

**MEMORANDUM
PLACER COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE**

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors

FROM: Thomas M. Miller, County Executive Officer
By: Bekki Riggan, Principal Management Analyst

DATE: July 11, 2006

SUBJECT: Placer County Animal Services and Shelter Facilities

ACTION REQUESTED:

Direct staff to take the following actions related to Placer County Animal Services, the development of a South Placer animal shelter facility, and replacement of the Auburn shelter facility:

1. Select architectural consultant/firm to commence design of South Placer facility.
2. Include both facilities in the County Capital Facility Plan, and incorporate an animal control facility impact fee into the County's existing fee program.
3. Obtain formal confirmation of the level of city participation in new shelter facilities, and commence formal site selection process in consultation with city partners.
4. Obtain formal confirmation of the level of non-profit partners' participation in delivery of compatible services in conjunction with the development of new facilities
5. Retain Animal Control services within the Department of Health & Human Services (HHS), and formalize the recent changes to the reporting status of Animal Control separate from the Environmental Health Division of HHS.
6. Form an Animal Services Advisory Committee to serve as a resource for the County Executive Office.

BACKGROUND:

The attached staff report provides a comprehensive review and attendant recommendations regarding the County's animal services program. Under the leadership of the County Executive Officer the Animal Services Ad Hoc Committee was reconvened in November of 2005. These meetings provided a forum for the CEO to hear from city and community stakeholders regarding their perspectives on improving the strategic direction of the County's animal services program.

The attached staff report summarizes key issues and identifies associated recommendations in the following areas:

- Overview of the County Animal Services and summary of recent efforts to improve services;
- Community planning process and associated facility, governance, non-profit partnerships and funding recommendations;
- Organizational alignment of animal services within the County and CEO Advisory Committee.

213

FISCAL IMPACT:

Total cost for the two shelters is estimated at \$20,000,000: \$15,000,000 for the South Placer facility, and \$5,000,000 for replacement of the Auburn facility. The CEO is finalizing a financing plan for funding these projects. In addition to a General Fund Contribution, this office has been meeting with cities to discuss fair share funding contributions from cities that use the shelter(s). In addition, it would be proposed that the capital facilities fee be amended to include funding for the new construction that will be needed due to population growth.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
7/11/06
Animal Services Staff Report

OVERVIEW

California Law requires that local governments provide animal control services, encompassing responsibilities such as: rabies control, quarantine of biting animals, controlling potentially dangerous animals, dog licensing, and maintaining an infrastructure to prevent animal neglect and abuse through investigation, prosecution, education and sheltering of stray and unwanted animals.

In 1998, two pieces of legislation were passed into law which significantly affected animal services costs and operation:

- o Vincent Bill – mandates that all shelter animals be spayed or neutered prior to adoption.
- o Hayden Bill – mandates extended holding period from the prior 72 hours to 4-6 days, depending on agency's public access hours, and expanded requirements for medical treatment for shelter animals. It also allows Animal Control agencies to submit claims to the state for reimbursement for associated increased costs (SB-90 claims process).

The current Auburn facility was built circa 1976 and is approximately 5,036 sq. ft. plus 2,300 sq. ft of auxiliary modular buildings. The facility was renovated in two phases beginning in 2001, which included upgrade of the back service and paddock areas behind shelter, relocation, enlargement and equipment upgrade of cat holding area, upgrade of HVAC, and the addition and refurbishment of modular buildings.

The County's current shelter reflects the mission, legal requirements, and best practices of the era in which it was designed and constructed. However, subsequent legislation, current best practices for animal shelters and operations must be reflected in our current planning efforts to meet the changing needs and demographics of the County.

City and Town Partnerships

The cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Loomis and Rocklin have contracted with Placer County for varying levels of animal services. Placer County Animal Control serves the entire County except for the City of Roseville, which currently has its own animal control officers and a sheltering contract with Placer SPCA. The cities of Rocklin and Auburn employ their own animal control officers for field services, but contract with the County to utilize its Auburn shelter. The cities of Colfax and Lincoln and the Town of Loomis contract with the County for both field and shelter services.

City/Town Contract Summary

Jurisdiction	FY 04/05	FY 2005/06 (60%)	FY 2006/07 (80%)	FY 2007-08 (100%)
Auburn	\$14,447	\$14,835	\$19,780	\$24,725
Colfax	7,695	19,484	25,979	32,474
Lincoln	31,480	99,309	132,412	165,516
Loomis	19,493	50,607	67,476	84,346
Rocklin	25,527	50,103	66,804	83,505
Totals	\$98,642	\$234,338	\$312,451	\$390,566

In 2005, HHS contracted with Maximus, Inc. to review animal services costs and recommend an appropriate and equitable cost methodology for its contracts with city partners.

In early 2006, three-year shelter/field services contracts with the County's partner cities were approved by the Board of Supervisors. The graduated, three-year implementation of 2005-06 actual costs included in the contracts was a result of discussions with city partners to identify a funding approach utilizing existing data, which was recognized by all parties as deficient.

The County agreed to purchase and implement new software in an effort to strengthen data collection capabilities, refine and/or establish internal processes to enhance data gathering, and allow for sufficient time with which to collect a more comprehensive data set. The Chameleon software will provide new data and will represent the basis for future city contracts, as well as allow for adjustments to the contract costs to cities from the interim-solution years.

RECENT EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ANIMAL SERVICES

Over the past several years, the County has undertaken a number of efforts to strengthen animal services.

2001

- o Board of Supervisors approved over \$300,000 in facility improvements for the Auburn shelter.
- o Animal Services Ad Hoc Committee meetings were established to focus on shelter planning and program and operational issues with County/cities/non-profit partners.

2002

- o Architect George Miers' shelter needs assessment was completed.
- o County Executive Office led a strategic planning session with the Ad Hoc Committee and identified subcommittees to address strategic priorities of shelter Improvements, needs assessment, in-house vet, staffing issues,

temperament assessment/adoptions, spay/neuter education and outreach, and website development.

- Animal Services Community Forum with Supervisor Harriet White.
- Animal Services Animal Community Meetings in Loomis and Kings Beach.

2004

- A refurbished modular building for veterinary services was donated by Friends of the Auburn Shelter.
- In December of 2004, Dr. Richard Burton was appointed as Director of Health & Human Services, and began assembling his new management team.

Beginning in early 2005, under the leadership of Dr. Richard Burton, Director Health and Human Services, efforts to improve animal services increased.

2005

- New Animal Services Manager Mike Winters, a 20+ year animal services veteran and former Director of Sacramento SPCA, was appointed as Animal Services Manager.
- HHS contracted with Animal Legal & Veterinary Medical Consulting Services (ALVMCS) for a complete operational review of systems and practices. The ALVMCS Final Report provided 120 recommendations for strengthening animal services operations and sheltering standards of practice. (As of June, 2006, 102 of those recommendations have been implemented.)
- A new shelter veterinarian was hired to provide medical oversight and future spay and neuter service to shelter animals.
- Two new Animal Control truck bodies and accompanying equipment were budgeted for replacement.
- Undertook and completed a major cleaning and sprucing up of Auburn kennels and animal care areas.
- Completed temperament testing on all animals sheltered at the Tahoe facility and sent nine staff members to the Placer SPCA for additional animal behavior training.

2006:

- Purchased new Chameleon shelter software to better track, store and summarize shelter animal information that had a "go live" date of 4-19-06.
- Two additional truck bodies with specialized animal control equipment were budgeted for replacement.
- A new kennel and shelter services supervisor was hired.
- New microchip (pet identification) program was launched.
- Animal Control Officer attended National Animal Cruelty Investigation School.
- Organized and held an "Open House" for National Shelter Appreciation Week to highlight the shelter facility and show appreciation for shelter staff.

ANIMAL SERVICES AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETINGS

In November, 2005 Tom Miller reconvened the Animal Services Ad Hoc Committee with expanded participation from community stakeholders. (See attached list for Animal Services Ad Hoc Committee participants.)

Four subcommittees were formed to explore options as well as review and comment on the following related components of Animal Services:

- Governance Options for City Partners
- Non-Profit Organizations
- Shelter Facilities
- Tahoe/Truckee Shelter Collaborative (While the County continues to explore partnership opportunities within the Tahoe/Truckee basin, this report focuses primarily on Auburn and South Placer animal services. These discussions are on-going and recommendations will be brought forward when finalized.)

The Committee met again in January 2006 to review each subcommittee's progress and input. The third meeting of the committee, held June 26, 2006, was an opportunity to update community stakeholders on staff recommendations regarding shelter facilities, city and non-profit partnerships, and Animal Services organizational issues that would be presented to the Board of Supervisors at their July 11, 2006 meeting. Altogether, approximately 12 meetings of the various subcommittees and Ad Hoc Committee occurred over the last eight months.

Subcommittee on Governance Options for City Partners

The Governance Options subcommittee was formed to explore animal services governance options in place in other jurisdictions and identify a model that would best suit Placer County. City partners met with the County Executive and other county staff in January, March and April 2006 to discuss various models, review cost parameters, space estimates and potential partner commitments for future field and shelter facilities and services.

At the conclusion of those meetings, there was general agreement to proceed with developing a three-shelter regional model:

- West Placer (Roseville, Rocklin, Lincoln and unincorporated area west of Loomis) – new
- Auburn (Colfax, Auburn, Loomis) – replacement
- Tahoe/Truckee Shelter Collaborative – on-going discussions

This regional approach to Animal Services is in keeping with the recent justice system planning processes that recognized the importance of establishing services and facilities in proximity to the County's population centers of Lake Tahoe, Auburn, and South Placer.

Subcommittee on Potential Partnerships with Non-Profit Organizations

The Ad Hoc Non-Profit subcommittee members met several times in January, 2006, with a facilitator to discuss their priorities and shelter support issues. Their report and recommendations were submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee at its January 27, 2006 meeting expressing their interest in collaborating with the County on future facility development and service enhancement.

County staff met in March, 2006 with Placer SPCA Board members and their executive director regarding co-location and partnership opportunities in a South County shelter facility. A subsequent meeting was held with SPCA in June, 2006 to review shelter facility alternatives, funding, sites and co-location planning issues.

County staff also met in June, 2006 with representatives from non-profit groups (Friends of Auburn/Tahoe Vista-Placer County Animal Shelter and Field Haven) to review Auburn shelter alternatives, funding and potential co-location planning issues.

Both the South Placer and Auburn non-profit groups have expressed their interest in pursuing co-located, complimentary services.

Subcommittee on Shelter Facilities

Facilities Services staff convened two meetings with city representatives and community/non-profit stakeholders to discuss issues associated with the Auburn and potential South County animal shelters and co-located non-profit auxiliary activities.

Two shelter alternatives were considered:

- First: Construction of one single main shelter with an adjacent non-profit shelter to serve County needs, excluding Lake Tahoe.
- Second: Construction of a main shelter located in South Placer, and a satellite shelter located in Auburn. The South Placer shelter facility would be constructed first and subsequent relocation of operations would occur while the satellite Auburn facility is rebuilt.

The second alternative is recommended for the following reasons:

- Regional service model and proximity to the County's major population center;
- Partnering opportunities with private, non-profit animal service providers;
- Ability to provide shelter space during the construction of the respective facilities;
- Cost of renovation and remodel of the Auburn facility meets or exceeds the costs of new construction.

Shelter Financing

Placer County's draft *Capital Improvement Financing Plan* to be considered by your Board at the July 24, meeting reflects the recommended alternative outlined above including a new shelter in West Placer and replacement of the Animal Control shelter in Auburn. Total cost for the two shelters is estimated at \$15,000,000 for the South Placer facility and \$5,000,000 for replacement of the Auburn facility. As part of that plan, this office has included funding for these facilities through a general fund contribution, capital facility fees and, assuming that we continue to contract with the cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Loomis, and Rocklin for animal control services, the County would propose fair share contributions from the participating agencies.

Capital Facilities Fees

Consistent with the County's existing impact fees, the purpose of an Animal Control Capital Facility Impact fee would be used to provide funding for expansion and/or new construction of facilities. The current capital facilities fee does not include specific funding for animal shelters. Given the growing demand for animal control shelter services, especially in the western portion of Placer County, we believe it would be appropriate to consider amending the existing capital facilities fee to include animal control facilities to provide for construction of facilities necessary due to growth.

If approved, a Capital Facility Impact Fee for animal control would provide funding for shelter facilities required to serve new development. Capital Facility Impact fees are based on costs for buildings and capital equipment that will be required to serve the projected increase in service population assuming a specific standard and projecting the need based on anticipated development. It is assumed that the existing 2006 *service population* of 196,853 residents will increase from 2007 to 2025 by 111,815 residents.

Preliminary analysis indicates that at the planning standard, which is an improvement over the existing standard, a single family residential unit could be charged in the range of \$80-120 for animal shelter services. Based on projected growth, over the planning horizon (through 2025) approximately \$5,043,058 would be generated for construction, assuming the cities for which the County currently provides services adopt the fee.

City Participation

While Capital Facilities Fees can be charged to fund the cost of facilities needed to serve growth, replacement facilities are the obligation of existing development. Animal control services are currently provided countywide, except for the City of Roseville which operates their own animal control shelter. It would be reasonable that participating jurisdictions would assist in funding a fair share of these facilities.

The County Executive Office has been meeting with the City Managers to discuss the level of interest in construction of a new shelter and replacement of the existing shelter. An equitable approach in funding would address replacement costs, costs due to new development, and costs to remedy existing deficiencies that would be addressed with construction of new shelters. To be fair, each of these factors for each jurisdiction would be considered in the methodology for apportionment of costs. Obviously, the overall contributions from each source will vary depending upon the cities participating and the level of participation. For planning purposes, it is assumed that about half of the replacement costs will be contributed by cities

A General Fund Contribution would be required to fund the remaining costs of the projects. The Executive Office would intend to continue to work with the cities to agree upon an equitable approach apportionment of costs that would not be funded by new development and make adjustments to the Capital Facilities Financing Plan as directed by your Board. In addition, it would be suggested that staff proceed with technical analysis necessary to enact a Capital Facilities Impact Fee for Animal Control.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The animal services ad hoc committee has been an informal body consisting of city, county and non-profit organizations and stakeholders. It has been invaluable to the Health and Human Services and the County Executive Office in helping to craft the recommendations before the Board today.

As the County embarks on the development of new Animal Services facilities and relationships, it seems appropriate to formalize this group as an advisory body to the County Executive Office. This will give interested stakeholders continued input into the process, and address important animal services issues on an on-going basis to continue to improve delivery of services in this area.

ANIMAL CONTROL ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT

There have been requests from the community as well as discussions during Ad Hoc Committee meetings regarding removing animal services from the Department of Health & Human Services and establishing a stand-alone County department.

Multiple factors were considered in bringing forth the recommendation to retain Animal Control services within the Department of Health & Human Services (HHS), and maintain its current reporting status of Animal Control separate from the Environmental Health Division, reporting directly to the Assistant Director of Health and Human Services.

The County obligations with regard to Animal Control are health-related/disease prevention and control which relates most closely to HHS' core function. In addition, a stand-alone Department of Animal Services would increase the span of control of the County Executive, who already has broad responsibilities including

the coordination and/or direct report of more than 20 appointed and elected department heads.

Health and Human Services' new management has recently made some bold moves in addressing unacceptable practices and personnel issues through disciplinary actions, terminations and new hires. New operational controls have been implemented to strengthen operations and reporting. In addition, HHS has administrative infrastructure (human resources, accounting, budgeting) to provide support, allowing Animal Control to focus on its primary functions. A stand-alone department would have to duplicate these support services.

ANIMAL SERVICES AD HOC COMMITTEE

Representative	Agency	Title
Beck, Perry	Town of Loomis	Loomis Town Manager
Blake, Veronica	PL. Community Foundation	Executive Director
Buhan, Mechelle		
Burton, Richard	Placer County - HHS	Director & Health Officer
Davis, Stuart		
Emslie, Georgia	Placer County - CEO	Sr. Mgmt. Analyst
Flanagan, Jan	Field Haven	
Frieborn, Rosemary	Friends of the PC Shelter	President & Founder
Gandley, Jim	Placer County - HHS	Asst. Director
Harris, Valarie	City of Auburn	Capt. Auburn P.D.
Howe, Lynn	A New Hope	
Jasper, Marilyn		
Johnson, Gerald	City of Lincoln	City Manager
Kurth, Sharon	Field Haven	
Lardner, Bill	Placer County - Facility Services	
Lohman, Georgianna B.	A.A.A.R.F.	President & Co-Founder
Miller, Tom	Placer County - CEO	CEO
Neves, Joel	City of Roseville	Chief-Roseville P.D.
Nowlin, Connie	Wiley Animal Rescue Foundation	
Olsen, Dan	Truckee Animal Control	Supervisor
Perrault, Bob	City of Colfax	City Manager
Reeves, Cassie		
Richardson, Bob		
Riggan, Bekki	Placer County - CEO	Principal Mgmt. Analyst
Roberts, Rosemary		Resident / Volunteer Writer
Selers, Marie	Filed Haven	
Shaw, Dede	Animal Spay & Neuter	
Shelgren, Paul	City of Lincoln - P.D.	
Siemens, Mark	City of Rocklin	Chief-Rocklin P.D.
Smith, Joy	Filed Haven	President
Unholz, Rob	Placer County - Facilities	Capital Improvements Mgr.
Vierra, Leilani	Placer SPCA	CEO
Vizzusi, Brian	City of Lincon	Chief-Lincoln P.D.
Winters, Michael	Placer County - HHS	Program Mngr. Animal Svcs
Wright, Anita		
Woodward, Sandy	Friends - Weimar	Board Member
Yoder, Anita	Placer County - CEO	Placer County -CEO PIO
Young, James DVM	Placer SPCA	President Elect

