revenue streams, approximately \$6M annually.

The 26 member Board of Trustees is launching its fundraising efforts to address their commitment to revitalize SPZ with a \$20M pledge toward the front entrance, education and guest experience services. The President and CEO and the Board of Trustees stated their confidence in securing the pledged funds. To date, the Society has secured grant and pledges for \$2.5M of the \$20M pledge.

The Society's Development Plan has not yet fully implemented their Capital Fund Raising Campaign, but voiced confidence of their future success.

Finance

Monroe County and the Seneca Park Zoo Society have an operating agreement that defines the respective roles of each party. Pamela Sanchez, President and CEO of the Society, has consistently been able to generate the necessary revenue to meet the Society's operational obligations under challenging conditions. The café and other guest experiences operate in outdated spaces and modular offices. The Society's Capital Investments will complement the County's Capital Investment, together totaling \$85M. The new facilities will be better able to service larger attendance as well as service the additional expenses associated with SPZ's growth and expansion.

The Society's finances are routinely audited and come with no management issues.

Physical Facilities

The facilities at Seneca Park Zoo were well maintained and clean and were operating with an appropriate response and plan in place to address issues. The Life Support Systems department includes a dedicated staff member, Kristen Miles-Pavia, assuring the functions of equipment and water quality are acceptable with good documentation. The Parks system facilities employees work together to assure SPZ is their top priority, and professionals are available to address concerns quickly and adequately.

All buildings and exhibits appear appropriately heated, lit, and functional throughout the season. The lynx exhibit was not as well lit, but staff promptly added light to this back area before the inspection team departed. The overall cleanliness of the park is noteworthy and staff is obviously proud of their zoo.

The Main Zoo Building is still functioning as a public building, but does not adequately meet modern zoological standards. As noted at the beginning of this report, the team was informed that the building will be closed and demolished by September 2018.

Safety and Security

The Seneca Park Zoo is in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. There was clear evidence of zoonotic disease training, which is managed by Dr. Louis DiVincenti, staff veterinarian. There is also an occupational health and safety program through the County. Tuberculosis testing is in place and staff members working with hazardous chemicals are trained to do so and know where to find Safety Data Sheets (SDS) in case of an accident. The SPZ has automated emergency defibrillators (AED) as required and staff is trained in the use of the equipment. The AEDs are in areas only accessible to staff and not located in public areas. First Aid kits throughout the zoo contain some outdated supplies.

There are paid staff members responsible for ensuring that the required drills are conducted and evaluated. Interviewed staff members clearly knew their roles in the event of an emergency. It appears, however, that there was no documentation of a required venomous drill although staff confirmed one was conducted. The policies and procedures for dealing with ozone emergencies are excellent.

In regards to facilities, the animals and the public are adequately protected from one another. Almost all areas are well lit, clutter free, and have appropriate ground fault interrupters. The Visiting Committee did note one area with significant lighting issues (lynx exhibit), but the SPZ is to be commended for correcting that problem during the course of the inspection.

Protocols are in place for working with dangerous animals and safety appeared to be a high priority for the staff. SPZ maintains a very small venomous collection. Appropriate antivenins are stored and maintained by a local hospital. The Visiting Committee recommends that venomous animal procedures be improved by requiring handlers to call other staff to let them know when handling begins and when it is completed.

Secondary chemical containers throughout the zoo are not labeled properly.

The security program is handled by the local police department. SPZ does maintain firearms for use in animal escape emergencies and the staff is trained on the proper use of the firearms. The firearms examined during the inspection were clean and well maintained.

The perimeter fence appears to enclose the entire property, with no instances of the perimeter fence also serving as a primary animal containment fence. There are areas where buildings (sheds) are placed against the fence and are less than 8'tall. To fully meet the intent of this standard, these should be eliminated or moved at least 3' from the fence. There was also a lot of vegetation growing on the fence, making many areas almost impossible to inspect.

Guest Services

Guest Services staff members encountered by the Visiting Committee were excellent. The new exhibit openings and increased attendance have created more demands on staff at the dining facility and kitchen. The Visiting Committee sampled the food products served at the Café and was impressed.

Capital investments have been pledged to enhance the current facilities. More investment will enhance the necessary expansion of services that higher attendance will require. Kid friendly climbing installations, archeological dig areas, universal handicap accessibility to exhibits and people movers are available every day. Restrooms were in good repair and properly serviced.

Strategic Planning

0 1 1 1

The Seneca Park Strategic Plan and Master Plan was most recently updated in 2015. The Seneca Park Zoo Strategic Plan was officially adopted by the Monroe County Council by Resolution No.413 of 2015 on November 17, 2015. Such commitment by community leadership for growth of SPZ is to be celebrated. This strategic plan generated an outline of the SPZ's future needs for investments and a focus for the regional efforts to build out the existing zoo footprint. This year's opening of the \$37M "Step into Africa" and "Cold Asia" exhibits are a result of that earlier vision.

3	ÿ,	8.	0.