



Arizona Department of Agriculture

1688 W. Adams Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 542-0990 FAX (602) 542-5420

Daniel Ruiz
Chief Operating Officer
Governor's Office
1700 West Washington
Phoenix, Az 85007

Dear Chief Ruiz;

I am forwarding to you the "Williamson Report." I commissioned this third-party, unbiased look at the Livestock Inspection and Investigations Services Section within the Animal Services Division of the Arizona Department of Agriculture for the following reasons:

- 1) Complaints from customers
- 2) Concerns by employees
- 3) Governor Ducey's mandate that all government functions be reviewed and improved
- 4) AZDA's continued efforts to improve and enhance all aspects of the Department functions and responsibilities

To my knowledge livestock inspections and investigations have never been reviewed by outside experts. I made the determination that having an independent, out of state expert would be prudent and wise in an effort to identify issues that needed to be improved, revised or eliminated.

Thus, the Williamson Report points out a number of challenges, deficiencies, problems and resource/pay issues confronting the Livestock Inspection and Investigation units of the Animal Services Division.

To properly deal with the issues identified in the report, I'm recommending two committees be appointed to address the items in the Report.

The first committee would be made up of the Director of DPS or his designee, two County Sheriffs or their designees, two police Chiefs or their designees with staff support from AZDA and the Governor's Government Transformation Office.

This committee would make a recommendation concerning the management structure of the AZDA livestock investigation and inspection section within AZDA.

The second committee would consist of industry members, state legislators, the GTO office and AZDA employees to review and make recommendations on how to improve the Livestock Inspection Program. This would include organization structure, response times, and resources and recommended legislative changes.



Arizona Department of Agriculture

1688 W. Adams Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 542-0990 FAX (602) 542-5420

Organize a hiring committee to advise me on filling the vacant ASD Assistant Director's position. This committee would be made up of industry and senior staff of AZDA.

Strengthen the department's priority around customer advocacy and problem resolution, with direct engagement by the AZDA Director to better receive agency wide customer complaints and work with the Divisions to resolve any complaints.

Last but not least, I take this report very seriously, though I do not agree with some of the suggestions and characterizations, none-the-less this report is now my roadmap to improve upon AZDA's Inspection and Investigation service.

Very truly yours,

Mark W. Killian
Arizona Department of Agriculture
Director

Audit Review

Arizona Department of Agriculture Livestock Division

July 2020

by

Scott Williamson

Larry Gray

Departmental Review

By: Scott Williamson / Larry Gray

All information associated with this review is Confidential to the State of Arizona, as noted in paragraph 6 of the consulting agreement.

We have 70 years combined Texas State law enforcement and brand inspection, primarily investigating livestock and agricultural felonies. This review is completed independently and has no reflection to any state, association, or current employer. We hold the perspective of the livestock industry, each raised and vested in ranching.

I was initially contacted by AZDA Director Mark Killian in April of 2020 to perform a review of the livestock division. Conditions rendered from Covid-19 delayed the execution of the performance contract to the first of July. Further Covid-19 rules forced the review to be accomplished remote through zoom and phone meetings. This report is compiled from information we discovered in more than 50 hours of interviews, a review of case reports, investigation ledgers, AZ title 3 and title 13, pay schedules, inspection reports and policies. The review document will contain the following format.

Executive Summary – Overview, task summary and limitations, participating consultants, major findings of concern, and recommended strategic goals by priority.

Review Details – Acknowledgements, interview list, overview, management and reporting configuration, key performance indicators (KPI), staffing, training, reports, self-inspection, policies and procedures, equipment, lawsuits, morale, and conclusion.

Supporting Documents – Ledger of interviews, AZDA supplied case report ledger

Accusations against AZDA exist for misconduct, primarily inferring a dereliction of duty to investigate thefts, both by intention and omission. There was not sufficient time to investigate each of these claims, but the scarcity of livestock theft investigations in the complete AZDA report ledger support the accused issue. The first 6 months of 2020, the 8 livestock investigators logged 63 investigations, with only 4 identifying as theft. This reflects 1.3 investigations per month, per investigator, primarily related to animal cruelty, dead or stray livestock, and dog investigations. Insufficient investigation productivity is a result of prioritized inspections (90% of investigators time), referral process to Special Investigations, lack of priority, low and lacking AZDA expectation to thoroughly and successfully complete investigations. Successful completion should always include victim communication and follow up.

We recognize segmentation of the livestock industry, political influence, employee pool and the laws of Arizona require our recommendations be tailored specifically to the AZDA future goals. All recommendations are derived from 70 years of experience within a similar setting. We hope our experience and unbiased perspective give answer and direction that can assist the AZDA Livestock Division with new direction to revitalize expectation and a foundation for excellence.

Scott Williamson / Larry Gray

Table of Contents

COVER LETTER.....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
Overview.....	4
Task summary and limitations.....	4
Participating consultants.....	5
Major findings of concern.....	5
Recommended strategic goals by priority.....	6
INTEVIEWS AND REVIEW ANALYSIS	8
Acknowledgements.....	8
Mission.....	9
Management and Reporting Configuration.....	9
Key Performance Indicators to evaluate productivity and effectiveness.....	10
Staffing.....	11
Training.....	13
Self-Inspection.....	14
Policies and Procedures.....	14
Equipment.....	14
Lawsuits.....	15
Morale.....	15
CONCLUSION.....	15
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	
AZDA Investigation ledger	
Interview ledger	

Review - Arizona Department of Agriculture – Livestock Division

July 2020

This review is completed by Scott Williamson and Larry Gray independently and not associated with our professional employments. Collectively we hold over 70 years of experience in Texas law enforcement and brand inspection, prioritized in livestock theft, felony agricultural crimes and managing the Texas brand inspection program.

“Make clear your expectations, provide them tools and training to complete your expectations, allow them to live up to your expectations and they shall surpass your expectations. If they do not, deal with them swiftly so they don’t corrupt the rest.” Delwin Williamson rule of management

Executive Summary

Overview

This review is at the request of the Arizona Department of Agriculture (AZDA), Director M. Killian. Director Killian stated that Arizona Governor Ducey requested an AMS review of each department. The purpose of this review was to satisfy the AMS request and provide analysis of the Livestock Program to be outlined in this advisory report. Specific review was requested for six areas; 1) training of inspectors and investigators, 2) investigation procedures and reports - including investigation follow-up, 3) gathering and handling of evidence, 4) entire reporting structure for chain of command – inspector through Director, 5) customer relations, 6) preliminary review of program rules and regulations. Primary contacts were Director Killian and Caption Richard Shore. Provided were contact list of employees, department structure, industry contacts, AZDA pay scales, comparative compensatory examples for State officers, daily reports, case report ledger for AZDA, and links to Title 3, Title 13, and Title 28. This review revealed several problems that will require legislative action to change. They are not separated from issues that are independently AZDA departmental changes because they are intertwined, and we are not knowledgeable or experienced on Arizona statute.

Task Summary and Limitations

The task is a review of basic livestock laws, AZDA livestock department structure, reporting mechanisms, chain of command protocols, standard operating procedures, industry complaints of integrity deficiency and lack of effectiveness. To facilitate this task, we used interviews of AZDA livestock division employees, administrators, industry producers, Arizona Cattle Growers Association members and staff, AZDA advisory council, Arizona Sheriffs and other individuals as needed. Limitations included restrictions from Covid-19 which prohibited the in-person travel to Arizona for these interviews. Williamson and Gray utilized zoom and phone interviews to obtain the statements and information for this review. Understanding that a remote format has limitations

to the honesty and clarity of each interview. An in-depth investigation would be needed to verify individual claims of inaction from investigators and inspectors.

Participating Consultants

Review and consulting in whole completed by Scott Williamson and Larry Gray. Review was initiated on 07/06/2020 and completed throughout July 2020 by Zoom and telephone interview. All documents were delivered to Williamson and Gray by email.

Major Finding of Concern

1. A problematic lack of industry and Law Enforcement trust in the AZDA integrity or abilities.
2. A problematic lack of industry stakeholder satisfaction with the AZDA.
3. Industry concerns in confidentiality of their information or investigative information. Inspectors and investigators have personal information that must stay confidential.
4. Direct communication with the production industry is critical and must be prioritized. Producers regularly reported poor or no communication from investigators after initial report. Regular communication with victim is critical to address industry concerns and requires a closing disposition – even when there is no further evidence or investigative progress.
5. Recommend a separation in the Law Enforcement and Inspection functions. Investigators need a specific directive and priority to investigate criminal activity, Inspectors need a specific directive and priority to complete inspections and audit self-inspections.
6. A chain of command simplification and clarification is necessary. The Inspector should report to the investigator (for their assigned district) – who reports to the Law Enforcement supervisor for the region (possible Lieutenant) and then report to the Captain. The Lieutenant or supervisor must be seasoned in investigations and livestock industry/inspections. The current process of referring investigations to a headquarters investigator with no livestock background, no appreciation for the livestock industry, and an inability to identify with producers does NOT work.
7. Recommend increased funding to hire seasoned investigators with extensive livestock background and high-quality inspectors. Entry level pay should be adjusted to obtain the required experience. Investigation, livestock, and industry knowledge are learned after extensive experience and each are equally critical to be effective in livestock criminal investigations.
8. Prioritize investments into first line law enforcement investigators. Train, teach and, mentor your front-line investigators to build a succession plan – develop your next leaders within. Hire brand inspectors with potential and develop the best into livestock investigators.

9. Review directives and authority that limit investigation to only livestock. Broaden investigative scope to include all agricultural crimes (agricultural property, fraud). To be effective, AZDA must hire seasoned personnel, self-starters, driven to help industry.
10. Recommend clearly defined departmental priorities and service obligations. Peace officers have an obligation to protect life and property, ignoring this responsibility by a failure to act or investigate holds vicarious liability for the investigator and the agency.
11. Recommend defined training in Title 3, 13 and 28 laws, relative to AZDA authority and expectations.
12. Recommend defined and measurable “FTO” Field Training Officer program.
13. Recommend enhanced training on investigative skills, including investigative reporting, legal processes, interview and interrogation, arrest and search warrants, evidence handling, full judicial process and expectations. These need to be taught by outside professionals from relative backgrounds. (not narcotics, gang, etc., but those that understand industry)
14. Self-inspection program needs complete restructure, including rules that apply equitably to all segments of industry, application and approval process, submission of inspections process, information contained in the self-inspection, audit system and, regulatory and criminal penalties for violations.
15. Inspection process is cumbersome and financially not sustainable. Priorities for brand inspection program, clear goals and, realistic financial stability all need to be addressed.
16. Brand recording program needs to be improved for accurate reflection of data between I.T programs of registration and inspection.

Recommended Strategic Goals by Priority

This review reflects a cross section of the livestock industry in Arizona and in no way is considered an exhaustive consensus. Chief Livestock Officer Richard Shore was praised by investigators and inspectors but lacked support from industry and producers. There is disfunction within the AZDA livestock division which will require repair throughout and will not be resolved by a simple increase in funding.

1. Create mindset and mission of excellence and success throughout department, loud enough that it reflects to all industry. This mission must be evident to the public, this includes professional public presentation in dress and attitude. “Status Quo is the enemy of Success” A standard of minimal wages, hiring to only fill an employment position, and not mandating high employee expectation has deteriorated the AZDA livestock division. Make high expectations a clear department directive and mandate.
2. Accountability – There should be no tolerance for lazy or poor performance, poor investigations or, failure to investigate. There should be regular and consistent documented audit tracking requested investigation, investigation follow up, recovery, case dispositions, inspections, inspection quality and accuracy.
3. Increase funding to equitably pay quality employees and purge employees with low integrity, low work ethic, and an attitude of mediocrity. AZDA investigator pay should be

comparable to Sheriff Department investigators or State Police investigators. Simply hiring more bodies with no change in mindset will not fix the problem.

4. Solicit high quality and seasoned investigators with extensive livestock background. These are motivated leaders that love to investigate and interact with the livestock industry.
5. Solicit and retain high quality young investigators to develop into your succession plan. Hire candidates with skills and traits you want in your next Associate Director, then train and develop them. Allow investigators to investigate, not refer to headquarters investigations. Allow livestock investigators to prioritize investigations over inspections.
6. Restructure job descriptions, inspectors should be full time with no investigation responsibility, investigators should be full time with no or minimal inspections. The public is confused with job responsibilities and job description. Employees have no clear direction to their job responsibility.
7. Communication and team building are absent, most staff interviewed had little or no communication outside of their immediate area. Build investigators and inspectors as a team, trust investigators to be responsible for investigations in their districts.
8. Self-Inspection must be addressed and repaired.

Interviews and Review Analysis

Acknowledgements

The following were interviewed by either Zoom or Voice for the basis of this review. The totality of over 40 hours of interview content was condensed into this report, giving weight to information that was regularly reinforced from multiple sources from various backgrounds.

1. Richard Shore	Captain	AZDA Livestock	07/06/20
2. Kevin McFee	Inspector	AZDA Livestock	07/08/20
3. Barry Baher	Inspector	AZDA Livestock	07/08/20
4. Jonnel Horrock	Inspector	AZDA Livestock	07/08/20
5. Shad Willis	Inspector	AZDA Livestock	07/08/20
6. Rudy Mejia	Inspector	AZDA Livestock	07/08/20
7. Raymon Christensen	Sergeant Inv.	AZDA Livestock	07/10/20
8. Manny Angulo	Lieutenant	AZDA Livestock	07/10/20
9. Scott Schade	Investigator	AZDA Cactus	07/10/20
10. Gary Kiehne	Producer		07/13/20
11. Gaither Martin	Producer	Ex. Director ACGA	07/15/20
12. Royal Reidhead	Inspector	AZDA Livestock	07/15/20
13. Jay Whetten	Producer	Past President ACGA	07/15/20
14. Shawn Harrelson	Producer		07/16/20
15. John Ladd	Producer		07/16/20
16. Billy Elkins	Producer		07/16/20
17. Jake Woehlecke	Investigator	AZDA Livestock	07/17/20
18. Stephanie Teskey	Investigator	AZDA Livestock	07/17/20
19. Ron Hirsch	Investigator	AZDA Livestock	07/17/20
20. Darrel Hale	Lieutenant Inv.	AZDA Livestock	07/17/20
21. Garrett Lacey	Investigator	AZDA Livestock	07/17/20
22. Suzanne T. Menges	Advisory Council		07/17/20
23. Mike Wear	Producer/Officer	AZDA/SO/ACGA	07/20/20
24. Clay Overson	Producer		07/20/20
25. Jeff Menges	Producer		07/20/20
26. Ted Noon	Producer		07/21/20
27. Ted Noon Jr.	Pima Co. Deputy		07/21/20
28. Mark Lamb	Sheriff	Pinal Co S.O.	07/21/20
29. Dr. Gary Thrasher	Veterinarian		07/23/20
30. Conner Courtney	Investigator	AZDA Livestock	07/24/20
31. Mark Killian	Director	AZDA	07/27/20
32. Jeff Grant	Assistant Dir.	AZDA	07/27/20
33. Jack Peterson	Interim Assoc. Dir.	AZDA	07/27/20
34. Leatta McLaughlin	Past Assoc. Dir.	AZDA	07/29/20
35. Jack Mann	Producer	ACGA	07/29/20
36. Chuck Podolak	Advisor	Governor's Office	07/30/20

Mission

AZDA Livestock Division is responsible for enforcing Arizona Title 3 law and regulatory enforcement relative to the livestock laws, which includes all brand and inspection laws. AZDA has authority to enforce Arizona Title 13 relative to property crimes although they are administratively guided not enforce these laws. Law enforcement authority is legislated and not a subsidiary to any other department or authority. AZDA is guided by Director Killian, Assistant Director Jeff Grant, interim Associate Director Jack Peterson and, Captain Richard Shore. It is structured with inspectors and investigators that share task with no clear path to duty expectations.

Management and Reporting Configuration

It is our opinion that the current management and job description format is not effective. Current job descriptions and reporting structure cause confusion publicly and within the department. Training is insufficient and directives set an atmosphere where no one can successfully compete expectations. More efficient and effective hiring, training, expectations, professionalism and, productivity would result from specialized job descriptions. Only measurable and evident change in procedure and productivity will regain the respect of industry, producers and, law enforcement agencies.

1. The Director and the Assistant Director of the Arizona Department of Agriculture should not be involved in the daily business of the Livestock Department.
2. Consideration of a commission or committee to assist and complement the Director and Assistant Director with appointment of the Associate Director. Current appointment process gives heightened producer concern and risk of preferential or unqualified associate director appointment. The Associate Director should have experience in management, law enforcement criminal investigation, and extensive agricultural experience. The Associate Director should have exclusive responsibility over the livestock division and accountable for their actions and inactions.
3. The Chief Livestock Officer should have primary responsibility over the livestock investigation and inspection department and employees.
4. There is no need for a special investigator within the livestock department. Funding and training priority should be placed in hiring qualified applicants with extensive criminal investigation and livestock backgrounds. Prioritize hiring qualified first line investigators and prioritize their training. These should be assigned to a district and supervise inspectors within that district.
5. There should be two definitive job descriptions, 1) Experienced criminal investigator (must have extensive livestock background) who is not responsible for inspections but is competent to complete inspections 2) Livestock inspector that has extensive livestock background and industry understanding, that is not commissioned and that conducts no criminal investigations.
6. Obtain a hiring ratio of experienced investigators with young investigators who can be mentored for future management and leadership.

7. The supervisor should report directly to the Captain or appropriate title.
8. The investigator should report directly to the supervisor investigator (title of choice).
9. The livestock inspectors should report directly to the Investigator for their district.
10. The State of Arizona should be divided into regions and districts with a supervisor (or appropriate title) who is a seasoned criminal investigator and has experience with the livestock and industry.

Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) to evaluate productivity and effectiveness

KPI's are specific performance measurements that AZDA should use to monitor the performance and effectiveness of investigators and inspectors. These are measurable items reported by employees. This data will document a factual productivity to each employee, help recognize over obligated districts and recognize districts that can either be merged or eliminated. Currently there are minimal KPI's in place for the livestock division which leaves little or no source for monitoring the specific accountability and productivity of employees.

1. AZDA does require weekly logs which document inspections. Inspections should be logged into a monthly and annualized ledger that can evaluate the number of inspections, number of head inspected, number of stray livestock recovered from shipping with their estimated value, total hours and expenses involved in completion of these duties.
2. A weekly log of investigations by officers should be used to monitor the productivity of each person. Investigations should be logged into a monthly and annualized ledger that can evaluate the number of criminal investigations initiated, assist to ensure cases are completed and to document and track case dispositions. Investigations should include a case report, watch or BOLO form, specific case disposition form and a recovery form. Investigative reports need to document the closing of an investigation and why it was closed, including documented follow up with the victim. Investigations should be individually and collectively recorded to ensure individual and departmental performance is documented, evaluated, and justified. Reports should be coded specific to each investigator, each district and type of investigation. Missing reports should be investigated as theft reports until proven different, many thefts initiate as strays.
3. Annual reports will identify weak employees, districts and, areas of the state that need either additional support or reduced support. This allows for a more accurate allocation of assets.
4. There should be an annual report of investigations and separate annual report of inspections. The annual reports are for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of individuals and the department. This report should designate the following statistics:
 - a. Total investigations
 - b. Total criminal investigations
 - c. Total theft cases – broken down by specifics (cattle, horses, sheep, goats, property)
 - d. Total value of items reported missing/stolen (all missing reports worked as theft)
 - e. Total inventory of livestock / property reported missing/stolen
 - f. Complete record of case dispositions with record of punishments (total years, etc.)

- g. Total head recovered or accounted for
 - h. Total value of livestock and property recovered or accounted for, include ownership disputes, estrays, theft recoveries, values from financial fraud
5. An accounting of the true cost of inspections should be recorded to guide future legislation, inspection policy, fees, and justification.
 - a. Include complete cost of employee
 - b. Include complete cost of vehicle (fuel, tires, vehicle depreciation, etc.)
 - c. Include complete cost of inspection program operation per head
 - d. The complete liability of facilitating the inspection program should be balanced against the total income derived from the inspection process, per inspection to identify the most and least cost-effective inspection processes and locations.
6. The current investigation reporting ledger for the first six months of 2020 documents 63 records for all investigators. Dead and stray livestock, animal cruelty and, dog investigations consume the bulk of these reports. Only four reports identify as a theft case and they do not record any action, completion, disposition, or recovery.
7. There was no visible tracking of case completion or disposition. This supports the industry's accusation that AZDA will not or has not satisfactorily completed investigations which leads to public perception that no action was taken.
8. Annual or semi-annual evaluations must be used to document each employee's performance. Evaluations must document all performance, productivity and attitude standards, accomplishments, and failures. Failure to address needed improvement creates an environment of mediocrity. Incorporate specialized investigative training goals into the evaluation process. Quarterly evaluations with mandated expectations should be considered for under-performing employees to expedite either their improvement or termination.

Staffing

1. Staffing is a significant problem in the AZDA livestock division. AZDA is under-funded which significantly impairs their ability to hire high quality employees. The maximum range of the graded pay structure could be sufficient as a starting point to acquire quality employees. State and County officer salary range is from \$52,000 to \$75,000 annually, until AZDA is competitive they will continue to struggle in attracting the desired candidates.
2. "ADOA" Arizona Department of Administration has the final control on setting livestock department salaries. It is our understanding that ADOA will not allow a new hire above the median pay range within a grade classification. To obtain experienced and highly qualified (investigative and livestock) employees they must allow initial hiring at the maximum range of the pay scale and allow hiring into an advanced grade.
3. Hiring should never be completed only to fill a vacancy. This has been the standard, much of which roots in the low pay. Underqualified employees can do more damage than having

- a vacant position. It was noted in one interview, that a hire of the eighth ranked applicant was made because they were the only one that could financially take the job.
4. There must be a rigorous documented standard procedure for hiring. Agriculture is an integrity-based industry, if absolute integrity is not the cornerstone of hiring, then industry will never support or trust the livestock department.
 5. Candidates must document significant investigative skills and livestock knowledge. Quote from the interview of a current employee "I always wanted to be a cowboy".
 6. It is critical to background every employee far beyond the references on their application. This should involve the other investigators and inspectors in the regions the applicant has lived or operated. This background should also include the DPS state police for any criminal history and all social media research. Every employee represents AZDA, all day every day, on or off duty, and those on or off duty actions reflect on the entire agency.
 7. A complicated employee structure could be simplified with the possibly of three positions being eliminated. Currently AZDA utilizes 1) inspectors, 2) officers, 3) livestock investigators, 4) sergeants, 5) lieutenants, 6) a special investigator, 7) a chief livestock officer.
 8. Suggested chain of command
 - a. Associate Director (administrative)
 - b. Captain (managing and arranging training, supervising, leading)
 - c. Lieutenants (supervisors)
 - d. Investigators (full time investigations and first line supervisor of inspectors)
 - e. Inspectors (full time inspector, no investigations)
 9. Consider elimination of the office of special investigator. This office is currently reporting to the Director for special assignment, assigned to handpicked cases and, completing internal affairs investigations. This removes chain of command, demoralizes investigators, creates atmosphere of distrust and, makes it pointless to have a Chief officer and associate director. Investigations should be completed by first line investigator.
 - a. We recommend obtaining an MOU with the Arizona Department of Public Safety to complete significant internal affairs investigations. Under current scrutiny, the only recognized internal affairs investigation would be through an outside and unbiased and respected investigative agency.
 - b. In its current format, Special investigations has built distrust, disrupted chain of command and ineffective guidance and mentoring of investigators.
 - c. All investigators, specifically supervisory investigators with the AZDA must have extensive livestock background and capable of understanding livestock, behaviors, livestock industry commerce and its producers.
 10. In the rural setting of agricultural crimes, the rancher or producer, the cowboy, order buyer, market owner or employee, truckers and fence builders are where evidence and witnesses arise from. Livestock investigations and inspections require the ultimate in community policing. Before this information is obtained, a mutual respect and admiration must first reside. This is built, not mandated by job title.

Training

Interviews completed with AZDA investigators and inspectors revealed the following opinions of their training, job description and, job preparation.

1. There is no consistent training program for newly hired investigators and inspectors. Most investigators and inspectors reported being shown how to complete a livestock inspection, with other duties learned on their own. Quotes “threw me the keys”, “fly by the seat of my pants till I learned”
2. A detailed, consistent onboard training procedure is needed. This program should include:
 - a. Detailed study of title 3 and title 13.
 - b. Clear expectations of the job description, priorities, expected work product, productivity goals and directives.
 - c. Defined investigative guidelines that emphasize pursuit and completion of investigations with excellence as the standard.
 - d. Clearly defined standard of professional dress and public presentation.
3. There is no standard “FTO” Field Training Officer program, although some newly hired employees did ride with an investigator or inspector for a short period of time. Employee quality and productivity would be increased with a consistent new hire mentoring program. The FTO must be a highly motivated professional that will instill the mission and expectations of the AZDA future.
4. Continuing education is a critical investment in the AZDA investigators. Training hours should be utilized to teach critical thinking and investigative skills, not only to satisfy mandatory roster hours. Regularly I.T. updates, new policy or operational training is used to obtain mandated credits. These are necessary but should not substitute for meaningful investments in employees investigative or inspection skills.

Examples of valuable CEU’s

- a. Crime scene investigation
- b. Evidence documentation at crime scene, evidence gathering, chain of custody, submission to lab and, proper storage
- c. Interview and interrogation tactics
- d. Federal law updates to ensure that statements and evidence are admissible
- e. Arrest, search, and seizure laws that utilize practical applications
- f. Report documentation, including index, timelines, and discovery
- g. Investigative tools (ex. CLEAR, TLO, Public Data), i.e. social media, cell phone, tower data, intelligence applications, etc.
- h. Advanced use of force, firearms, safe encounters with vehicles
- i. INVEST IN YOUR FRONT LINE INVESTIGATORS

Self-Inspection

The self-inspection process is designed by the legislature and not by the AZDA, it is evident that some form of the program is needed to assist the under-staffed AZDA inspection system. It is evident that the current structure is not functional or equitable to all segments of industry or a credible deterrent to theft. Each person we interviewed recognized the need to restructure the self-inspection program. The following suggestions for restructure of the self-inspection program gleaned from the totality of these interviews.

1. **Equitable** - Program should be the consistent and equitable to each segment of industry, to include feedlot, dairy, range, non-range.
2. **Application and Approval Process** - User should have to apply and be approved prior to self-inspection access; no criminal history, no or minimal regulatory violations, trained on how to properly complete, acknowledge they may be audited.
3. **Consistent** - Self-inspections should contain the same or similar information to the inspection form as the AZDA in person inspection. AZDA investigators/inspectors should be a part of the advisory group to identify mandatory information.
4. **Timely** - Inspection must be filed 24 to 48 hours prior to shipping, preferably online electronically. It should direct first to the local brand inspector, investigator and to the headquarters. This allows the local brand inspector to complete an audit check without a mandate to inspect every livestock movement. Investigator notification allows for select monitoring of suspect cattle. The self-inspection could be audited at the origination or the destination. This operates on a similar premise to driving the speed limit because of the highway patrol presence.
5. **Penalty** - This is a governmental document, there should be criminal and regulatory penalties for intentionally falsifying a self-inspection.

Policies and Procedures

Policies and procedures focus primarily on firearms, arrest, and case filing procedures. No inspection policy or performance expectations were included in the policies and procedures that we received. It was evident from employee interviews that it was not emphasized during the hiring or training process.

We recommend policies and procedures be expanded to include specific job expectations, a path to excel in those expectations, and prioritized duties.

Equipment

Multiple investigators and inspectors referenced the need for additional and upgraded equipment. Equipment is out of the scope of this review and is likely relative to the funding deficit.

Lawsuits

Interviews revealed allegation of lawsuits against the AZDA Livestock division and some of its employees. This is out of the scope of this review, we did not investigate, or document facts associated to their existence, nor did we interview participants regarding allegations and made no opinion as to their validity.

Morale

The consensus of the department was mixed relative to morale. There were numerous reports, primarily in the investigative division of morale issues. Inspectors reported they were over worked and under paid while investigators reported that they were directed to prioritize inspections over investigations which left them little or no time to have any investigative success. There is consistent contempt and distrust for the Special Investigations office.

Conclusion

This review is not derived from any one of the four segments of industry, but with the goal to provide opinions that will be beneficial to grow an equitable, productive, trusted and, respected livestock program. We understand that to some portion, some of these suggestions are already in place. We also recognize that some of these items will require legislative and policy changes.

We believe that in general there is a lack of trust in the AZDA livestock division. We believe in general, there is not significant demand placed on work product quality and without enfaces on an attitude to pursue success at all ethical cost. This is in part stifled by poor salary, in part to hiring practices forced by salary and, in part a work culture more focused on getting a job done in place of a culture to be excellent. It was evident from our many interviews that there are several employees that do not need to continue a career with AZDA. It was equally evident that there are several quality employees that need to be trained and mentored with an opportunity to succeed. The scope of opinions is broad, from total elimination to full support. We believe that the truth lies in the middle, AZDA minimizes or fails to understand the depth of the problem while some industry overstates the failures.

We believe that the current job descriptions allow inspectors with no law enforcement training or authority to initiate investigative reports, while investigators who should be solely focused on investigations are 90% encumbered with inspections. Separation of responsibilities in necessary for both investigators and inspectors to excel. Clear chain of command is required with the Associate Director and the Chief Livestock Officer being in command and with decision making authority. This is undermined in the current format. Currently Lt. Angulo and Director Killian are directing all investigative information, including internal investigations. In our opinion this completely undermines the entire investigative division. To build strong front-line investigators

they must investigate, not refer! Pour training from outside instructors into your succession plan. Build leaders not referrals.

We believe that any internal investigations should be referred to the Arizona Department of Public Safety State Police. There is some degree of public perception that the AZDA Livestock Department is either corrupt or dysfunctional. In our opinion, no self-investigation holds merit, a State Police investigation into any alleged accusations should be considered.

It is evident that it is not financially feasible to complete all inspections as in person on ranch inspections and that the self-inspection process should play a vital role. In our opinion, self-inspections have no value, credibility nor theft deterrent in its current format. Fees for both the in-person inspections and the self-inspection are low and not sustainable to either program.

There is a plethora of independent factors that we are not fully capable of calculating into this review. Industry segmentation, political influence, financial limitations, potential employee pool and the laws and spirit of the State of Arizona. We respectfully submit this review from our experience with successful practices.

AZDA Interview ledger

Date	Person	Title	Zoom/Phone	Hours	Note
7/6/2020	Captain Richard Shore	AZDA Cpt. Livestock Div	Phone	2.5	SW/LG
				2.5	review email info, create questionnaire
7/8/2020	Kevin McFee	Inspector	Zoom	7	SW/LG
	Barry Baher	Inspector	Zoom		SW/LG
	Jonnel Horrock	Inspector	Zoom		SW/LG
	Shad Willis	Inspector	Zoom		SW/LG
	Rudy Mejia	Inspector	Zoom		SW/LG
	Captain Richard Shore	Investigation/Admin	Zoom		SW/LG
				3	SW/LG
7/10/2020	Raymon Christensen	Investigator/Inspection	Zoom	3	SW/LG
	Manny Angulo	Lt. Investigations	Zoom		SW/LG
	Scott Schade	Cactus Inv. / LS Inv.	Zoom		SW/LG
				3	SW/LG
7/13/2020	Gary Kiehne	Producer	Phone	1.5	LG
7/15/2020	Gaither Martin	Ex. Director ACGA	Phone	1	SW/LG
	Royal Reidhead	Inspector	Zoom	1.5	SW/LG
	Jay Whetten	Past Pres. ACGA	Phone	1	SW/LG
7/16/2020	Shawn Harrelson	Producer	Phone	0.5	SW
	John Ladd	Producer	Phone	1	LG
	Billy Elkins	Producer	Phone	1.5	LG
				3	documentation of interviews
7/17/2020	Jake Woehlecke	Investigator/Inspector	Zoom	1	LG/SW
	Stephanie Teskey	Investigator/Inspector	Zoom	1	LG/SW
	Ron Hirsch	Investigator/Inspector	Zoom	1	LG/SW
	Lt. Darrel Hale	Investigator/Inspector	Zoom	1.5	LG/SW
	Garrett Lacey	Investigator/Inspector	Zoom	1	LG/SW
	Suzanne T. Menges	Advisory Council	Phone	2.5	LG/SW
				3	documentation of interviews
				8	first draft - AZDA review document report
7/20/2020	Mike Wear	ACGA / LE - past AZDA	Phone	2.5	SW
	Clay Overson	Producer	Phone	0.5	LG
	Jeff Mengus	Producer	Phone	0.5	LG
7/21/2020	Ted Noon	Producer	Phone	0.5	LG
	Ted Noon Jr.	Pima Co. Deputy	Phone	0.5	LG
	Sheriff Lamb	Pinal Co. Sheriff	Phone	0.5	LG
7/23/2020	Dr. Gary Thrasher	Veterinarian	Phone	1.5	LG
7/24/2020	Conner Courtney	Investigator/Inspector	Phone	0.5	SW
7/27/2020	Mark Killian	AZDA Director	Zoom	2	LG/SW
	Jeff Grant	AZDA Assistant Dir.	Zoom	1	LG/SW
	Jack Peterson	AZDA Associate Dir.	Zoom	1	LG/SW
7/29/2020	Jack Mann	Producer / ACGA board	Phone	1	SW
	Leatta McLaughlin	Past Associate Dir AZDA	Phone	0.5	SW
				6	draft work review document report and document interviews
7/30/2020	Chuck Podolak	Governors Office	Google	0.5	SW
8/2 - 8/4				5	Review final draft V1
8/5/2020	submitted by email to	Director Killian Advisor Podolak		5	Final draft and submission of reports to AZDA
				80	Total work hours in AZDA Review