

COURT COPY

No. F120444

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION OF PARKS & WILDLIFE				Cash Receipt Acceptance No.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Penalty Assessment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Summons and Complaint <input type="checkbox"/> Warning <input type="checkbox"/> Felony/DA Filing				2019M341 J	
The People of the State of Colorado VS (Last Name) (First) (Middle) DEFENDANT <u>Belfiore Ashleigh L.</u>			DATE OF BIRTH		VIOLATION VENUE APPROXIMATE TIME <u>11:00 PM</u> DATE <u>11 08 2018</u> COUNTY <u>Jefferson</u> STATE OF COLORADO APPROXIMATE LOCATION <u>18301 January 30, 2018 2:32 PM Ave</u> <u>St 1000</u> <u>Littleton, CO 80123</u>
STATE <u>CO</u> CID # <u>—</u>					
VEHICLE / VESSEL LICENSE # <u>—</u> STATE <u>—</u> VIN # <u>—</u> YEAR <u>—</u>					
YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED TO APPEAR IN <u>Jefferson</u> COUNTY COURT AT <u>100 Jefferson County Plwy / Golden, CO.</u> COLORADO					
ON <u>Feb. 11</u> .20 <u>19</u> AT <u>1:15</u> <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PM TO ANSWER CHARGES OF VIOLATION OF					
#1	<u>18-9-202 (CRS AS AMENDED)</u> did knowingly neglect an animal by depriving it of veterinary care (to wit: two-toed sloth.)				FINE SUMMONS
#2	() CRS AS AMENDED				
#3	() CRS AS AMENDED				
#4	2 CCR 40 # _____ PURSUANT TO TITLE 33- _____ CRS AS AMENDED				2018 JAN 22 A
#5	2 CCR 40 # _____ PURSUANT TO TITLE 33- _____ CRS AS AMENDED				A
DNA SURCHARGE:					\$2.50
Penalty assessments must be paid within twenty (20) days from date of issue. Payment shall be considered a conviction of the offense(s) charged above. A Summons and Complaint requires you to appear in court at the place, date and time indicated. Your signature is a promise to appear in court and is NOT an admission of guilt.					TOTAL POINTS: <u>0</u>
DEFENDANT Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> atty <u>42399</u>				I HEREBY AGREE TO PAY TOTAL PENALTY ASSESSMENT OR PROMISE TO APPEAR AT THE TIME AND PLACE INDICATED ABOVE	
The undersigned has probable cause to believe that the defendant committed the offense(s) against the peace and dignity of the People of the State of Colorado and affirms that a copy of this summons and complaint or penalty assessment was duly served upon the defendant.				JUVENILE - Parent must appear <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
OFFICER NAME <u>Terrill Mahu</u> Dated this <u>11</u> day of <u>Jan</u> , 20 <u>19</u>				SIGNATURE <u>Terrill Mahu</u> BADGE NO <u>995</u>	



COLORADO PARKS & WILDLIFE CASE REPORT

Citation Number: F120444

Defendant:

<u>First</u>	<u>MI</u>	<u>Last</u>	<u>DOB</u>	<u>CID #</u>
Ashleigh	L	BELFIORE	[REDACTED]	NA

Additional Parties:

<u>Type</u>	<u>First</u>	<u>MI</u>	<u>Last</u>	<u>DOB</u>	<u>Citation #</u>
Defendant	David	C	Slater	[REDACTED]	F120433
Defendant	SEAQUEST			NA	F120422

Evidence Seized:

<u>Seizure Tag #</u>	<u>Description/Location of Evidence</u>
84978	Disc containing audio files/McKee case file
84979	Disc containing photo files/McKee case file

Additional Officer(s):

<u>First</u>	<u>Last</u>	<u>Badge</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Rachel	Saylor		JeffCo Animal Control

Narrative:

License and Background History

SEAQUEST Interactive Aquarium is located at 8501 W. Bowles Ave in Littleton, CO in Jefferson County. Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) licenses SEAQUEST under their Commercial Parks Licensing, specifically under a Zoological Parks License.

SEAQUEST does not have an accreditation under the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA). Colorado Revised Statutes (CRS) 33-4-102 (13) (a) states "the commission shall establish a license classification for zoological parks." The Zoological Parks License is for the exhibition of captive wild or exotic animals for the education of the general public. CPW Regulation 1104 (A)(6) states "Zoological Park License is issued for the operation of facilities, other than AZA-accredited zoos, open to the public for wildlife exhibition."

Most of the species housed at SEAQUEST are not regulated by CPW laws. However, fifteen of the species at SEAQUEST are regulated species, therefore a CPW Zoological Parks License was issued to SEAQUEST on 06/22/2018. SEAQUEST allows visitors to touch, feed, and otherwise interact with the species in their facility. However, CPW only allows the exhibit of regulated species thus no public contact can be made with any animal regulated by CPW. SEAQUEST's two-toed sloth is one of the species that is regulated under that license and is therefore contained within an enclosure that does not allow public access.

CRS 33-4-102 (13)(a)(III) requires that the facility have a state-licensed veterinarian on staff and

under contract who is available to provide professional consultation when needed. In June 2018, SEAQUEST contracted with Dr. [REDACTED] to provide vet care for the animals in their facility.

CPW Regulation 1108 (F) states that all facilities for small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and birds must be designed, constructed, and maintained to provide safety and protection for wildlife and people.

SUMMARY

The sloth at SEAQUEST (named Flash) was burned twice on its heat lamp in its enclosure. The first burn happened on or before 10/18/2018. According to SEAQUEST staff, the burn was isolated to the sloth's nose with some associated swelling. The print from the sloth's nose was observed on the heat lamp bulb in the sloth's exhibit after the burn. After the first burn, SEAQUEST staff did not cover the lamp nor did they move it to an area where it was not accessible to the sloth. SEAQUEST staff did not call Dr. [REDACTED] regarding the burn. SEAQUEST staff treated the sloth with honey, coconut oil, and Neosporin. About a week later, Dr. [REDACTED] made a routine visit where staff members stated that Dr. [REDACTED] saw the sloth and prescribed care. However, Dr. [REDACTED] did not specifically see the sloth on that visit and she stated that if she was told of the burn on the sloth, staff made it sound insignificant enough that Dr. [REDACTED] was not worried about it, did not recall the conversation later, and did not make a note of the burn. Dr. [REDACTED] stated that she would not have prescribed coconut oil or honey.

The sloth was burned again, more severely, on or before 11/08/2018. According to staff, the second burn caused swelling of the sloth's entire face including around the eyes, the nose, the mouth and the lips. Multiple raw areas and redness were observed on the face with scabbing, sloughing of the skin, and a couple of the wounds were oozing. Staff stated that the sloth winced when it ate strawberries due to the discomfort from the burn. Remaining foods had to be cut smaller in order for the sloth to eat. SEAQUEST staff did not notify Dr. [REDACTED] about the second burn.

Jefferson County Animal Control Officers (ACOs) received an anonymous call on the sloth's injuries on 11/09/2018. ACOs visited SEAQUEST where they were told by staff that the sloth had been seen by their vet who had recommended they treat the burn with coconut oil and Neosporin (this staff member was later identified as Ashleigh BELFIORE). ACOs called Dr. [REDACTED] office on 11/16/2018, asking for information about the burn on the sloth. A message was left with Dr. [REDACTED] staff at that time. Dr. [REDACTED] did not see the sloth until 18 days after the second burn when she did her routine inspection on 11/27/2018. Dr. [REDACTED] called ACOs back on 11/29/2018. Dr. [REDACTED] stated that she had not known of the injuries sustained by the sloth and that is why there was a delay in getting back with them. Dr. [REDACTED] stated that SEAQUEST staff did not notify her of the burn nor did they ask her about treatment options regarding the burn. Dr. [REDACTED] stated that she did see the sloth on 11/27/2018 and, at that time, the injury seemed to be healing fine.

Dr. [REDACTED] did not know the full extent of injuries caused by the second burn until she spoke with Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) Officer McKee on 12/09/2018. When given the description of injuries, Dr. [REDACTED] stated that she would have expected to be contacted by SEAQUEST. Dr. [REDACTED] stated that she would not have prescribed coconut oil or honey, she would have wanted to see the sloth due to the burns, and she would have considered treatment for inflammation, infection, and pain control.

See Timeline Attachment.

DETAILS

On 11/28/2018, CPW was notified that the sloth at SEAQUEST had been burned in its exhibit
On 11/28/2018, Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) Officer Jerrie McKee received a call from

Jennifer Dow, Animal Control Supervisor with Jefferson County Animal Control. Officer Dow stated that Jeffco Animal Control Officers (ACOs) had recently visited SEAQUEST due to a complaint that their sloth (named Flash) was swollen and bloody. Officer Dow stated that they found that the sloth had been burned in its exhibit when it crawled into its heat lamp.

Officer McKee asked Officer Dow if they could share their report with CPW once it was completed.

CPW reviewed the report provided by Jefferson County ACOs

On 11/30/2018, Officer McKee received the report from Officer Dow. [See ACOs Report Attachment.] In summary from that report:

On 11/09/2018, Jeffco ACOs received an anonymous call that the sloth at SEAQUEST had a swollen face and blood all over it.

- ACOs Matt Clark and Rachel Saylor visited the facility on 11/09/2018.
- They spoke with staff on scene (later identified as Ashleigh BELFIORE, who is the Bird, Reptile, and Mammal Manager for SEAQUEST.)
- BELFIORE told ACOs that the sloth had been burned when it climbed into its heat lamp in the exhibit.
- The sloth's face was swollen and pink around the nose, head and mouth.
- The sloth had a red substance on its face which staff stated was strawberry juice.
- BELFIORE told ACOs that Dr. [REDACTED] had seen the sloth and recommended they use coconut oil and Neosporin.
- BELFIORE stated that they were going to cover the lamp with mesh so it couldn't get burned again.
- Officer Saylor took photos. These photos are blurry as Officer Saylor stated that the sloth was very agitated and was moving a lot and that she could not use the flash feature. [See Photo Attachment].

On 11/16/2018, Officer Saylor contacted Dr. [REDACTED] office inquiring about the medical notes regarding the sloth's burns. Dr. [REDACTED] was not in the office but her staff stated that they would inquire with her about the report.

On 11/24/2018, Officers Saylor and Erica Duplan did a follow-up visit at SEAQUEST. The sloth's exhibit had been reconfigured with additional climbing structures. The heat lamp had been hung from the ceiling and was no longer in line with the sloth's climbing poles. The sloth appeared to be healing and the swelling on the face was no longer noticeable.

11/29/2018, Officer Saylor received a call from Dr. [REDACTED] about the burn. Dr. [REDACTED] told Officer Saylor that she had not known of the injuries sustained by the sloth and that is why she was delayed in getting back with her. Dr. [REDACTED] saw the sloth on 11/27/2018 and told Officer Saylor that the sloth seemed to be healing fine. Officer Saylor asked Dr. [REDACTED] if SEAQUEST had at all indicated the injury to the sloth or asked for treatment options prior to her visit on 11/27/2018. Dr. [REDACTED] said "No."

On 11/30/2018, Officer McKee spoke with Jefferson County Animal Control about the direction of the case

On 11/30/2018, Officer McKee spoke with Officer Dow who stated that Jefferson County would be issuing SEAQUEST a written warning on 12/01/2018 regarding the care of the sloth. Officer McKee asked if they could hold off until CPW had time to review the case. Officer Dow stated that they would hold off.

On 12/07/2018, Officers Saylor and McKee did a follow-up visit with SEAQUEST regarding the sloth's burn

On 12/07/2018, at approximately 10:05am, Officers McKee and Saylor, arrived at SEAQUEST to follow-up on the burn from the sloth. BELFIORE took the officers to the sloth exhibit.

The exhibit had been modified since Officer McKee had seen it last, which was several weeks

earlier. There were a lot more climbing structures in the exhibit. The sloth had previously been housed with two Kookaburras. No birds were in the exhibit now, only two turtles. One Kookaburra had died in August 2018. The report from SEAQUEST stated that the Kookaburra died from drowning in its water bowl. The report from ACOs stated that there were fibers found in the Kookaburra's throat and that choking may have been the cause of death. BELFIORE stated that the remaining Kookaburra was pulled off exhibit recently since it had been acting more aggressively since the other Kookaburra died. BELFIORE stated that SEAQUEST is looking into getting another Kookaburra in the future.

Officer Saylor stated that the exhibit was very different then it was on her initial visit on 11/09/2018, when she had investigated the burn on the sloth. Officer Saylor stated that there were only two climbing poles in the exhibit that bisected one another at that time. The two lights in the exhibit had been mounted in a way that they were in line with the climbing poles so the sloth could climb right into them and make direct contact with the bulbs under the hood of the lights.

The lights, one white UVB light and one red heat lamp, were now hanging down from the mesh from the top of the ceiling of the exhibit. They were no longer mounted to the climbing poles. There was also a mesh covering under the hood to eliminate direct access to the bulbs.

The picture of the heat lamp below was taken by Officer McKee on 12/07/2018



BELFIORE stated that they pulled the sloth off the exhibit on 11/10/2018, and redid the entire exhibit at that time, including adding more climbing structures and covering the light hoods with a mesh so direct contact could no longer be made.

BELFIORE stated that she was the one that was in the exhibit, and the one who spoke with the ACOs, on 11/09/2018 when Officer Saylor and Officer Clark first investigated the burn.

Officers McKee and Saylor asked BELFIORE more details about the sloth's burn. Shortly into the conversation, David SLATER, General Manager for SEAQUEST also joined in. BELFIORE and SLATER stated the following:

*The First Burn:

- There had been two burns sustained by the sloth, one in October 2018 and one in November 2018.
- The first burn was observed on 10/18/2018. Staff had noticed that the sloth had pink spots on his nose and the area was a little swollen. Initially, BELFIORE thought that the Kookaburra had bitten the sloth. However, at a later point, BELFIORE noticed a nose print on the light bulb from the heat lamp. That is when they first realized the sloth had been burned on its lamp.
- Officer McKee asked if there was noticeable swelling on the nose from the first burn?
- BELFIORE said "Yes, but not as..., not as..., not as it was when you guys had come."
- BELFIORE stated that they raised the lamps higher on the climbing poles after the first burn.
- BELFIORE stated that the sloth needed two lamps in the exhibit. One was a white light, UVB bulb. The other was a red, night-time bulb and heat lamp. That is the one the sloth likes to bask near and that is the one that the sloth burned itself on. Both lights get very hot to the touch.
- BELFIORE stated that the light was attached to a rope so it hung lower. There were only two climbing poles before and they lead right up to the two lights.
- BELFIORE stated that the sloth was able to climb up the pole and put his face all the way under the hood of the light.
- BELFIORE was not there the day the sloth was burned, but she noticed the pink nose the next day and started treating it.
- BELFIORE stated "then we changed lights and raised them and he burned it again which is why we added this mesh."
- BELFIORE stated that about a week after the first burn, Dr. [REDACTED] did a walk through.
- BELFIORE talked to Dr. [REDACTED] at that time about the first burn.
- BELFIORE stated that Dr. [REDACTED] told them to treat with Neosporin and honey.
- SLATER then commented to BELFIORE that they used coconut oil and BELFIORE stated that they used coconut oil, honey and Neosporin on the sloth's burns.
- Officer Saylor asked if SEAQUEST had a thermometer in the exhibit to help monitor the temperature for the sloth's exhibit and BELFIORE said "no."

***The Second Burn:**

On 11/09/2018, Jefferson ACOs received an anonymous call from a citizen who was concerned about the sloth at SEAQUEST. The caller stated that the sloth had scrapes, swelling of the face and was bloody. That was the reason for Officer Saylor's visits to SEAQUEST on 11/09/2018 and on 11/24/2018.

Officer Saylor stated that during her visit on 11/09/2018 that she noticed sloughing of the skin and oozing from some of the wounds. Officer Saylor stated that "He was definitely swollen, I took some pictures." BELFIORE said "Yes, he was". Further discussion on the second burn was as follows:

- BELFIORE stated that she thought the second burn happened on 11/08/2018.
- BELFIORE was there on 11/09/2018.
- Officer McKee asked about the extent of injuries on the second burn to see if it was isolated to the nose, to the face, etc?
- BELFIORE said "it was more his whole face, there were some marks on his lips, more pink around his nose, definitely some new ones."
- Officer McKee asked if BELFIORE noticed swelling with the second burn?
- BELFIORE said "Oh yeah, yeah, for sure."
- Officer McKee asked BELFIORE if she then notified Dr. [REDACTED] of the second burn?
- BELFIORE said "Um..., No..., I think, she was out..., she has been out a few times."
- BELFIORE stated that Dr. [REDACTED] had come back and looked at the sloth after the ACOs came out to look at him. BELFIORE stated that her visit was about a week or two after the second burn.
- Officer McKee asked again if Dr. [REDACTED] had been called after the sloth was burned the second time?
- BELFIORE stated that they did not call about the second burn, "...we just kept doing the same thing we had been doing."
- Officer McKee asked BELFIORE if she noticed swelling on the sloth's lips after the burn?

- BELFIORE said "yes."
- Officer McKee asked if BELFIORE was concerned about the sloth's ability to feed and asked if he was able to eat normally after the burn?
- BELFIORE stated that the sloth was eating normal. She stated that they chopped food up to make it easier for him to eat and that the swelling went down in just a couple days, "it definitely wasn't too long".
- They talked some more about the sloth's ability to eat after the burn and BELFIORE stated that after the burn, the staff stayed away from strawberries because the sloth winced when he got the strawberry juice on his face. BELFIORE stated that the strawberries were served soft and that when the sloth ate, the juice would ooze out onto the sloth's face and he would then wince away. BELFIORE stated that strawberries were the sloth's favorite food. BELFIORE stated that staff gave him more apples and bananas and cut his cucumbers up thinner to make it easier for him to eat. They chopped his food up smaller for about a week then they got back to normal.
- Officer McKee asked if BELFIORE thought the sloth winced away from the strawberries due to discomfort from his burns?
- BELFIORE said "yes."
- Officer McKee asked if any of the burned areas blistered on the sloth?
- BELFIORE stated that there was scabbing but that the wounds never "bubbled up".
- Officer McKee asked BELFIORE if she noticed swelling around the sloth's eyes after the burn?
- BELFIORE said "Yes". BELFIORE stated that she saw swelling around the eyes initially "...really his whole face was."
- Officer McKee asked about the coloration of the wounds and asked if any of the wounds were oozing?
- BELFIORE said "They were pink, I wouldn't say they were super oozy. Maybe one or two of them were....Um., but, I mean., it was swollen very very red, very rawish."
- The sloth still had some pink pigmentation around his nostrils. Officer McKee asked about the pink coloration. BELFIORE stated that the pink was still left over from the first burn.

The picture below of the sloth was taken by Officer Saylor on 11/09/2018



The picture of the sloth below was taken by Officer McKee on 12/07/2018



See Photo Attachment.

Officer McKee told SLATER and BELFIORE that one of the reasons for her visit was to make certain things were resolved with the heat lamps. Officer McKee stated that she was concerned that the sloth was burned at all and was concerned that the sloth was burned once before and modifications were not made at that time to protect the sloth from further injury.

CPW Regulation 1108 (F) All facilities for small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and birds must be designed, constructed, and maintained to provide safety and protection for wildlife and people.

Officer McKee stated that she was also concerned that the second burns were more severe than the first and yet staff had not notified or consulted with their vet. Officer McKee told SLATER and BELFIORE that she had concerns that burns had been sustained to the face (which caused swelling of the nose, mouth, lips and eyes) which could impair eating and breathing and yet the vet had no opportunity to prescribe any additional treatment including pain medication. Officer McKee stated that the expectation is that when an animal is injured, SEAQUEST would consult their vet regarding care.

CRS 33-4-102 (13)(a)(III) The park shall have a state-licensed veterinarian on staff or under contract with the park and available to provide professional consultation and care when needed.

The Program of Veterinarian Care established between SEAQUEST and Dr. [REDACTED] states the following under Section E: Sick, diseased, injured, or lame animals shall be provided with veterinary care or euthanized.

CRS 18-9-202 (1) (a) A person commits cruelty to animals if he or she knowingly, recklessly, or with criminal negligence overdrives, overloads, overworks, torments, deprives of necessary sustenance, unnecessarily or cruelly beats, allows to be housed in a manner that results in chronic or repeated serious physical harm, carries or confines in or upon any vehicles in a cruel or reckless manner, engages in a sexual act with an animal, or otherwise mistreats or neglects any animal, or causes or procures it to be done, or, having the charge or custody of any animal, fails to provide it with proper food, drink, or protection from the weather consistent with the species, breed, and type of animal involved, or abandons an animal.

CRS 18-9-201- (4) "Neglect" means failure to provide food, water, protection from the elements, or

other care generally considered to be normal, usual, and accepted for an animal's health and well-being consistent with the species, breed, and type of animal.

In response to Officer McKee's comments about the state's expectation to consult with their vet, SLATER said "I know that when we had Dr. [REDACTED] out the first time it was a...it was definitely an issue that was addressed more than just the first time." "And, she had certainly looked and inquired about, um...the sloth, and made no...I...made no indications that anything further, then what we were already doing, needed to be done." "And, she's pretty good about making those suggestions when she sees a concern." "Especially since she knew about it from the initial consult."

Officer McKee asked SLATER who was responsible for contacting Dr. [REDACTED] if they felt care was needed. SLATER stated that BELFIORE would be primary and that he would be secondary if BELFIORE was not there. SLATER stated that he was responsible for scheduling the routine, monthly visits.

Officer McKee asked about their notification protocols for Dr. [REDACTED]. SLATER stated that they do not call much, that he mostly emails with her. SLATER stated that Dr. [REDACTED] had emailed him about the burns. SLATER looked through his emails and read the email he found from Dr. [REDACTED] on 11/26/2018. The email he received from Dr. [REDACTED] stated she had received a call from Officer Saylor with animal control regarding the sloth. She had not called Officer Saylor back yet. She wanted to wait for her walk through with them to get details from SLATER on what occurred causing them to call her.

SLATER stated that he responded on 11/27/2018. Slater stated animal control had stopped by to see how the burn on the sloth's nose was doing. About a month ago, they (ACOs) received a complaint about the sloth's nose being burned. This Saturday was a follow-up visit. He looked fine, we have rearranged the exhibit and he can't reach the lamp as easily and have put up a screen.

Officer McKee asked SLATER if Dr. [REDACTED] was even aware that the sloth had been burned twice? He stated that he believed that she was. SLATER stated that Dr. [REDACTED] had been by and had checked on the first burn and he was pretty sure that the second burn had happened by that time.

Officer Saylor asked if SEAQUEST maintained a care ledger. BELFIORE retrieved it and made a copy of the notations she had on the sloth's burns.

See SeaQuest Care Log Attachment.

Before leaving the facility, Officers McKee and Saylor went back to the sloth exhibit. SLATER provided a step stool so officers could reach up and feel the mesh under the hood of the light. The mesh was warm to the touch but would prohibit the sloth from getting under the hood again and making direct contact with the bulb. Officer Saylor recommended that SEAQUEST place more mesh under the hood as part of it was falling off. Staff had hung fake vegetation over the top of the hood on the lamp. The top of the hood was hot. Officers noticed that there were other exhibits in the facility that had the same configuration. Officer McKee recommended that SEAQUEST get another fire inspection to specifically address human and fire safety in regards to their heat lamps and lights, their accessibility by the public, and the flammability of the décor that covered them. Officer Saylor expressed her concern on the heat lamps ability to explode if they make contact with water in anyway. SLATER stated that they would look into it further.

Officer McKee did an audio recording of this visit. It was saved as *SeaQuestSlothDec72018WS400512.WMA*

12/07/2018, Officer McKee requested additional supplemental from Officer Saylor

After leaving the facility, Officers Saylor and McKee discussed in more detail the extent of the burns Officer Saylor had observed on the sloth on 11/09/2018, and the behavior change she had noticed from

when he was burned compared to now. Officer McKee asked Officer Saylor if she could provide a supplemental statement detailing further the extent of the injuries she observed and the sloth's change in behavior? Officer Saylor emailed over that supplemental on 12/15/2018.

See Officer Saylor Attachment.

12/07/2018, Officer McKee contacted Dr. [REDACTED]

On 12/07/2018, at approximately 2:50pm, Officer McKee called Dr. [REDACTED]. Officer McKee explained how the sloth had been burned twice.

Dr. [REDACTED] said "Dave (SLATER) emailed me earlier today and said something about there were two burn incidents and I said 'Ok, I don't know what's going on.'" "When Officer Saylor called, I really didn't remember anything about it." "Ashleigh (BELFIORE) just emailed me and said 'When you did your last walk through I had mentioned it to you and I told you that we were treating it, and that it was really no big deal' and so... I guess, I thought it was so minor that I didn't even put it in my notes or anything." "So, I guess I was informed but I was kinda lead to believe that it was nothing so I didn't even bother to try and take a close up look at it." Dr. [REDACTED] continued by stating that when Officer Saylor called her about the burn, it caught her off guard because she didn't know anything about it nor had she advised them on it.

Officer McKee described the extent of the injuries from the second burn as was described to her by ACOs, SEAQUEST staff, and from the photos. Officer McKee described the wounds as multiple burns on the face with lots of the black pigmentation around the nose missing. The skin was scabbing and sloughing. A couple of the wounds were yellow and oozy. The sloth had swelling of the eyes, the mouth, the nose, and the lips. Officer McKee continued by saying that BELFIORE described his whole face as being swollen and said it was very red and very raw. Dr. [REDACTED] said "I never knew he was burned that badly until just now."

Officer McKee asked if Dr. [REDACTED] would have expected to be notified of the sloth's injuries? Dr. [REDACTED] said "Yes. Yeah- I'm a little startled to hear what you're describing to me. I would have thought that with something that fits the description of what your saying, with the swelling of the eyes and all of that, I certainly should have been notified, and..um.. taken a look at that."

Officer McKee told Dr. [REDACTED] that SEAQUEST staff used coconut oil, honey and Neosporin on the burns. Dr. [REDACTED] stated that she would not have prescribed honey or coconut oil. She stated that she doesn't necessarily have an issue with those things but would have just said to use the Neosporin. Dr. [REDACTED] stated that she likely would have looked into using Meloxicam (which is an anti-inflammatory drug) and antibiotics. She also stated that she would have looked into pain medication especially hearing that the sloth was wincing when he tried to eat strawberries.

Dr. [REDACTED] stated "I know that this is maybe not the best thing on the SEAQUEST end of things to be telling you that, but I am telling you that, had I seen something that I believe with what you're describing - you know, if I came and looked at it and said 'Oh my gosh, he's got swollen eyes and burns on the face' had I seen something that I also would have described the same way, Um then I would have definitely looked further into what would be appropriate antibiotics and possibly pain meds."

Dr. [REDACTED] said "If I went and looked at it- would I have thought it was as bad as the description you're giving me? We'll never know because I did not get to see it when it was that bad."

Officer McKee told Dr. [REDACTED] that a couple of the areas from the pictures taken by the ACOs looked like they were yellow and oozing. Dr. [REDACTED] stated "yellow -oozing, that would concern me."

Dr. [REDACTED] did a routine inspection on 11/27/2018. At that time she took a close look at the sloth and it looked like he was healing fine and that she stated that she didn't have any concerns at that point.

Dr. [REDACTED] stated that she had a visit planned with SEAQUEST later that evening to look at the hedgehogs so she would talk with them further and let them know that they need to let her know when something like this happens in the future.

Officer McKee recorded and saved this conversation as [REDACTED]

On 12/15/2018, [REDACTED] sent CPW her report and emails regarding the sloth

On 12/15/2018, at approximately 9:00am, Officer McKee talked to Dr. [REDACTED]. Officer McKee asked if Dr. [REDACTED] could provide a statement regarding her specific involvement regarding her care for the sloth in reference to his burns. Officer McKee also asked for copies of any email communications regarding the burn. Dr. [REDACTED] stated that she was still working on compiling her vet care notes to send over to Officer Saylor and that she would send them over to Officer McKee as well. She also stated she would attach email communications.

On 12/15/2018, at approximately 11:00am, Officer McKee received an email from Dr. [REDACTED] which had her Complete Chart History and emails. The attachment was 12 pages.

See Dr. [REDACTED] Attachment.

On 01/11/2019, Officer McKee issued a warning and Citation to SEAQUEST and a warning to SLATER

On 01/11/2019, Officer McKee met with SLATER. SLATER accepted a citation on behalf of SEAQUEST. SEAQUEST was issued Citation No. F120422 under CPW Regulation 1108(F)(1) for "did unlawfully house a small mammal in a facility that failed to provide safety and protection (to wit: sloth in an exhibit with an exposed heat lamp.)" SEAQUEST also received a written warning under 18-9-202(1)(a) for "did knowingly neglect an animal by depriving it of veterinary care (to wit: two-toed sloth)."

Officer McKee explained the citation and suspension points to SLATER and explained SEAQUEST's options for handling the citation. Officer McKee also explained that payment of the citation would result in a guilty plea adding 5 additional suspension points towards SEAQUEST, bringing them up to a total of 40 suspension points. SLATER stated that he understood.

SLATER was issued a written warning on F120433 under 18-9-202(1)(a) for "did knowingly neglect an animal by depriving it of veterinary care (to wit: two-toed sloth)." Officer McKee then cleared the scene.

Officer McKee recorded and saved this conversation as
SEAQUESTCitationJan112019WS400534.WMA.

On 01/11/2019, Officer McKee issued a Citation to BELFIORE's Attorney

Later in the afternoon, Officer McKee met with Attorney Jessica Enggasser Johnson who accepted Citation No. F120444 on behalf of BELFIORE. BELFIORE was written under 18-9-202(1)(a) for "did knowingly neglect an animal by depriving it of veterinary care (to wit: two-toed sloth.)"

END OF REPORT

The above is true and correct Jerrie McKee

Officer (print)

995

Badge