



City Council Meeting Date: September 5, 2006

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Gary P. Keefe, City Administrator

SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF STRICTER REGULATION OF DANGEROUS DOGS

RECOMMENDATION:

That City Council receive staff's report, hear public testimony, waive further reading, and introduce Ordinance No. 1534(06); approve any related ancillary requirements; and give appropriate direction to staff; or direct staff to take alternative action(s).

BACKGROUND:

In April, Councilmember Siminski asked that Council consider strengthening the City's ordinance relating to dangerous dogs, in light of the recent passage of California Senate Bill 861(05). SB861 authorizes local governments to enact legislation regulating spaying, neutering, and breeding of dogs of a specified breed.

On May 2, 2006, staff presented a draft ordinance to Council for discussion and direction. There was general support for the ordinance, and by a vote of 4-1, Council directed staff to return with a more complete ordinance that supplements existing state and local legislation. City staff has consulted with County Animal Control, and their comments have been incorporated into the proposed ordinance.

DISCUSSION:

A number of legislative schemes for regulating dangerous canine behavior already exist at state and local levels.

- A. State Laws. California Food and Agriculture Code Sections 31606 through 31683 establish regulatory procedures for identifying and controlling "potentially dangerous dogs" and "vicious dogs".

The statutes require that an animal control or law enforcement officer investigate reports of unsafe canine behavior. If the investigating officer determines that probable cause exists that a dog is potentially dangerous or vicious, the dog may be impounded at the owner's expense while the Police Chief or the Chief Animal

Control Officer petitions the Superior Court for a public hearing to determine if the dog should be declared potentially dangerous or vicious.

The dog's owner or keeper is served with notice of the hearing, which must be held between five and ten working days after service of notice. The owner or keeper may appear and give evidence why the dog should not be declared potentially dangerous or vicious. If the Judge finds that the dog is potentially dangerous or vicious, he or she is authorized to issue appropriate orders for control of the animal, including requirements for licensing, vaccination, maintenance of records of the dog's past behavior, and restraint when off the owner's premises. The judge may also order that the animal be euthanized and the owner prohibited from keeping any other dog for three years. State laws provide substantial appeal rights to the dog's owner or keeper prior to any final action.

Section 31683 authorizes a city or county to adopt stricter regulations to control potentially dangerous and vicious dogs, but the local program may not be specific as to breed except in the areas of spaying, neutering, and breeding. State law prohibits a blanket advance declaration of dangerous or vicious animal from being applied to an entire breed.

A copy of the statutes summarized above is attached at Exhibit A.

- B. Local Ordinances. Chapter 6 of the Lumpoc City Code regulates the keeping of animals. The sections pertaining to dangerous canine behavior are attached at Exhibit B. The City Attorney may charge violations as infractions or misdemeanors.

The City Code provides for impoundment of dogs running at large, trespassing, biting or attacking any person or animal, or exhibiting vicious behavior. The City Administrator or his/her designee then is required to conduct a hearing to determine whether the animal is a dangerous animal. Notice of the hearing is served on the animal's keeper or owner who may attend the hearing to present evidence and call witnesses. The hearing is recorded.

In determining if an animal is dangerous, the City's Hearing Officer considers many factors, including the animal's previous biting or attacking history, the extent of injuries inflicted or property damage sustained, the number of victims, the presence or absence of provocation, evidence of characteristics of training for fighting or attack, evidence of aggressive or unpredictable temperament, the potential for effective retraining, the manner of maintenance and custody provided by the owner, the future ability of the owner to protect the public safety, etc.

After hearing evidence, the Hearing Officer may declare a dog or other animal to be a vicious animal when it has bitten, attacked, or caused injury to any human being, or when substantial evidence has been presented to show that the animal is vicious in that it constitutes an actual and serious immediate physical threat to the life, health, or safety of human beings or other animals. Lompoc City Code Section 0656.D.3 provides that "any dog or other animal "declared to be a dangerous animal shall be humanely destroyed".

The Hearing Officer is authorized to issue appropriate orders in cases of animals determined not be dangerous. These include such measures as revocation of dog license or animal permit, prohibition against future ownership of similar animals, or release of the animal with conditions for its keeping, e.g., maintenance of liability insurance, restrictions on the place and manner of keeping the animal, and requiring permanent marking of the animal for future identification purposes.

- C. New Regulatory Authority. The laws summarized above have been in effect for many years. The hearing procedure contained in the Lompoc City Code has been used often in response to allegations of dangerous canine behavior. Petitioning for a hearing in Superior Court is another option that can be selected.

The tragic deaths of several persons from dog attacks in recent months prompted San Francisco lawmakers to request new state legislation. Prior to January 1, 2006, Food and Agriculture Section 31683 authorized a local jurisdiction to enact its own program for the control of potentially dangerous and vicious dogs. Such programs were allowed to be stricter than the state laws, provided that no program regulated such dogs in a manner specific to breed. However, SB 861(05) amended Section 31683 and adopted Health and Safety Code Section 122331 to provide that "[c]ities and counties may enact dog breed-specific ordinances pertaining only to mandatory spay or neuter programs and breeding requirements, provided that no specific dog breed, or mixed dog breed, shall be declared potentially dangerous or vicious under those ordinances".

Jurisdictions implementing breed-specific regulations for spaying, neutering, and breeding are required to compile statistics to measure the effectiveness of the program. Quarterly reports must be submitted to the State Public Health Veterinarian identifying, as a minimum, the number of dog bites occurring during the reporting period, the severity of the bites, the breeds of the dog involved, whether the dogs were spayed or neutered, and whether the dogs were subject to the local program.

D. Cost Recovery.

Historically, Santa Barbara County has provided animal control services for the City of Lompoc, operating out of the Lompoc Animal Control Shelter. Lompoc Animal Shelter staff also provide services to the unincorporated areas of the County.

As Council will recall, the City and County operated under a fee-for-service contract for many years, but a per capita fee methodology was adopted by Santa Barbara County in July of 2002. In October of 2002, the Lompoc City Council approved a two-year agreement utilizing the per capita fee methodology for our contract with the County. The per capita fee schedule represents a substantial increase over the fee-for-service contract costs, and these new costs were phased in over a four-year period. During the first year, the County recovered 70% of their costs, followed by 80% the second year, 90% in the third year, and 100% in the fourth year (FY 2005-2006). The City costs have been:

- FY 01-02 \$ 75,000
- FY 02-03 \$133,834
- FY 03-04 \$152,942
- FY 04-05 \$195,000
- FY 05-06 \$216,927
- FY 06-07 \$217,935

The current fee structure provides approximately \$53,000 in revenue to County Animal Control. There are currently 2,270 dogs licensed in the City of Lompoc. The City of Lompoc provides \$217,935 (see attached July 2006 staff report) from the General Fund to pay Lompoc's per capita share of Animal Control Services. The City could recover the cost of this service through dog licensing fees and attempt to relieve the General Fund of this cost. To accomplish this cost recovery, the current \$17.00 annual sterilized licensing fee would need to be raised to \$85.00, and the current annual unaltered licensing fee of \$39.00 would need to be raised to \$180.00. Fees in the \$85-\$180 range will likely cause customers to avoid the cost and run the risk of penalties. Staff has therefore recommended a modest increase in fees to help recover costs.

RECOMMENDATION:

As Council directed, staff has reviewed the City's ordinances and analyzed their provisions. In light of the restrictions imposed by state law, the scope of amendment is limited. However, the following changes are recommended for Council's consideration.

- A. Adoption of clearer definitions of terms used in the City's animal control regulations.

B. Approval of expansion of the definition of "dangerous animal" to include an animal declared potentially dangerous that is being kept in violation of the conditions imposed by a judge or hearing officer for its release.

C. Approval of the expansion of the definition of "potentially dangerous animal" to include an animal demonstrating unprovoked terrorizing behavior, defined as the action exhibited by an animal that, in a vicious or terrifying manner, approaches any person in apparent attitude of attack" in public areas of the City.

D. Approval of clearer definitions of service dogs and their exemptions from certain provisions of the Animal Control regulations.

E. Adoption of an anti-"bite and run" provision ---i.e., a law requiring that licensing and vaccination information for any dog biting a human must be given to the victim by the dog's owner or keeper. The owner or keeper must also provide his or her name and address to the victim, as well as disclosing the name of the owner's or keeper's homeowner's or renter's insurance company.

F. Require mandatory spaying or neutering for all pit bulls within the City, subject to certain exemptions and appeal rights as to identity of breed and exemptions from sterilization.

[OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE]

F. Require mandatory spaying or neutering of all dogs within the City, subject to certain exemptions and appeal rights. (This option is recommended by staff.)

G. Set forth the specific penalties for violation of any of the animal control regulations.

H. Amend the existing dog license fees as follows:


1. Sterilized dog: increase existing fee of \$17 to \$25; and
2. Unsterilized dog: change present fee of \$39 to:
 - (a) Unsterilized Per Exemption -- \$50
 - (b) Unsterilized -- \$80.

The draft ordinance attached to this report contains the necessary language to enact the recommendations listed above

SUMMARY:

Staff requests that the Council consider the proposals and recommendations contained in this report, as well as public comments, and appropriately direct staff to carry out Council's decisions by amendment to the City's animal control regulations.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary R. Keefe
City Administrator

Attachments:

- Exhibit A, Existing State Laws
- Exhibit B, Existing City Ordinances
- Exhibit C, Proposed City Code Amendments (Draft Ord. No. 1534(06)).
- Exhibit D, Animal Control Comments
- Exhibit E, Animal Control City Staff Report, July 18, 2006

EXHIBIT A

EXISTING STATE LAWS

CALIFORNIA FOOD AND AGRICULTURE CODE

§ 31601. Legislative declarations and findings

The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) Potentially dangerous and vicious dogs have become a serious and widespread threat to the safety and welfare of citizens of this state. In recent years, they have assaulted without provocation and seriously injured numerous individuals, particularly children, and have killed numerous dogs. Many of these attacks have occurred in public places.

(b) The number and severity of these attacks are attributable to the failure of owners to register, confine, and properly control vicious and potentially dangerous dogs.

(c) The necessity for the regulation and control of vicious and potentially dangerous dogs is a statewide problem, requiring statewide regulation, and existing laws are inadequate to deal with the threat to public health and safety posed by vicious and potentially dangerous dogs.

§ 31602. Potentially dangerous dog defined

"Potentially dangerous dog" means any of the following:

(a) Any dog which, when unprovoked, on two separate occasions within the prior 36-month period, engages in any behavior that requires a defensive action by any person to prevent bodily injury when the person and the dog are off the property of the owner or keeper of the dog.

(b) Any dog which, when unprovoked, bites a person causing a less severe injury than as defined in Section 31604.

(c) Any dog which, when unprovoked, on two separate occasions within the prior 36-month period, has killed, seriously bitten, inflicted injury, or otherwise caused injury attacking a domestic animal off the property of the owner or keeper of the dog.

§ 31603. Vicious dog defined

"Vicious dog" means any of the following:

(a) Any dog seized under Section 599aa of the Penal Code and upon the sustaining of a conviction of the owner or keeper under subdivision (a) of Section 597.5 of the Penal Code.

(b) Any dog which, when unprovoked, in an aggressive manner, inflicts severe injury on or kills a human being.

(c) Any dog previously determined to be and currently listed as a potentially dangerous dog which, after its owner or keeper has been notified of this determination, continues the behavior described in Section 31602 or is maintained in violation of Section 31641, 31642, or 31643.

§ 31604. Severe injury defined

"Severe injury" means any physical injury to a human being that results in muscle tears or disfiguring lacerations or requires multiple sutures or corrective or cosmetic surgery.

§ 31605. Enclosure defined

"Enclosure" means a fence or structure suitable to prevent the entry of young children, and which is suitable to confine a vicious dog in conjunction with other measures which may be taken by the owner or keeper of the dog. The enclosure shall be designed in order to prevent the animal from escaping. The animal shall be housed pursuant to Section 597t of the Penal Code.

§ 31606. Animal control department defined

"Animal control department" means the county or city animal control department. If the city or county does not have an animal control department, it means whatever entity performs animal control functions.

§ 31607. Impounded defined

"Impounded" means taken into the custody of the public pound or animal control department or provider of animal control services to the city or county where the potentially dangerous or vicious dog is found.

§ 31608. County defined

"County" includes any city and county.

§ 31609. Nonapplication of act

(a) This chapter does not apply to licensed kennels, humane society shelters, animal control facilities, or veterinarians.

(b) This chapter does not apply to dogs while utilized by any police department or any law enforcement officer in the performance of police work.

§ 31621. Hearing on declaration of dog as potentially dangerous or vicious

If an animal control officer or a law enforcement officer has investigated and determined that there exists probable cause to believe that a dog is potentially dangerous or vicious, the chief officer of the public pound or animal control department or his or her immediate supervisor or the head of the local law enforcement agency, or his or her designee, shall petition the superior court of the county wherein the dog is owned or kept for a hearing for the purpose of determining whether or not the dog in question should be declared potentially dangerous or vicious. A proceeding under this section is a limited civil case. A city or county may establish an administrative hearing procedure to hear and dispose of petitions filed pursuant to this chapter. Whenever possible, any complaint received from a member of the public which serves as the evidentiary basis for the animal control officer or law enforcement officer to find probable cause shall be sworn to and verified by the complainant and shall be attached to the petition. The chief officer of the public pound or animal control department or head of the local law enforcement agency shall notify the owner or keeper of the dog that a hearing will be held by the superior court or the hearing entity, as the case may be, at which time he or she may present evidence as to why the dog should not be declared potentially dangerous or vicious. The owner or keeper of the dog shall be served with notice of the hearing and a copy of the petition, either personally or by first-class mail with return receipt requested. The hearing shall be held promptly within no less than five working days nor more than 10 working days after service of notice upon the owner or keeper of the dog. The hearing shall be open to the public. The court may admit into evidence all relevant evidence, including incident reports and the affidavits of witnesses, limit the scope of discovery, and may shorten the time to produce records or witnesses. A jury shall not be available. The court may find, upon a preponderance of the evidence, that the dog is potentially dangerous or vicious and make other orders authorized by this chapter.

§ 31622. Determination and orders; notice; compliance; appeal

(a) After the hearing conducted pursuant to Section 31621, the owner or keeper of the dog shall be notified in writing of the determination and orders issued, either personally or by first-class mail postage prepaid by the court or hearing entity. If a determination is made that the dog is potentially dangerous or vicious, the owner or keeper shall comply with Article 3 (commencing with Section 31641) in accordance with a time schedule established by the chief officer of the public pound or animal control department or the head of the local law enforcement agency, but in no case more than 30 days after the date of the determination or 35 days if notice of the determination is mailed to the owner or keeper of the dog. If the petitioner or the owner or keeper of the dog contests the determination, he or she may, within five days of the receipt of the notice of determination, appeal the decision of the court or hearing entity of original jurisdiction. The fee for filing an appeal, payable to the clerk of the court, is as provided in subdivision (b) of Section 70626 of the Government Code. If the original hearing held pursuant to Section 31621 was before a hearing entity other than a court of the jurisdiction, appeal shall be to the superior court. If the original hearing was held in the superior court, appeal shall be to the superior court before a judge other than the judge who originally heard the petition. The petitioner or the owner or keeper of the dog shall serve personally or by first-class mail, postage prepaid, notice of the appeal upon the other party.

(b) The court hearing the appeal shall conduct a hearing de novo, without a jury, and make its own determination as to potential danger and viciousness and make other orders authorized by this chapter, based upon the evidence presented. The hearing shall be conducted in the same manner and within the time periods set forth in Section 31621 and subdivision (a). The court may admit all relevant evidence, including incident reports and the affidavits of witnesses, limit

the scope of discovery, and may shorten the time to produce records or witnesses. The issue shall be decided upon the preponderance of the evidence. If the court rules the dog to be potentially dangerous or vicious, the court may establish a time schedule to ensure compliance with this chapter, but in no case more than 30 days subsequent to the date of the court's determination or 35 days if the service of the judgment is by first-class mail.

§ 31623. Failure of owner or keeper to appear; decision

The court or hearing entity of original jurisdiction or the court hearing the appeal may decide all issues for or against the owner or keeper of the dog even if the owner or keeper fails to appear at the hearing.

§ 31624. Finality of determination

The determination of the court hearing the appeal shall be final and conclusive upon all parties.

§ 31625. Seizure and impoundment pending hearing

(a) If upon investigation it is determined by the animal control officer or law enforcement officer that probable cause exists to believe the dog in question poses an immediate threat to public safety, then the animal control officer or law enforcement officer may seize and impound the dog pending the hearings to be held pursuant to this article. The owner or keeper of the dog shall be liable to the city or county where the dog is impounded for the costs and expenses of keeping the dog, if the dog is later adjudicated potentially dangerous or vicious.

(b) When a dog has been impounded pursuant to subdivision (a) and it is not contrary to public safety, the chief animal control officer shall permit the animal to be confined at the owner's expense in a department approved kennel or veterinary facility.

§ 31626. Circumstances under which dogs may not be declared potentially dangerous or vicious

(a) No dog may be declared potentially dangerous or vicious if any injury or damage is sustained by a person who, at the time the injury or damage was sustained, was committing a willful trespass or other tort upon premises occupied by the owner or keeper of the dog, or was teasing, tormenting, abusing, or assaulting the dog, or was committing or attempting to commit a crime. No dog may be declared potentially dangerous or vicious if the dog was protecting or defending a person within the immediate vicinity of the dog from an unjustified attack or assault. No dog may be declared potentially dangerous or vicious if an injury or damage was sustained by a domestic animal which at the time the injury or damage was sustained was teasing, tormenting, abusing, or assaulting the dog.

(b) No dog may be declared potentially dangerous or vicious if the injury or damage to a domestic animal was sustained while the dog was working as a hunting dog, herding dog, or predator control dog on the property of, or under the control of, its owner or keeper, and the damage or injury was to a species or type of domestic animal appropriate to the work of the dog.

§ 31641. Licensing and vaccination; potentially dangerous designation maintained in registration records; additional fee

All potentially dangerous dogs shall be properly licensed and vaccinated. The licensing authority shall include the potentially dangerous designation in the registration records of the dog, either after the owner or keeper of the dog has agreed to the designation or the court or hearing entity has determined the designation applies to the dog. The city or county may charge a potentially dangerous dog fee in addition to the regular licensing fee to provide for the increased costs of maintaining the records of the dog.

§ 31642. Keeping and controlling potentially dangerous dogs

A potentially dangerous dog, while on the owner's property, shall, at all times, be kept indoors, or in a securely fenced yard from which the dog cannot escape, and into which children cannot trespass. A potentially dangerous animal may be off the owner's premises only if it is restrained by a substantial leash, of appropriate length, and if it is under the control of a responsible adult.

§ 31643. Death, sale, transfer, or permanent removal; notice

If the dog in question dies, or is sold, transferred, or permanently removed from the city or county where the owner or keeper resides, the owner of a potentially dangerous dog shall notify the animal control department of the changed condition and new location of the dog in writing within two working days.

§ 31644. Removal from list of potentially dangerous dogs

If there are no additional instances of the behavior described in Section 31602 within a 36-month period from the date of designation as a potentially dangerous dog, the dog shall be removed from the list of potentially dangerous dogs. The dog may, but is not required to be, removed from the list of potentially dangerous dogs prior to the expiration of the 36-month period if the owner or keeper of the dog demonstrates to the animal control department that changes in circumstances or measures taken by the owner or keeper, such as training of the dog, have mitigated the risk to the public safety.

§ 31645. Destruction; nondestruction, conditions; enclosures

(a) A dog determined to be a vicious dog may be destroyed by the animal control department when it is found, after proceedings conducted under Article 2 (commencing with Section 31621), that the release of the dog would create a significant threat to the public health, safety, and welfare.

(b) If it is determined that a dog found to be vicious shall not be destroyed, the judicial authority shall impose conditions upon the ownership of the dog that protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

(c) Any enclosure that is required pursuant to subdivision (b) shall meet the requirements of Section 31605.

§ 31646. Prohibition of owning, possessing, controlling, or having custody

The owner of a dog determined to be a vicious dog may be prohibited by the city or county from owning, possessing, controlling, or having custody of any dog for a period of up to three years, when it is found, after proceedings conducted under Article 2 (commencing with Section 31621), that ownership or possession of a dog by that person would create a significant threat to the public health, safety, and welfare.

§ 31681. Severable provisions

If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the chapter which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this chapter are severable.

§ 31682. Forms, preparation; existing civil liability or criminal laws, effect of chapter

The Judicial Council shall prepare all forms necessary to give effect to this chapter, including a summons or citation to be used by law enforcement agencies in the enforcement of this chapter. This chapter does not affect or change the existing civil liability or criminal laws regarding dogs.

§ 31683. Local programs

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prevent a city or county from adopting or enforcing its own program for the control of potentially dangerous or vicious dogs that may incorporate all, part, or none of this chapter, or that may punish a violation of this chapter as a misdemeanor or may impose a more restrictive program to control potentially dangerous or vicious dogs. Except as provided in Section 122331 of the Health and Safety Code, no program regulating any dog shall be specific as to breed.

| | | |
|---|--------------|--|
| ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name and Address) | TELEPHONE NO | FOR COURT USE ONLY |
| ATTORNEY FOR (Name) | | |
| COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS MAILING ADDRESS CITY AND ZIP CODE BRANCH NAME | | |
| PETITIONER: RESPONDENT | | |
| PETITION TO DETERMINE IF DOG IS <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Dangerous <input type="checkbox"/> Vicious | | CASE NUMBER |
| 1. Petitioner (name) (representative capacity, if any) | | PETITION REFERRED TO ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY FOR HEARING DATE DEPUTY CLERK |

requests a hearing under Food and Agricultural Code section 31601 et seq. to declare a dog to be potentially dangerous or vicious.

2. Respondent (name)
(address):

is the owner or keeper of the following dog (briefly describe dog and give license number, if available):

3. An animal control officer or a law enforcement officer has investigated and determined that probable cause exists to believe that the dog is potentially dangerous or vicious.

4. **Potentially dangerous dog** Petitioner requests that the dog be declared to be "potentially dangerous" for the following reasons:
- a. The dog, unprovoked, has on two separate occasions within the prior 36-month period engaged in behavior that required a defensive action by a person to prevent bodily injury when the person and the dog were off the property of the owner or keeper of the dog.
 - b. The dog, unprovoked, bit a person causing a less severe injury than described in item 5b.
 - c. The dog, unprovoked, on two separate occasions within the prior 36-month period, killed, seriously bit, inflicted injury, or otherwise caused injury attacking a domestic animal off the property of the owner or keeper of the dog.

5. **Vicious dog** Petitioner requests that the dog be declared to be "vicious" for the following reasons:
- a. The dog was seized under Penal Code section 599aa and the owner or keeper was convicted under section 597.5(a)
 - b. The dog, unprovoked, in an aggressive manner, inflicted severe injury or killed a human being.
 - c. The dog was previously determined to be and is currently designated as a potentially dangerous dog. After its owner or keeper was notified of this determination, the dog continued the behavior described in Food and Agricultural Code section 31602 or the owner or keeper maintained the dog in violation of Food and Agricultural Code sections 31641, 31642, or 31643.

(Continued on reverse)

| | |
|-------------|-------------|
| PETITIONER: | CASE NUMBER |
| RESPONDENT: | |

6. This petition is supported by the following (attach a copy of each document checked):

- a. Declaration of (name) _____ animal control officer law enforcement officer.
The declaration was made after an investigation and determination that probable cause exists to believe that the dog is potentially dangerous or vicious.
- b. A written and verified complaint signed by a member of the public (name):
- c. An incident report prepared by (name):
- d. Affidavit of a witness to the incident (name):
- e. Other (specify):

7. Number of pages attached (specify):

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

This declaration is made on information and belief.

Date:

.....
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)



(SIGNATURE OF PETITIONER)

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name and Address) _____ TELEPHONE NO. _____ | FOR COURT OR AGENCY USE ONLY |
| ATTORNEY FOR (Name) _____ COURT OR AGENCY: STREET ADDRESS _____ MAILING ADDRESS _____ CITY AND ZIP CODE _____ BRANCH NAME _____ | |
| PETITIONER: _____ RESPONDENT: _____ | |
| NOTICE OF HEARING On Petition to Determine If Dog is Potentially Dangerous Vicious | |

1. NOTICE is given that petitioner (name):

(representative capacity, if any):

has filed a **Petition to Determine If Dog Is Potentially Dangerous or Vicious**. Copies of the petition and supporting documents are attached to this notice.

2. A HEARING on the matter will be held as follows:

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Date: _____ | Time: _____ | Dept.: _____ | Room: _____ |
| Address of court or agency _____ | shown above _____ | is: _____ | |

3. At the hearing, you may present evidence as to why the dog should not be declared potentially dangerous or vicious. **Failure to appear at the hearing may result in an order terminating or restricting your possession of the dog.**

DO NOT BRING THE DOG TO THE HEARING

Date: _____ Clerk, by _____ Deputy

..... (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) Agency _____ (SIGNATURE)

_____ (TITLE)

_____ (TELEPHONE NUMBER)

(Proof of Service on reverse)

| | |
|------------|-------------|
| PETITIONER | CASE NUMBER |
| RESPONDENT | |

PROOF OF SERVICE
Petition to Determine If Dog Is Potentially Dangerous or Vicious
 Personal Service Certified Mail

Service of the notice on the other party may be made by one of the following ways:

(1) Personally delivering these papers to the other party.
OR

(2) Mailing the papers by certified mail return receipt requested, postage prepaid, mailed to the last known address of the other party.

1. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age and not a party to this legal proceeding.
2. I served copies of the following papers in the manner shown below:
 - a. Papers served: **Petition to Determine If Dog Is Potentially Dangerous or Vicious** with supporting documents and **Notice of Hearing**
 - b. Manner of service (*check and complete either (1) or (2) below*)
 - (1) **Personal service** I personally delivered these papers to the owner or keeper of the dog as follows:
 - (a) Name:
 - (b) Address where served:
 - (c) Date served:
 - (d) Time served:
 - (2) **Certified mail return receipt requested** I deposited these papers in the United States mail, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I used certified mail and requested a return receipt. The envelope was addressed and mailed to the owner or keeper of the dog as follows:
 - (a) Name:
 - (b) Address:
 - (c) Date of mailing:
 - (d) Place of mailing (*city, state*)
 - (e) I am a resident of or employed in the county where the notice was mailed.
3. My residence or business address is (*specify*):

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date:

..... (TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON WHO SERVED THE NOTICE) (SIGNATURE OF PERSON WHO SERVED THE NOTICE)

4. Telephone number of person who served the notice:

| | | |
|---|---------------|------------------------------|
| ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name and Address) | TELEPHONE NO. | FOR COURT OR AGENCY USE ONLY |
| ATTORNEY FOR (Name) | | |
| COURT OR AGENCY: STREET ADDRESS MAILING ADDRESS CITY AND ZIP CODE BRANCH NAME | | |
| PETITIONER: RESPONDENT: | | |
| ORDER AFTER HEARING (Menacing Dog) | | CASE NUMBER |

The proceeding was heard as follows:

1. a. Date: _____ Dept.: _____ Room: _____
 b. _____ Judge (name) Hearing officer (name): _____
 c. _____ Petitioner present Attorney present (name): _____
 d. _____ Respondent present Attorney present (name): _____
2. _____ Respondent presented evidence as to why the dog should not be declared potentially dangerous or vicious.

THE _____ COURT _____ AGENCY FINDS AND ORDERS

3. The dog is described as follows (briefly describe dog and give license number, if available):

4. a. _____ The owner of the dog is (name):
 b. _____ The keeper of the dog is (name):

5. The dog
 a. _____ is _____ is not potentially dangerous
 b. _____ is _____ is not vicious

6. a. _____ Potentially dangerous dog

- (1) _____ The dog shall be properly licensed and vaccinated, and the licensing authority shall include the "potentially dangerous" designation in the dog's registration records.
 (2) _____ The dog, while on the owner's or keeper's property, shall at all times be kept indoors or in a securely fenced yard from which the dog cannot escape, and into which children cannot trespass. The dog may be off the owner's or keeper's property only if it is restrained by a substantial leash, of appropriate length, and only if it is under the control of a responsible adult.
 (3) _____ If the dog dies, or is sold, transferred, or permanently removed from the city or county where the owner or keeper resides, the owner shall notify the animal control department of the changed condition and new location of the dog within two working days.
 (4) _____ Other (specify):

b. _____ Vicious dog

- (1) _____ Releasing the dog would create a significant threat to the public health, safety, and welfare (check one):
 (i) _____ The dog shall be destroyed by the animal control officer.
 (ii) _____ The following conditions are imposed on the ownership of the dog to protect the public health, safety, and welfare (specify):

(Continued on reverse)

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| PETITIONER _____ | CASE NUMBER _____ |
| RESPONDENT _____ | |

6. b. (continued)

- (2) _____
- (i) Continued ownership or possession of ANY DOG by the dog's owner or keeper would create a significant threat to the public health, safety, and welfare.
 - (ii) The _____ owner _____ keeper named in item 4 is prohibited from owning, controlling, or having custody of any dog for a period of (specify) _____ from the date this order becomes final.
- (3) _____ The following conditions are imposed on the ownership of the dog (specify): _____
- (4) _____ Other (specify) _____

7. **Time to comply (Name):** _____ must comply with this order in accordance with the time schedule, if any, established by the animal control department or local law enforcement agency, BUT NOT more than 30 days from the date of this order (35 days if this order is mailed to you).

8. **Appeal** If you disagree with this determination, you may, within five days after you receive this order, appeal the decision to the _____ municipal _____ justice _____ superior court at (address): _____

Date: _____



 (SIGNATURE OF JUDGE OR HEARING OFFICER)

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that I am not a party to this cause and that a copy of the **Order After Hearing (Menacing Dog)** was mailed first class, postage fully prepaid, in a sealed envelope to each person whose name and address is shown below, and that the order was mailed

at (place): _____, California.

on (date): _____

Clerk, by _____ Deputy

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | |
|--|---------------|--------------------|
| ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name and Address) | TELEPHONE NO. | FOR COURT USE ONLY |
| ATTORNEY FOR (Name) COURT NAME: STREET ADDRESS MAILING ADDRESS CITY AND ZIP CODE BRANCH NAME | | |
| PETITIONER: RESPONDENT | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL (Menacing Dog) | | CASE NUMBER |

- I am the petitioner respondent in this action.
- I appeal from the order entered by (court or agency name) on (date):
- I received a copy of the order on (date):

Date:

.....
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)



.....
(SIGNATURE)

(Proof of Service on reverse)

| | |
|-------------|--------------|
| PETITIONER: | CASE NUMBER: |
| RESPONDENT: | |

PROOF OF SERVICE
Notice of Appeal - Menacing Dog
Personal Service First-Class Mail

Service of the notice of appeal on the other party may be made by one of the following ways:

(1) Personally delivering these papers to the other party.

OR

(2) Mailing the papers by first-class mail, postage prepaid, mailed to the last known address of the other party.

Anyone at least 18 year of age EXCEPT ANY PARTY may personally serve or mail the notice. Be sure whoever served the notice fills out and signs this proof of service. File this proof of service with the court as soon as the notice is served.

1. At the time of service I was at least 18 years of age and not a party to this legal proceeding.
2. I served copies of the following papers in the manner shown:
 - a. Papers served: **Notice of Appeal (Menacing Dog)**
 - b. Manner of service *(check and complete either (1) or (2) below)*
 - (1) **Personal service** I personally delivered these papers to the other party as follows:
 - (a) Name:
 - (b) Address where served:
 - (c) Date served:
 - (d) Time served:
 - (2) **First-class mail** I deposited these papers in the United States mail, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. The envelope was addressed and mailed to the owner or keeper of the dog as follows:
 - (a) Name:
 - (b) Address:
 - (c) Date of mailing:
 - (d) Place of mailing *(city, state)*:
 - (e) I am a resident of or employed in the county where the notice was mailed.
3. My residence or business address is *(specify)*:

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date:

 (TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON WHO SERVED THE NOTICE)

▶

 (SIGNATURE OF PERSON WHO SERVED THE NOTICE)

4. Telephone number of person who served the notice:

CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE

§ 122330. Legislative findings and declarations

The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) Uncontrolled and irresponsible breeding of animals contributes to pet overpopulation, inhumane treatment of animals, mass euthanasia at local shelters, and escalating costs for animal care and control; this irresponsible breeding also contributes to the production of defective animals that present a public safety risk.

(b) Though no specific breed of dog is inherently dangerous or vicious, the growing pet overpopulation and lack of regulation of animal breeding practices necessitates a repeal of the ban on breed-specific solutions and a more immediate alternative to existing laws.

(c) It is therefore the intent of the Legislature in enacting this chapter to permit cities and counties to take appropriate action aimed at eliminating uncontrolled and irresponsible breeding of animals.

§ 122331. Local regulation of spay/neuter programs and breeding requirements; statistical effect on dog bites

(a) Cities and counties may enact dog breed-specific ordinances pertaining only to mandatory spay or neuter programs and breeding requirements, provided that no specific dog breed, or mixed dog breed, shall be declared potentially dangerous or vicious under those ordinances.

(b) Jurisdictions that implement programs described in subdivision (a) shall measure the effect of those programs by compiling statistical information on dog bites. The information shall, at a minimum, identify dog bites by severity, the breed of the dog involved, whether the dog was altered, and whether the breed of dog was subject to a program established pursuant to subdivision (a). These statistics shall be submitted quarterly to the State Public Health Veterinarian.

EXHIBIT B

EXISTING CITY ORDINANCES

CHAPTER 6: ANIMALS.

Article 1. In General.

Section 0601. Animals Running At Large Prohibited; Exception for Dogs on Leash.

A. It shall be unlawful for any person owning or having possession, charge, custody, or control of any dog or other animal, to cause or permit or allow the dog or other animal to run, stray, be uncontrolled or in any manner be in, upon, or at large upon a public street, sidewalk, park, or other public property or in or upon the premises or private property of another person; provided that dogs may be permitted upon the streets or other places of the City if on a leash not exceeding six feet in length and under the immediate care and control of the owner or other person having the care, custody and control thereof. Any animal not kept under restraint or so confined or enclosed as provided in this Chapter is hereby declared to be a menace and nuisance to public health and safety.

B. A person who owns or is in charge of or controls or possesses a dog or other animal who permits, allows, or causes the dog or other animal to run, stray, be uncontrolled or in any manner be in, upon, or at large upon a public street, sidewalk, park or other public property or in or upon the premises or private property of another person is guilty of a misdemeanor if said dog or other animal bites, attacks, or causes injury to any human being or other animal. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor under this provision shall not own, possess, control or be in charge of any animal of the species which caused the bite, attack or injury, for a period of three years from the date of conviction and the Animal Control Officer shall not issue or renew any license or permit to the person so convicted for said species of animal.

Section 0602. Picking Up Trespassing Animals.

Any animal found trespassing on any private property in the City may be taken up by any person and delivered to the Animal Control Officer.

Section 0606. Animals Suspected of Having Rabies.

Whenever the owner or person having the custody or possession of an animal shall observe or learn that such animal shows symptoms of rabies, or acts in a manner which would lead to a reasonable suspicion that it may have rabies, such owner or person having the custody or possession of such animal shall immediately notify the Health Officer. The Health Officer shall make or cause an inspection or examination of such animal to be made by a licensed veterinarian until the existence or nonexistence of rabies in such animal is established by such veterinarian. Such animal shall be kept isolated in a pound, veterinary hospital or other adequate facility in a manner approved by the Health Officer, and shall not be killed or released for at least ten days after the onset of symptoms suggestive of rabies, after which time such animal may be released by the Health Officer.

Lompoc City Code

Section 0609. Controlling Dogs in Heat.

No person having control or possession of a female dog in heat shall fail to confine or enclose such female dog so that she cannot come in contact with any male dog except for the purposes of planned breeding.

Section 0611. Limitation on Number of Dogs.

No person shall keep, harbor or maintain or cause or allow to be kept, harbored or maintained, more than four dogs over four months of age on any premises other than in a commercial establishment or kennel operating in accordance with City and State regulations and permit and licensing requirements.

Section 0614. Dog Defecation; Removal by Owners.

A. Any person owning, possessing, harboring, or having the care, charge, control or custody of any dog shall immediately remove and thereafter dispose of any fecal matter deposited by said dog on public property. For the purpose of this Section, dog fecal matter shall be immediately removed by placing said matter in a closed or sealed container and thereafter disposing of it by depositing said matter in a trash receptacle, sanitary disposal unit, or other closed or sealed container.

B. Violation of this Section shall be an infraction punishable by (1) a fine not exceeding \$50.00 for a first violation; (2) a fine not exceeding \$100.00 for a second violation within one year; and (3) a fine not exceeding \$250.00 for each additional violation within one year.

C. This Section shall not apply to blind persons accompanied by a dog used for their assistance. (Ord. No. 1217(84), adopted 12/18/84.)

Section 0615. Animals in Parks During Certain Events.

When a determination has been made by the Recreation and Parks Commission of the City of Lompoc that it is necessary to protect the public peace, health and safety by prohibiting animals in parks during events authorized by the Commission, upon the Commission's determination and the posting of signs providing notice of the prohibition at all entrances to the park, where the activity is taking place, it shall be unlawful for any person owning or having possession, charge, custody or control of any animal to cause or permit the animal to be at the park during the specified event. Any person failing to remove an animal from the park during the

Lompoc City Code

specified event, upon being given notice of the prohibition, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

In accordance with Section 54 through 55.1 of the California Civil Code, this Section shall not apply to a specially trained guide dog, signal dog, or service dog as defined in Civil Code Section 54.1, accompanying a totally or partially blind person, or deaf person, or person whose hearing is impaired or physically handicapped person.

Article 2. Dogs.

Division 1. Generally.

Section 0616. Removal and Improper Use of License and Vaccination Tags.

No person shall remove any tag from any dog not owned by him or not lawfully in his possession or under his control or place on any dog any such license tag not issued as provided in this Article for that particular dog for the then current calendar year, or shall make or have in his possession or place on a dog any counterfeit or imitation of any license tag or vaccination tag provided for in this Article.

Division 2. Licenses.

Section 0617. Required--Generally.

Except as provided in Section 0618, it shall be unlawful to own, keep or control any dog unless a license has been procured therefore as provided in this Division.

Section 0618. Same--Exceptions.

The provisions of Section 0617 shall not apply to dogs under the age of four months if kept within a sufficient enclosure; nor to a dog used to assist a person with impaired vision; nor to dogs owned by or in custody or under the control of persons who are nonresidents of the City traveling through the City or temporarily sojourning therein for a period not exceeding thirty days; nor to dogs brought to the City exclusively for the purpose of entering the same in any dog show or exhibition, and which are actually entered in and kept at such show or exhibition; nor to dogs under treatment in the custody or control of animal hospitals; nor to dogs on sale in duly licensed pet shops; nor to dogs owned, kept or controlled by any person having a permit to keep and maintain a dog kennel; provided that such dogs are kept enclosed within such pet

Lompoc City Code

shop or dog kennel; nor to dogs under the ownership, custody and control of the owner of a dog kennel duly licensed under the provisions of this Division or his duly authorized employee or agent when such dogs are removed from such kennel in the bona fide operation thereof for the purpose of exercise or training, provided, that any such dog shall bear an identification tag attached to a collar, harness or other device, which tag shall be of a size and type designated by the Animal Control Officer, shall be furnished at the sole cost and expense of the owner of such kennel and shall set forth the name and address of such kennel; and a dog bearing such tag shall be treated in all respects as a licensed dog in the event of its escape and subsequent impoundment.

Section 0619. Dog License Fee.

Every person owning, keeping or having control of any dog within the City shall pay the license fee required by the City Council by resolution for the calendar year commencing January 1 and ending December 31, or any part thereof, before the first day of March of the current year, or within thirty days after said dog attains the age of four months or is first brought into the City, whichever be the earliest; and upon failure to do so shall pay the penalty specified by Council resolution.

Section 0620. No License Without Vaccination.

The Animal Control Officer shall not license any dog until it has been vaccinated with an approved canine anti-rabies vaccine of modified live virus chick embryo origin, by injection or other method approved by the Health Officer, and the owner or person in possession of said dog submits a Certificate of Vaccination from a licensed veterinarian certifying the vaccination of such dog within 18 months of January 1 of the year for which the license is to be issued.

Section 0621. Certificate to Owner.

A. The Animal Control Officer shall be the issuing authority for dog licenses. Upon payment of the license fee hereinabove provided and upon presentation to the license collector of a valid vaccination certificate, as hereinabove provided, there shall be issued a license certificate stating the year for which such license fee is paid, the date of payment, the name and resident address to whom such license is issued, the name, breed, and sex of the dog licensed, and the number of the license tag hereinafter provided for. Such certificate shall be delivered to the person paying such license fee, and one copy shall be retained by the Animal Control Officer. All receipts and records of the Animal

Lompoc City Code

Control Officer shall be kept in the office of the public pound as part of the records during the period of at least three (3) years. The Animal Control Officer shall at the same time issue and deliver to the person paying such license fee, a tag of such form and design as the Animal Control Officer shall designate, with the words "Santa Barbara County Dog License" and a serial number and the calendar year for which issued, plainly inscribed thereon. The license tag shall be securely affixed to a collar, harness, or other device which shall be at all times worn by such dog.

B. The Animal Control Officer may deputize any duly qualified and licensed veterinarian, the Santa Barbara Humane Society, or any pet shop having a valid permit from the Animal Control Officer, to license any dog, collect the license fee thereon, and issue to the person paying said fee the dog tag provided for, upon presentation by said person to the License Collector of a valid vaccination certificate as hereinabove provided. Any person so authorized by the Animal Control Officer to perform the aforementioned acts shall account to the Animal Control Officer not less than once each month for all dogs so licensed and all license fees collected.

Section 0623. Fee For Duplicate License.

If any dog license tag shall be lost or stolen, the person owning, possessing, or having control of the dog for which the same has been issued, shall be entitled to receive a duplicate of such tag by presenting to the Animal Control Officer the original certificate showing ownership of such tag and subscribing to an affidavit sufficiently showing that such tag was stolen or lost. The Animal Control Officer, upon receipt of a fee established by Council resolution, shall issue a properly numbered duplicate tag, and shall keep on file in his office the original affidavit, upon which such duplicate tag was issued.

Division 3. Rabies Control.

Section 0626. Vaccination--Required; Exception.

It shall be unlawful for any person owning, harboring or having the care, custody, or possession of any dog to keep or maintain such dog in any place in the City unless such dog has been vaccinated. This section shall have no application to dogs under the age of four months, who are fastened securely by a rope, chain, or leash, or confined within the private property of the owner or person having control of such dog.

Section 0627. Same--Prerequisite to Licensing; Type to be Used.

The Animal Control Officer shall not license any dog until it has been vaccinated with an approved canine anti-rabies vaccine of modified live virus chick embryo origin, by injection or other method approved by the Health Officer, and the owner or person in possession of such dog submits a certificate of vaccination from a licensed veterinarian certifying the vaccination of such dog within eighteen months of January 1 of the year for which the license is to be issued.

Section 0628. Same--Performance; Issuance and Contents of Certificate.

The required anti-rabies vaccination shall be performed by a duly qualified and licensed veterinarian. Such veterinarian vaccinating any dog shall issue to the owner or person in possession of such dog a rabies vaccination tag and a certificate of vaccination, which certificate shall include the following:

- A. The type of vaccine used.
- B. The date of vaccination.
- C. A description of the dog.
- D. The serial number of the rabies vaccination tag issued to the dog.
- E. The name and address of the owner of the dog.
- F. The signature of the licensed veterinarian making the vaccination.
- G. A Statement that the dog is a male, female, or spayed female.

Lompoc City Code

Section 0629. Biting animals.

The Animal Control Officer may direct the owner or custodian or possessor of any animal which is determined by the Animal Control Officer to have bitten any person or animal to comply with any one of the following procedures:

A. Isolate the biting animal on the premises of the owner or custodian of said animal for the period of time determined by the Animal Control Officer.

B. Surrender the biting animal to the Animal Control Officer for isolation and impoundment for the period of time determined by the Animal Control Officer.

C. Surrender the animal to a licensed veterinarian for isolation for the period of time determined by the Animal Control Officer.

It shall be unlawful for the owner, possessor or custodian of a biting animal to fail to comply with the Animal Control Officer's requirements as set forth in this Section.

Section 0631. Same--Determination of Whether Rabid or Not; Destruction or Release.

If the Health Officer or a duly licensed veterinarian designated by the Health Officer shall determine that a dog impounded or quarantined pursuant to Section 0629 is diseased and by reason of such disease is dangerous to persons or to other animals, he shall so notify the Animal Control Officer, in writing, to destroy such dog. A copy of such notice may also be served upon the owner or person having control of such dog. If the Health Officer or such veterinarian shall determine that such dog is not so diseased, and if the license required for such dog shall have been duly paid for the then current year, the Animal Control Officer shall notify by mail the person to whom the license for such dog was issued and at the address from which the dog was surrendered to the Animal Control Officer and shall, upon demand, release such dog to the owner or person lawfully entitled thereto, upon payment of any charges provided therefor, including expenses of quarantine and veterinary care; provided, that if no person lawfully entitled to

Lompoc City Code

such dog shall, within five days after the date of giving such notice, appear at the public pound and request the release of such dog, and pay such charges, such dog may be sold or destroyed by the Animal Control Officer in the manner provided by this Chapter.

Section 0632. Right of Entry of Health Officer Where Rabies, Etc., Suspected.

The Health Officer, or his duly authorized representative, is authorized and empowered to enter upon private property where any dog or other animal is kept or believed by him to be kept for the purpose of ascertaining whether such dog or other animal is afflicted or infected with rabies or other contagious disease.

Article 3. Impoundment.

Section 0633. Establishment and Location of Public Pound.

A public pound is established and the same and any branches thereof shall be located at such place as shall be fixed by the Animal Control Officer provided for in this Chapter.

Section 0634. Post-Seizure Hearing.

Whenever an animal has been collected, seized, or impounded under a rule or regulation of the City providing for such collection, seizure or impoundment, the owner or keeper of such animal may request a public hearing to be held before the City Administrator or his designee. This request shall be made to the City Administrator within ten days after the collection, seizure or impoundment of the animal. The owner or keeper of the animal may appear in person at the hearing or present a sworn written statement concerning his ownership or relationship to the animal and why the collection, seizure or impoundment was not according to the law or is derogative of said owner's or keeper's rights. The City Administrator or his designee shall consider all facts, testimony, and sworn written statements as to the status and condition of the animal, and the reason for its collection, seizure or impoundment. The Hearing Officer shall not be limited by technical rules of evidence. At the conclusion of this hearing, the City Administrator may make such orders and impose such conditions, or take other action as he deems appropriate under the circumstances, to protect the rights of the owner or keeper of said animal and carry out the law relating thereto. Said decision shall be made and rendered in writing within three days of the date of the close of the hearing, which may be continued from time to time.

Lompoc City Code

Section 0637. Same--Care of Animals in Custody.

The Animal Control Officer shall provide all animals in his custody with proper food and water, and shall give them all necessary care and attention.

Section 0639. Same--Enforcement of Chapter.

It shall be the duty of the Animal Control Officer to enforce the provisions of this Chapter and it shall be the duty of every City official to cooperate with the Animal Control Officer in the enforcement of his duties.

Section 0640. Same--Police Power.

The Animal Control Officer and any deputies appointed by him shall have the power of arrest in connection with the enforcement of any of the provisions of this Chapter.

Section 0641. Same--Badges; Impersonation of Officer.

The Animal Control Officer and his deputies, while engaged in the execution of their duties, shall each wear in plain view a badge having their title or other designation of authority engraved thereon. Any person who has not been duly appointed an Animal Control Officer or his deputy, or one whose appointment has been revoked, who shall represent himself to be or shall attempt to act as such an Animal Control Officer or Deputy Animal Control Officer, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Lompoc City Code

Section 0642. Same--Hindering, Obstructing, Etc., Prohibited.

No person shall resist, hinder, molest or obstruct the Animal Control Officer or any of his deputies in the exercise of duties as such Animal Control Officer.

Section 0643. Delivery of Stray Animals to Animal Control Officer.

Every person taking up any animal under the provisions of this Chapter and every person finding any lost, strayed or stolen animal shall, within twenty-four hours thereafter, give notice thereof to the Animal Control Officer. The Animal Control Officer shall thereupon either pick up and take such animal into custody or require the person who has control of such animal to deliver such animal to the animal Control Officer without fee or charge. The Animal Control Officer shall thereupon hold and dispose of such animal in the same manner as though such animal had been found running at large and impounded by him.

Section 0644. Disposition of Impounded Livestock.

All domestic bovine animals, horses, mules, burros, sheep, goats and swine shall, unless claimed by the owner or person entitled to the custody thereof, within 72 hours, be released to the Director of Agriculture of the State in accordance with the provisions of the California Agriculture Code.

Section 0645. Redemption of Impounded Animals.

The owner or person entitled to the custody of any animal impounded under this Chapter may, at any time before the sale or other disposition thereof, during the office hours of the public pound, reclaim or redeem the same by paying the Animal Control Officer any charges imposed thereon.

Section 0646. Impoundment of Stray Dogs.

It shall be the duty of the Animal Control Officer to seize and impound, subject to the provisions of this Article, all stray or unlicensed dogs found within the City, and, for that purpose, the Animal Control Officer may go upon private property to enforce this Chapter or to collect and impound dogs.

Section 0647. Destruction of Diseased Animals.

If it is determined by the County Veterinarian or his licensed veterinarian designee that any animal impounded is by reason of

Lompoc City Code

contagious disease a danger to any person or any other impounded animal, such animal may be humanely destroyed.

Section 0648. Redemption of Impounded Animals.

The Animal Control Officer shall keep any animal impounded for at least 72 hours unless such animal is sooner reclaimed by the owner or person entitled to its custody. Sundays and holidays applicable to the pound shall not be included in said 72 hours. Redemption shall be made by exhibiting to the Animal Control Officer the license certificate or license tag issued by the Animal Control Officer showing that the license for an impounded dog for the then current year has been paid, and by paying the Animal Control Officer any charges provided for. Upon redemption being made, the Animal Control Officer shall release the animal provided that in all cases any charges provided for keeping such animal shall be paid. No cat or dog shall be released to any person other than the owner or custodian unless such cat or dog is neutered or unless the payment for such neutering has been deposited with the Animal Control Officer and the person to whom the dog or cat is released agrees in writing to cause such dog or cat to be neutered. Upon notice to the Animal Control Officer that the dog or cat has been neutered, the deposit shall be forwarded to the licensed veterinarian performing such neutering.

Section 0649. Disposition of Unredeemed Animals.

At any time after the expiration of the required period of 72 hours, the Animal Control Officer may, without further notice and without advertising in any manner, place for adoption, sell, destroy, or give away any animal not reclaimed or redeemed as provided in this Article, provided that any dog adopted or given away, which will be kept in the County, shall be licensed. No cat or dog shall be released to any person except upon neutering under the process provided in Section 0648. No impounded animal may be transferred to anyone for the intended use of the animal for research or testing.

Section 0650. Records of Animals Impounded.

The Animal Control Officer shall keep a record of the number, description and disposition of all animals impounded, showing in detail, in the case of each animal, the date of receipt, the date and manner of disposal, the name of the person reclaiming, redeeming or receiving such animals, the reason for destruction and such additional records as the Animal Control Officer may feel necessary. Such records shall be kept by the Animal Control

Lompoc City Code

Officer in books provided for that purpose, which shall be the record books of the Office of the Animal Control Officer, and shall not be removed therefrom except upon written order from a duly constituted authority.

Article 4. Kennels, Pet Shops, and Catteries.

Section 0651. Definition.

A. For the purposes of this Chapter, the following words and phrases shall have the meaning respectively ascribed to them by this Section.

B. Animal Control Officer means those officers and employees assigned the respective powers and duties provided in this Chapter by the County of Santa Barbara if the City has contracted with, or made a Council authorized arrangement with, the County for carrying out of said powers and duties, otherwise the officers and employees of the City assigned said powers and duties.

C. Cattery means any premises where five or more cats, four months of age or older, are kept and cared for, not including a licensed veterinary hospital, or the premises of the City, County, or Humane Society.

D. Dog kennel means any lot, building, structure, enclosure, or premises whereon or wherein five or more dogs, four months of age or older, are kept and maintained for any purpose whatsoever; provided, however, that if other animals or birds or fowl are bought, sold or bartered, the classification to apply shall be that of a pet shop; and provided, further, that this definition of "dog kennel" shall not be construed as applying to a duly licensed veterinary hospital nor to the Santa Barbara Humane Society.

E. Grooming shop means any commercial establishment where animals are bathed, clipped, plucked, or otherwise groomed; provided that this definition shall not include a duly licensed veterinary hospital, a Santa Barbara Humane Society facility, or any County or City facility.

F. Pet shop is defined as set forth in California Penal Code Section 597(1).

Section 0652. Dog Kennel, Cattery, Grooming Shop, Pet Shop; Regulations.

It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, corporation or association to erect, establish or maintain any kennel, cattery,

Lompoc City Code

grooming shop or pet shop as defined in this Ordinance without first obtaining a permit from the Animal Control Officer. The granting of such permit shall be in the discretion of the Animal Control Officer who shall take into consideration the type of construction to be employed as it relates to sanitation and manner in which the animals, birds or fowl are to be housed, as well as the character of the person, firm, corporation, or association making application, and such zoning regulations as may now be in effect or adopted from time to time. If the Animal Control Officer determines that the facilities or location where the animals are to be kept are not adequate for the safe or healthful keeping of said animals or the keeping might cause a nuisance, then said officer may limit the number of animals to be kept on the premises.

Upon approval of the Animal Control Officer, said Officer, upon the payment of annual license fee specified by Council resolution for the privilege of maintaining such dog kennel, cattery, grooming shop or pet shop, shall issue to the applicant a license in such form as he may prescribe. Such annual license shall be kept for the calendar year or any part thereof during which said dog kennel or pet shop shall be maintained, and shall be due and payable in advance on the first day of January of each year, and shall expire on the 31st day of December of such year, provided the abovementioned permit has not been revoked.

Section 0653. Same--Revocation.

The permit for the maintenance and operation of a dog kennel, cattery, grooming shop or pet shop may be revoked at any time for cause when, in the opinion of the Animal Control Officer, such dog kennel, cattery, grooming shop or pet shop is not being properly maintained or operated from the standpoint of sanitation of the premises or proper care of the animals, birds or fowl.

Section 0654. Posting of Emergency Addresses, Etc.

Every person maintaining a dog kennel, cattery, grooming shop or pet shop shall post a notice in a conspicuous place where it may be seen outside the locked premises listing names, addresses, and telephone numbers of persons who may be contacted in the event of an emergency.

Lompoc City Code

Article 5. Biting, Attacking or Vicious Animals.

Section 0655. Impoundment--Biting, Attacking or Vicious Animals.

A. The Animal Control Officer shall have the power to summarily and immediately impound a dog or other animal where there is evidence it has attacked, bitten or injured any human being or other animal, or where there is evidence that the animal is vicious in that it constitutes an actual and serious immediate physical threat to the life or health or safety of human beings or other animals, pending any court or dog license or animal permit revocation proceeding arising from the attack, bite, or injury; or to undertake a hearing pursuant to Section 0656.

Failure to surrender to the Animal Control Officer upon demand a dog or other animal which is subject to being impounded pursuant to this Section is a misdemeanor.

A dog or other animal, impounded pursuant to the authority of this Section, shall be returned to the owner or custodian as provided by Section 0656 or when it is no longer required as evidence, or if a notice of hearing pursuant to Section 0656 to declare the dog or other animal a dangerous animal has not been served on the owner or custodian within seven days after the impoundment by the Animal Control Officer.

B. In lieu of impound, the Animal Control Officer may permit the dog or other animal to be confined at the owner's or custodian's expense in a dog kennel or veterinary facility approved by the Animal Control Officer, within the City or at the dog owner's or custodian's residence provided that the owner or custodian:

1. Shall not remove the dog or other animal from the kennel, veterinary facility or residence without the prior written approval of the Animal Control Officer; and

2. Shall make the dog or other animal available for observation and inspection by the animal Control Officer or members of law enforcement or their authorized representatives.

3. The Animal Control Officer or his designated representative may have a dog or other animal, impounded or confined as provided in A or B above, permanently identified by means of photo identification prior to release from impound or confinement.

Lompoc City Code

Section 0656. Dangerous Animal - Procedures.

A. Hearing.

The City Administrator or his designee shall conduct a hearing to determine whether or not a dog or other animal confined or impounded pursuant to Section 0654 is a dangerous animal. The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the following procedures:

1. Notice of Hearing. The hearing shall be commenced by the Animal Control Officer issuing and serving a written notice upon the owner of the dog. Notice shall be served at least ten (10) days prior to the date set for the hearing. The notice shall state in clear and concise language:

a. the purpose and reason for holding the hearing and the requested remedy or penalty, and

b. the time and place where the hearing is to be held.

2. Witnesses. At the hearing, the owner of the dog, the complainant or complainants, if any, and the Animal Control Officer shall be given an opportunity to present evidence, and call and cross-examine witnesses.

3. Continuances. The hearing may be continued from time to time upon good cause being shown.

4. Evidence. Hearings need not be conducted according to technical rules relating to evidence or witnesses. Any relevant evidence shall be admitted if it is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in conduct of serious affairs, regardless of the existence of any common law or statutory rule which might make improper the admission of such evidence over objection in civil actions. Hearsay evidence may be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining any direct evidence, but shall not be sufficient in itself to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in civil actions.

5. Reporting. A recording or transcript of the hearing shall be taken.

6. Burden of Proof. The burden is on the Animal Control Officer to show by a preponderance of the evidence that the allegations made are true.

Lompoc City Code

7. Hearing Officer - Decisions. The person before whom the hearing is held shall, within 15 days of the conclusion of any hearing, issue a decision. The decision shall contain a summary of the evidence, including oral testimony, and shall state the findings supporting the decision.

The decision shall be a public record and a copy shall be served upon the owner of the dog by personal service or registered mail.

8. Finality of Decision. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Lompoc City Code to the contrary, decisions rendered in accordance with the provisions of this Article shall be final and not appealable.

B. Dangerous Animal, Declared.

After holding a hearing in accordance with subsection A infra, any dog or other animal may be declared to be a dangerous animal whenever it has bitten, attacked or caused injury to any human being or other animal or where it has been determined, based upon substantial evidence that the animal is vicious in that it constitutes an actual and serious immediate physical threat to the life or health or safety of human beings or other animals.

C. Determination of Dangerous Animal, Evidence

In making a determination that a dog or other animal is or is not dangerous, evidence of the following shall be considered:

1. Any previous history of the dog or other animal attacking, biting or causing injury to a human being or other animal;

2. The nature and extent of injuries inflicted and the number of victims involved;

3. The place where the bite, attack, or injury occurred;

4. The presence or absence of any provocation for the bite, attack or injury;

5. The extent to which property has been damaged or destroyed;

6. Whether the dog or other animal exhibits any characteristics of being trained for fighting or attack or other evidence to show such training or fighting;

Lompoc City Code

7. Whether the dog or other animal exhibits characteristics of aggressive or unpredictable temperament or behavior in the presence of human beings or dogs or other animals;

8. Whether the dog or other animal can be effectively trained or retrained to change its temperament or behavior;

9. The manner in which the dog or other animal had been maintained by its owner or custodian;

10. Any other relevant evidence concerning the maintenance of the dog or other animal;

11. Any other relevant evidence regarding the ability of the owner or custodian, or the Animal Control Officer, to protect the public safety in the future if the dog or other animal is permitted to remain in the City.

12. Any other relevant evidence concerning why the animal may constitute an actual and serious immediate physical threat to the life or health or safety of human beings or other animals.

D. Dangerous Animal - Disposition.

1. It shall be unlawful for any person to own, possess, harbor, or keep any dog or other animal declared, after a hearing, to be dangerous.

2. Any dog or other animal declared to be dangerous, if not already impounded by the Animal Control Officer, shall be immediately surrendered to the Animal Control Officer, and it is the duty of the Animal Control Officer to take up and impound any such dog or other animal.

3. Any dog or other such animal declared to be a dangerous animal shall be humanely destroyed.

E. Dog or Other Animal - Not Dangerous - Procedure.

If it is determined that the dog or other animal is not dangerous, but that a bite, attack or injury was the result of improper or negligent training, handling or maintenance, the dog license or animal permit may;

1. Be revoked if it is determined that the owner or custodian is unable or unwilling to properly train, handle or maintain the dog or other animal and a similar incident is not

Lompoc City Code

likely to occur in the future with proper training, handling, or maintenance, or

2. Be reissued with reasonable terms, conditions or restrictions imposed for the training, handling, or maintenance of the dog or other animal to protect the public health, safety and welfare if it is determined that the owner or custodian is able and willing to properly train, handle, or maintain the dog or other animal and a similar incident is not likely to occur in the future with proper training, handling, or maintenance. Such terms and conditions may include requiring the owner to provide public liability insurance in any amount determined to be appropriate for protection against bodily injury or death to any person or damage to property which may result from ownership, keeping, or maintenance of such dog or animal.

F. Revoked License - Previously Impounded or Confined.

1. If a dog or other animal has been impounded or confined pursuant to Section 0655 and its license or permit has been revoked pursuant to E, 1 above, and the owner or custodian wishes to reclaim and remove it from the City of Lompoc, the Animal Control Officer shall release it provided that the dog or other animal is taken to its new location immediately and directly upon its release from impound or confinement. Failure to remove the dog or other animal immediately and directly from the City upon release from impound or confinement is a misdemeanor.

2. Any dog or other animal which has previously been impounded or otherwise confined and which has not been claimed within five (5) calendar days of service of a notice of revocation of its license or permit shall be deemed abandoned and shall be disposed of by the Animal Control Officer in accordance with this Article. Notwithstanding the above, the owner may enter into a written agreement with the Animal Control Officer to take additional time to remove, to a new location outside the City. Such additional time shall not exceed ten (10) days.

G. Animal Identification.

Any dog or other animal subject to this Section must be permanently identified by the Animal Control Officer by the use of photographs or permanent marking, or both, prior to its release from impound or confinement.

H. Any person whose dog or other animal has been declared dangerous or whose license or permit has been revoked under this Section shall not own, possess, control or be in charge of any animal of the species declared to be dangerous or whose license or permit has been revoked, for a period of three (3) years from the date of the action declaring the animal dangerous or revoking the license or permit, and the Animal Control Officer shall not issue or renew any license or permit for said species of animal.



EXHIBIT C

PROPOSED CITY CODE AMENDMENTS



ORDINANCE NO. [REDACTED] (06)

An Ordinance of the City of Lompoc,
County of Santa Barbara, State of California
Amending Chapter 6 "Animals,"
Requiring Sterilization of Dogs in the City

WHEREAS, irresponsible breeding of animals contributes to pet overpopulation, inhumane treatment and neglect of animals, insufficient canine socialization and training, increased risk to the public safety, euthanasia of hundreds of animals annually at the City Shelter, and rising costs for animal control and care by the City; and

WHEREAS, although no specific breed of dog is inherently dangerous or vicious, pet overpopulation resulting from irresponsible breeding has moved the State Legislature to adopt California Health and Safety Code Section 122331 which authorizes cities that compile statistical information on dog bites, and submit their findings to the State Public Health Veterinarian on a quarterly basis, to enact dog breed-specific ordinances pertaining to mandatory spay or neuter programs and breeding requirements; and

WHEREAS, under the authority of California Government Code Section 36901, the City Council may establish fines, penalties, and forfeitures to enforce the provisions of the Lompoc City Code; and

WHEREAS, the Council of the City of Lompoc enacts this Ordinance to reduce and control irresponsible breeding of dogs, so as to better protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of the City.


NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOMPOC
HEREBY ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 0600 is added to Chapter 6 of the Lompoc City Code to read as follows:

"Section 0600. Definitions.

For purposes of this Chapter, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, the following words and phrases have the meanings set forth below:

- A. Animal means all nonhuman members of the animal kingdom, including domestic, exotic, and livestock species.





- B. Animal Control Officer means an officer or employee of the City of Lompoc or of the County of Santa Barbara authorized to carry out and enforce the powers, duties, and provisions of this Chapter relating to the care, control, and treatment of animals within the City.
- C. At Large means an animal that is off the premises of its owner or custodian and not restrained by a leash.
- D. Breeder means any person, business, or organization that is recognized as an animal breeder under the laws of the State of California.
- E. Cattery means any premises where five or more cats, four months of age or older, are kept and cared for, not including a licensed veterinary facility, animal shelter, or welfare organization, rescue facility, or shelter.
- F. Dangerous animal means an animal, except a law enforcement dog, which demonstrates any of the following behavior:
 - 1. An unprovoked attack that results in serious injury to, or the death of, any person when such person is acting lawfully;
 - 2. A second unprovoked attack within a 12-month period upon a person that requires a defensive action by any person to prevent bodily injury when the person is acting lawfully, or that results in less than a serious injury when the person is acting lawfully;
 - 3. An unprovoked attack that results in the death of another animal or livestock when the animal is or livestock are off the property of the owner of the attacking animal;
 - 4. A second unprovoked attack within a 12-month period on another animal or livestock that results in serious injury when the animal is or livestock are off the property of the owner of the attacking animal;
 - 5. An animal declared potentially dangerous that is kept thereafter in noncompliance with the conditions imposed by the Hearing Officer making such declaration; i.e., an animal that continues or is permitted to continue the behavior causing its declaration as potentially dangerous.
- G. Domestic Animal means any animal customarily kept by humans for pleasure or companionship, including, but not limited to, dogs, cats, birds, rabbits, hamsters, potbellied pigs, guinea pigs, mice, rats, iguanas, and the like, but not including feral cats.

SEP 5 2006

- H. Exotic Animal means any species of animal not normally considered domestic or livestock, those animals defined by California Fish and Game Code Sections 2116 and 2118.
- I. Feral Cat means an unsocialized cat without owner identification of any kind, usually exhibiting temperament and behavior connoting extreme fear and resistance to contact with people.
- J. Grooming Shop means any commercial establishment where animals are bathed, clipped, brushed, plucked, or otherwise groomed, not including a licensed veterinary facility, animal shelter, and welfare organization, animal rescue facility or shelter.
- K. Health Officer means the Public Health Officer of the Santa Barbara County or his or her designee.
- L. Hearing Officer means the City Administrator or his or her designee.
- M. Kennel means any lot, building, structure, enclosure, or premises whereon or wherein five or more dogs, four months of age or older, are kept and maintained for any purpose whatsoever, not including a licensed veterinary facility, animal shelter, and welfare organization rescue facility or shelter.
- N. Law Enforcement Dog means a specially trained canine animal accompanying or assisting a public safety or peace officer engaged in law enforcement duties or in the training of said animal.
- O. License means a permit obtained from a government or quasi-government agency which allows a person, business, or organization to perform described acts or maintain described premises.
- P. Livestock means any animals kept by humans that do not customarily inhabit their owner's dwelling. This includes, but is not limited to, equine, bovine, ovine, caprine, and porcine species, and any species of chicken, duck, pigeon, goose, turkey, or other domesticated fowl, but excludes bees.
- Q. Owner means any person who keeps, has charge or custody of, or gives care to an animal for at least thirty consecutive days. Owner does not include veterinarians who are treating or caring for an animal in the regular practice of veterinary medicine, nor owners or operators of an animal grooming business, kennel, or pet shop while engaged in the regular practice of such business.
- R. Pet Shop means any premises where domestic or exotic animals are kept for the purposes of wholesale or retail sale, exchange, or hire to the public.

SEP 5 2006



- S. Pit Bull means any dog that is an American Pit Bull Terrier, American Staffordshire Terrier, Staffordshire Bull Terrier, or any mixed breed of dog which contains, as an element of its breeding, one of these aforementioned breeds and exhibits the physical traits of any such breed(s).

- T. Potentially Dangerous Animal means an animal, except a law enforcement dog, which demonstrates any of the following behavior:
 - 1. Unprovoked terrorizing behavior toward a person who is acting lawfully;
 - 2. An unprovoked attack on a person that requires a defensive action by any person to prevent bodily injury when the person is acting lawfully;
 - 3. An unprovoked attack on any person that results in less than a serious injury when the person is acting lawfully;
 - 4. Any unprovoked behavior that constitutes a physical threat of bodily harm to any person when the person is off the property of the owner or keeper of the animal;
 - 5. An unprovoked attack on an animal or on livestock that results in serious injury when the animal is or livestock are off the property of the owner or keeper of the attacking animal.

- U. Serious Injury means any physical injury to a human or animal that requires sutures or corrective or cosmetic surgery, or results in muscle tears, puncture wounds, disfiguring lacerations, or severe bruising.

- V. Service Animal means a specially trained animal, usually a canine, assigned to a disabled person for the specific purpose of assisting that individual. Service animals include, but are not limited to, guide dogs for the vision or hearing impaired, canine companions, and pet-assisted therapy dogs.


- W. Shelter Supervisor means the supervising officer of the City's or County's animal shelter servicing the City of Lompoc, or his or her designee.

- X. Sterilization means the neutering of a male dog or cat and the spaying of a female dog or cat.

- Y. Terrorizing Behavior is that action exhibited by an animal that, in a vicious or terrifying manner, approaches any person in apparent attitude of attack upon the streets, sidewalks, or any public grounds or places.

- Z. Veterinary Facility means any premises where veterinary medicine, veterinary dentistry, veterinary surgery, and the various branches thereof are practiced.

SEP 5 2006





AA. Welfare Organization means any nonprofit public benefit corporation that is organized for the purpose of improving the lives or welfare of animals."

SECTION 2. Section 0601 of Article 1 of Chapter 6 of the Lompoc City Code is revised to read as follows:

"Section 0601. Animals Running At Large Prohibited; Exception for Dogs on Leash

A. It shall be unlawful for any person owning or having possession, charge, custody, or control of any dog or other animal, to cause, permit, or allow the dog or other animal to run, stray, be uncontrolled, or in any manner be in, upon, or at large upon a public street, sidewalk, park, or other public property, or in or upon the premises or private property of another person; provided however that dogs are permitted upon the streets and other places of the City if on a leash not exceeding six feet in length and under the immediate care and control of the owner or other person having the care, custody, and control of said dog. Any animal not kept under restraint or so confined or enclosed as provided in this Chapter is hereby declared to be a nuisance to public health and safety.

Section 0601.5. Owner of Animal At Large Causing Injury Guilty of Misdemeanor; Information to be Provided After Attack

- A. A person who owns, keeps, or is in charge or control of a dog or other animal, and who permits, allows, or causes the dog or other animal to run, stray, be uncontrolled, or in any manner be in, upon, or at large upon a public street, sidewalk, park, or other public property or in or upon the premises or private property of another person is guilty of a misdemeanor if said dog or other animal bites, attacks, or causes injury to any human being or other animal.
- B. Any person convicted of a misdemeanor under this provision shall not own, possess, control, or be in charge of any animal of the species of the animal which bit, attacked, or injured a person or animal, for a period of three years from the date of conviction and the Animal Control Officer shall not issue or renew any license or permit to the person so convicted for said species of animal.
- C. When any stray dog, whether leashed or unleashed, while on public property within the City or upon the private property of any person, including its owner or keeper, bites, attacks, or injures in any manner a human being or another animal, such dog's owner, keeper, or custodian is required forthwith to provide to the victim or the victim's agent, the name and address of the attacking animal's owner and/or person in charge of its care and keeping. The owner or keeper of the attacking dog shall also provide to the victim or his or her agent licensing, rabies, and vaccination information pertaining to the attacking dog, and sufficient information for the victim to contact the insurance carrier of the person responsible for the attacking dog.

SEP 5 2006

SECTION 3. Section 0614.C of Article 1 of Chapter 6 of the Lompoc City Code is amended to read as follows:

"Section 0614. Dog Defecation: Removal by Owners

C. This Section shall not apply to disabled persons accompanied by a service animal used for their assistance."


SECTION 4. Section 0618 of Division 2 of Article 2 of Chapter 6 of the Lompoc City code is amended to read as follows:

"Section 0618. Licenses – Exceptions

A. The provisions of Section 0617 do not apply to the following:

1. Dogs under the age of four months if kept within a sufficient enclosure;
2. Service dogs;
3. Dogs owned, kept, in the custody of, or controlled by nonresidents of the City who are traveling through or visiting the City for a period of thirty days or less;
4. Dogs brought to the City exclusively for the purpose of entering the same in any dog show or exhibition, and which are actually entered in and kept at such show or exhibition;
5. Dogs under treatment in the custody and control of animal hospitals, or veterinary facilities;
6. Dogs on sale in duly licensed pet shops;
7. Dogs owned, kept, or controlled by any person having a permit to keep and maintain a kennel, and provided that such dogs are kept enclosed within such pet shop or kennel; and
8. Dogs under the ownership, custody, and control of the owner of a kennel duly licensed under the provisions of this Division or his or her duly authorized employee or agent when such dogs are removed from such kennel in the bona fide operation thereof for the purpose of exercise or training, provided that any such dog shall bear an identification tag attached to a collar, harness, or other device, which tag shall be of a size and type designated by the Animal Control Officer, furnished at the sole cost and expense of the owner of such kennel, setting forth the name and address of such kennel. A dog bearing such tag shall be treated in all respects as a licensed dog in the event of its escape and subsequent impoundment."

SEP 5 2006



SECTION 5. Sections 0648 and 0649 of Division 3 of Article 3 of Chapter 6 of the Lompoc City Code are amended to read as follows:

"Section 0648. Redemption of Impounded Animals.

- A. The Animal Control Officer shall keep any animal impounded for at least six business days, not including the day of impoundment, unless such animal is sooner reclaimed by the owner or person entitled to its custody. Sundays and holidays observed by the pound shall not be included in said six days. Redemption shall be made by exhibiting to the Animal Control Officer the license certificate or license tag issued by the Animal Control Officer showing that the license for an impounded dog for the then current year has been paid, and by paying the Animal Control Officer any charges provided for. Upon redemption being made, the Animal Control Officer shall release the animal provided that in all cases any charges provided for keeping such animal shall be paid.
- B. No cat or dog shall be released to any person other than the owner or keeper unless such cat or dog is sterilized or unless the payment for such sterilization has been deposited with the Animal Control Officer and the person to whom the dog or cat is released agrees in writing to cause such dog or cat to be sterilized. Upon notice to the Animal Control Officer that the dog or cat has been sterilized, the deposit shall be forwarded to the licensed veterinarian performing such sterilization.
- C. Except as exempted in Section 0657 of this Chapter, no dog shall be released to its owner or keeper unless such dog is sterilized. The owner or keeper of a dog subject to mandatory sterilization may appeal such determination as set forth in Section 0657.5 of this Code.

Section 0649. Disposition of Unredeemed Animals.

At any time after the expiration of the required period of six business days, the Animal Control Officer may, without further notice and without advertising in any manner, place for adoption, sell, or give away any animal not reclaimed or redeemed as provided in this Article, provided that any dog adopted or given away, which will be kept in Santa Barbara County, shall be licensed. No cat or dog shall be released to any person except upon neutering or spaying under the process provided in Section 0648. Any cat or dog that is impounded pursuant to this Article shall, prior to the killing of that animal for any reason other than irremediable suffering, be released to a welfare organization animal rescue or adoption organization if requested by the organization prior to the scheduled killing of that animal. In addition to any required spay or neuter deposit, the pound or shelter, at its discretion, may assess a fee, not to exceed the standard adoption fee, for animals released. No impounded animal may be transferred to anyone for the intended use of the animal for research or testing."

SEP 5 2006

SECTION 6. Subsection A of Section 0651 of Article 4 of Chapter 6 of the Lompoc City Code is hereby repealed and replaced by Section 0600.

SECTION 7. Sections 0657 and 0657.5 are added to Article 5 of Chapter 6 of the Lompoc City Code, to read as follows:

"Section 0657. Sterilization of Dogs Required: Exemptions.

- A. No person shall own or keep any dog within the City limits that the person knows, or should know, has not been spayed or neutered. This Section does not apply to animals meeting any of the criteria listed below.
1. Dogs under the age of four months if kept within a sufficient enclosure;
 2. Service dogs;
 3. Dogs owned, kept, in the custody of, or controlled by nonresidents of the City who are travelling through or visiting the City for a period of thirty days or less;
 4. Dogs brought to the City exclusively for the purpose of entering the same in any dog show or exhibition, and which are actually entered in and kept at such show or exhibition;
 5. Dogs that are show dogs, evidence of which must be submitted within ten days after request therefor by the Animal Control Officer. Evidence shall include, but is not limited to, proof of registration with the American Kennel Club, United Kingdom Kennel Club, and/or American Dog Breeders Association; or documentation certifying that the dog has been or is being trained for the purpose of show, field trips, or agility trials.
 6. Dogs under treatment in the custody and control of animal hospitals or veterinary facilities;
 7. Dogs on sale in duly licensed pet shops;
 8. Dogs owned, kept, or controlled by any person having a permit to keep and maintain a kennel, provided that such dogs are kept enclosed within such pet shop or kennel and identified as set forth in Section 0618.A.8 during exercise and training;
 9. Law enforcement dogs;

SEP 5 2006

10. Any dog for which a licensed veterinarian has certified in writing that sterilization has a high likelihood of serious physical injury or death to the dog due to the dog's age or medical condition;
11. Any dog whose owner or keeper produces a valid exemption letter for such dog from the City Administrator or his or her designee, as set forth in Section 0657.5 of this Code.

Section 0657.5 Sterilization Exemption Hearing.

- A. Whenever a dog is subject to mandatory sterilization pursuant to this Code the owner or keeper of such animal may request a public hearing to be held before the City's Hearing Officer. This request shall be made to the Hearing Officer within ten days after notice to such owner or keeper that sterilization of such dog is required. The owner or keeper of the dog may appear in person at the hearing or present a sworn written statement showing good cause why said dog should be exempted from mandatory sterilization. Good cause shall be shown by the owner's or keeper's presentation of facts in mitigation of mandatory sterilization.
- B. The Hearing Officer shall consider all facts, testimony, and sworn written statements as to the reason for the requested exemption. The Hearing Officer shall not be limited by technical rules of evidence. Not later than ten calendar days after the conclusion of this hearing, the Hearing Officer shall issue his or her written determination regarding exemption or nonexemption from mandatory sterilization, the reasons therefor, and such other conclusion as he or she deems appropriate under the circumstances, to protect the rights of the owner or keeper of said dog and to carry out the laws relating thereto.
- C. If the owner or keeper of the dog wishes to appeal the Hearing Officer's determination, he or she may, within ten calendar days after the determination, request a hearing before the City Administrator. The hearing shall be held in accordance with Subsections 0657.5 B, and 0657.5.C, above. The decision of the City Administrator shall be final, notwithstanding any other contrary provision of the City Code.
- D. If good cause for exemption from sterilization is not established by the dog's owner or keeper, the dog shall be sterilized as set forth below.
 1. A veterinarian, chosen by the Animal Control Officer, shall spay or neuter the dog. The owner or keeper of the dog shall pay the cost of such sterilization and reclaim the dog from the veterinarian after the sterilization procedure is completed; or
 2. A veterinarian, chosen by the owner or keeper of the dog, shall spay or neuter the dog. The veterinarian must practice within Santa Barbara County. The

SEP 5 2006

animal shelter may release the dog either to the owner or keeper or directly to the veterinarian prior to the sterilization; provided, however, that if the shelter releases the dog to the owner or keeper, he or she must sign an affidavit affirming that he or she will arrange for the dog to be spayed or neutered within five days of the dog's release. Upon completion of the sterilization procedure, the owner or keeper shall provide written documentation to the Animal Control Officer verifying that such procedure occurred. If the Animal Control Officer does not receive such documentation within thirty days after the dog's release, or if the owner or keeper of the dog fails to have the dog spayed or neutered within five days after the dog's release, the Animal Control Officer shall have the authority to impound the dog, and the owner or keeper may be charged with a violation of Section 0657 of this Code."

[OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE]

SECTION 7. Sections 0657 and 0657.5 are added to Article 5 of Chapter 6 of the Lompoc City Code, to read as follows:

"Section 0657. Sterilization of Pit Bull's Required; Exemptions.

- A. No person shall own or keep any pit bull within the City limits that the person knows, or should know, has not been spayed or neutered. This Section does not apply to animals meeting any of the criteria listed below.
1. Dogs under the age of four months if kept within a sufficient enclosure;
 2. Service dogs;
 3. Dogs owned, kept, in the custody of, or controlled by nonresidents of the City who are traveling through or visiting the City for a period of thirty days or less;
 4. Dogs brought to the City exclusively for the purpose of entering the same in any dog show or exhibition, and which are actually entered in and kept at such show or exhibition;
 5. Dogs that are show dogs, evidence of which must be submitted within ten days after request therefor by the Animal Control Officer. Evidence shall include, but is not limited to, proof of registration with the American Kennel Club, United Kingdom Kennel Club, and/or American Dog Breeders Association; or documentation certifying that the dog has been or is being trained for the purpose of show, field trips, or agility trials.
 6. Dogs under treatment in the custody and control of animal hospitals or veterinary facilities;

SEP 5 2006

7. Dogs on sale in duly licensed pet shops;
8. Dogs owned, kept, or controlled by any person having a permit to keep and maintain a kennel, provided that such dogs are kept enclosed within such pet shop or kennel and identified as set forth in Section 0618.A.8 during exercise and training;
9. Law enforcement dogs;
10. Any dog for which a licensed veterinarian has certified in writing that sterilization has a high likelihood of serious physical injury or death to the dog due to the dog's age or medical condition;
11. Any dog whose owner or keeper produces a valid exemption letter for such dog from the City Administrator or his or her designee, as set forth in Section 0657.1 or Section 0657.5 of this Code.

Section 0657.1 Pit Bull Determination Hearing.

- A. When the breed of an unsterilized dog is at issue, the Animal Control Officer shall determine whether such dog is a pit bull.
- B. If the owner or keeper of the dog wishes to appeal the Animal Control Officer's determination that the dog is a pit bull, he or she may, within ten calendar days after the determination, request a hearing before the City's Hearing Officer.
- C. The owner or keeper of the dog may appear in person at the hearing or present a sworn written statement showing good cause why said dog should be exempted from mandatory sterilization, on factual grounds that the animal is not a pit bull.
- D. The Hearing Officer shall consider all facts, testimony, documentary evidence, and sworn written statements as to the reason for the requested exemption. The Hearing Officer shall not be limited by technical rules of evidence. The Hearing Officer may hear all grounds for exemption under Sections 0657.1 and 0657.2 at a single proceeding. Not later than ten calendar days after the conclusion of this hearing, the Hearing Officer shall issue his or her written determination regarding exemption or nonexemption from mandatory sterilization, the reasons therefor, and such other conclusion as he or she deems appropriate under the circumstances, to protect the rights of the owner or keeper of said dog and to carry out the laws relating thereto.
- E. If the owner or keeper of the dog wishes to appeal the Hearing Officer's determination, he or she may, within ten calendar days after the determination, request a hearing before the City Administrator. The hearing shall be held in accordance with Subsections 0657.5.B, and 0657.5.C, above. The decision of

SEP 5 2006

the City Administrator shall be final notwithstanding any other contrary provision of the City Code.

- F. If the dog's owner or keeper has not established good cause for exemption from sterilization on grounds that the dog is not a pit bull, the dog shall be sterilized as set forth below.
1. A veterinarian, chosen by the Animal Control Officer, shall spay or neuter the dog. The owner or keeper of the dog shall pay the cost of such sterilization and reclaim the dog from the veterinarian after the sterilization procedure is completed; or
 2. A veterinarian, chosen by the owner or keeper of the dog shall spay or neuter the dog. The veterinarian must practice within Santa Barbara County. The animal shelter may release the dog either to the owner or keeper or directly to the veterinarian prior to the sterilization; provided, however, that if the shelter releases the dog to the owner or keeper, he or she must sign an affidavit affirming that he or she will arrange for the dog to be spayed or neutered within five days of the dog's release. Upon completion of the sterilization procedure, the owner or keeper shall provide written documentation to the Animal Control Officer verifying that such procedure occurred. If the Animal Control Officer does not receive such documentation within thirty days after the dog's release, or if the owner or keeper of the dog fails to have the dog spayed or neutered within five days after the dog's release, the Animal Control Officer shall have the authority to impound the dog, and the owner or keeper may be charged with a violation of Section 0657 of this Code.

Section 0657.2 Sterilization Exemption Hearing.

- A. Whenever a pit bull is subject to mandatory sterilization pursuant to this Code, the owner or keeper of such animal may request a public hearing to be held before the City Hearing Officer. This request shall be made to the City's Hearing Officer within ten days after notice to such owner or keeper that sterilization of such pit bull is required.
- B. The owner or keeper of the dog may appear in person at the hearing or present a sworn written statement showing good cause why said dog should be exempted from mandatory sterilization.
- C. The Hearing Officer shall consider all facts, testimony, and sworn written statements as to the reason for the requested exemption. The Hearing Officer shall not be limited by technical rules of evidence. The Hearing Officer may hear all grounds for exemption under Sections 0657.1 and 0657.2 at a single proceeding. Not later than ten calendar days after the conclusion of this hearing, the Hearing Officer shall issue his or her written determination regarding

SEP 5 2006

exemption or nonexemption from mandatory sterilization, the reasons therefor, and such other conclusion as he or she deems appropriate under the circumstances, to protect the rights of the owner or keeper of said dog and to carry out the laws relating thereto.

- D. If the owner or keeper of the dog wishes to appeal the Hearing Officer's determination, he or she may, within ten calendar days after the determination, request a hearing before the City Administrator. The hearing shall be held in accordance with Subsections 0657.2.B, and 0657.2.C, above. The decision of the City Administrator shall be final notwithstanding any other contrary provision of the City Code.
- E. If good cause for exemption from sterilization is not established by the dog's owner or keeper, the dog shall be sterilized as set forth in Section 0657.1.E.1 and Section 0657.1.E.2 of this Code."

SECTION 8. Section 0659 is added to Chapter 6 of the Lompoc City Code to read as follows:

"Section 0659. Penalties for Violations.

- A. Unless specified to the contrary in this Chapter, any person violating any provision of this Chapter that is punishable as an infraction is guilty of an infraction which is punishable by:
 - 1. A fine not exceeding one hundred dollars (\$100) for a first offense;
 - 2. A fine not exceeding two hundred dollars (\$200) for a second offense within one year after the first conviction; and
 - 3. A fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500) for each additional violation of this Chapter within one year after the second conviction.
- B. Unless specified to the contrary in this Chapter, any person violating any provisions of this Chapter that is punishable as a misdemeanor is guilty of a misdemeanor, which is punishable by a maximum fine of one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per violation or by incarceration in the County Jail for a maximum of six months or both.

SECTION 9. SEVERABILITY. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance. The City Council hereby declares that it would have adopted the Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase thereof, regardless of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, clauses, or phrases be declared unconstitutional.

SECTION 10. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance is effective on and after the thirty-first day after its adoption.

This Ordinance was introduced on September 5, 2006, and duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Lompoc, at its regular meeting on _____, 2006, by the following electronic vote:

AYES: Councilmember(s):

NOES Councilmember(s):

Dick DeWees, Mayor
City of Lompoc

ATTEST:

Donna N. Terrones, City Clerk
City of Lompoc

RECEIVED
SEP 5 2006

Exhibit D

ANIMAL CONTROL COMMENTS



August 17, 2006

Gary P. Keefe, City Administrator
 City of Lompoc
 PO Box 8001
 Lompoc, CA 93438-8001

AUG 21 2006

Ref: Comments on Proposed Ordinance Change

Dear Gary:

In your letter you request information on implementation, enforcement, consistency with County regulations and potential cost. If implemented, Animal Services would apply the ordinance on the date the City makes it effective. We will educate our staff and provide them a copy of any new ordinance. In regard to enforcement, we would provide the same level of enforcement as is currently provided, unless the City determines that it wants a different service level. The County could provide information on the cost of an additional field officer, if requested.

The following information is provided for your review:

| Category | Lompoc Current Fee (County current fee) | Lompoc Proposed fee | LA Co. new fee |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Sterilized dog | \$17.00 | \$25.00 | \$20.00 |
| Unsterilized dog per exemption | | \$45.00 | \$60.00 (exempt from S/N reqt) |
| Unsterilized dog | \$39.00 | \$80.00 | \$60.00 |

California State law currently mandates that the fee for a dog license for an altered dog "shall not exceed 50 percent of the license fee otherwise imposed." (Government Code 38792) Our reading of your proposed fees does not appear to conform to this requirement. (Adjusting the unsterilized exemption fee to \$50.00 would resolve this) One philosophy, when crafting dog license fees, is to establish a large differential between the fee for altered and unaltered dogs, to provide a strong incentive for spaying and neutering pets. At this time, we are unable to say what recommendation will be for a fee adjustment to the County's license fees, if any.

As Michael Harris, Deputy Director, Public Health, told the city managers at their recent meeting, the department is interested in turning the tide over the continual

growth of unwanted animals in this county. Mr. Harris is directing the Animal Services program staff to convene a workgroup to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and, if desired by the cities, regarding revisions to the County animal ordinance this upcoming fall. The work group may also review the ordinance for other desired adjustments, including a "pooper scooper" provision and sanitation clause, and other areas the group may identify. There has been some interest expressed in substantially raising the penalty for not licensing your dog, as well. The workgroup will include staff, representatives from the partnering cities, volunteers, community members and representatives from the local animal business community. Because of the timing, the City of Lompoc's ordinance change will be ahead of any change the County may make.

In general, it seems the direction we will explore is the potential implementation of mandatory spay and neuter for all dogs, with certain exemptions, as has recently been passed and will be implemented in Los Angeles County September 3, 2006. (A copy of their News Release of April 18, 2006 is included with this letter.) While Los Angeles County did exempt certain dogs from the spay/neuter requirement (registered purebred dogs, service dogs, law enforcement dogs) the fee for the license for these dogs is consistent with the fee for all unaltered dogs. Our goal would be to coordinate with all the cities within the county for as much consistency as possible. The current County ordinance along with the local city ordinances, have dangerous dog enforcement procedures that work well for addressing this problem.

Again, thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on proposed changes to the City's animal control ordinance and serve our community. Please feel free to contact me at 681-5284 if you would like to discuss the ordinance proposal further.

Thank you,



Jan E. Glick
Animal Services Director

Enclosures

25802. Public Pounds

The board may maintain, regulate, and govern public pounds, fix the limits within which animals shall not run at large, and appoint poundkeepers. All expenses of operation and maintenance and the compensation of the poundkeepers shall be paid out of the fines imposed and collected from the owners of impounded animals, or from the general fund of the county, or both.

(Enacted 1947.)

25803. Dog Poisoning or Shooting, Injuries to Sheep

The board may provide for the prevention of injuries to sheep by dogs, and for the destruction and control of predatory animals, and may tax the possessors of dogs and direct the application of the tax. The board may, by ordinance, require veterinarians licensed pursuant to Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 4800) of Division 2 of the Business and Professions Code to report to the county the shooting or poisoning of any dog. Such veterinarian may be required to report the name of the owner of such dog, if known, or the person or persons requesting treatment of such dog. (Enacted 1947, amended 1973.)

36900. City Ordinance May Reduce Misdemeanor to Infraction: Maximum Penalties

(a) Violation of a city ordinance is a misdemeanor unless by ordinance it is made an infraction. The violation of a city ordinance may be prosecuted by city authorities in the name of the people of the State of California, or redressed by civil action.

(b) Every violation determined to be an infraction is punishable by (1) a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars (\$100) for a first violation; (2) a fine not exceeding two hundred dollars (\$200) for a second violation of the same ordinance within one year; (3) a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500) for each additional violation of the same ordinance within one year.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a violation of local building and safety codes determined to be an infraction is punishable by (1) a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars (\$100) for a first violation; (2) a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500) for a second violation of the same ordinance within one year; (3) a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each additional violation of the same ordinance within one year of the first violation. (Enacted 1949, last amended 2003.)

38792. City Authority to License Dogs: Maximums: Half-Price for Spay/Neuter

(a) The legislative body of a city may impose and collect a license fee for a period not to exceed two years and not exceeding the cost of services relating to dogs, including, but not limited to, animal shelters and control and the programs specified in Section 30652 of the Food and Agricultural Code, provided by the city, on every dog owned or harbored within the city limits. The license fee for spayed bitches and neutered males shall not exceed 50 percent of the license fee otherwise imposed.

(b) In addition to the authority provided in subdivision (a), the legislative body of a city may impose and collect a license fee, as described in subdivision (a), for a period not to exceed three years for dogs that have attained the age of 12 months or older and have been vaccinated. The person from whom the license fee is collected pursuant to this subdivision may choose a license period as established by the legislative body of up to one, two, or three years. However, when imposing and collecting a license fee pursuant to this subdivision, the license period shall not extend beyond the remaining period of validity for the current rabies vaccination. The license fee for spayed bitches and neutered males, under this subdivision, shall not exceed 50 percent of the license fee otherwise imposed. (Enacted 1949, last amended 1987.)

NEWS RELEASE

April 18, 2006

Contact: Brenda Sanchez (562) 256-1364
Bob Ballenger (562) 256-1362

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Acting on a unanimous 4-0 vote, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors gave preliminary approval to a new measure that requires all adult dogs kept in unincorporated Los Angeles County to be spayed or neutered and implanted with an identifying microchip.

"This measure, one of the first of its kind in the nation, will have double benefits," said Marcia Mayeda, director of the Los Angeles County Department of Animal Care and Control, which drafted the ordinance.

"Its mandatory spay and neuter provisions, which are required of all dogs over the age of four months, will help reduce the numbers of unwanted animals flooding into our shelters," Mayeda said. "The Found Animal Foundation of Los Angeles has promised to pay for the microchip and lifetime registration for 1,000,000 dogs in Los Angeles County. We are truly grateful for their generous offer of support."

"The microchip provision will provide positive, reliable on-body identification for dogs, speeding their return to owners."

During 2004-05, the County's Department of Animal Care and Control, the largest public animal control agency in the nation, impounded more than 40,000 dogs.

More than 24,000 of those animals were unsterilized, stray dogs, found running at large and raising public safety concerns by their behavior.

=2=

Once housed in County shelters almost 19,000 dogs had to be humanely euthanized because the agency could not find their owners or was unable to place them in new homes.

"Our agency is very much in agreement with the 'No Kill' animal care philosophy that is gaining wider and wider acceptance in the general public," Mayeda said.

"And, at the same time, we understand the practical realities of animal control; our agency has been doing this for almost 70 years. In order to euthanize fewer animals – with the goal of euthanizing no animals – we first have to drastically reduce the number of animals coming into our shelters."

Like all public animal shelters in California, the County shelters have been spaying and neutering all adopted animals prior to placement.

That program has led to dramatic drops in the number of animals coming into the shelter system. But, Mayeda noted, it is not enough.

"Most animals in the community do not come from shelters and most animals are not spayed and neutered," she said. "That means we are constantly receiving a new flow of animals every day at every shelter."

The mandatory spay and neuter ordinance is designed to encompass the non-shelter animal population to reduce the number of animal impounds and the number of animals humanely euthanized at Los Angeles County shelters.

=3=

Tuesday's Board action, which must be ratified by a vote on the enabling ordinance, slated for May 2, does not include all dogs. Dogs used by law enforcement agencies, certified service dogs and purebred dogs registered with recognized breed clubs are exempted under the measure.

"We recognize that organizations such as the American Kennel Club, the United Kennel Club and others have a legitimate reason for keeping animals registered with them intact," Mayeda said.

"And, we are confident that the rules enforced by those groups and the care and concern shown by their members reflect their dedication to animals, so they are worthy of exemption."

The mandatory spay and neuter measure also adjusted the County's annual dog license rates to \$20 for dogs that have been altered and \$60 for dogs that have not been spayed or neutered.

Proceeds from licensing will help pay for low-cost spay-and-neuter operations to encourage compliance. Mayeda noted.

"Our intent is not punitive," the director said, "we want to encourage compliance and everything in the ordinance was crafted with that in mind."

As adopted by the Board, the measure applies only to the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, which includes more than 1 million residents of the entire county.

=4=

"We hope, as this measure proves its success, every city in Los Angeles County, as well as cities outside the county, will adopt local ordinances, based on our model," Mayeda said.

"We think this measure will be a major step toward ending the humane euthanization of animals in shelters and transforming the 'No Kill' goal from dream to reality."

A copy of the new ordinance is posted on the homepage of the Department's website at: <http://animalcontrol.co.la.ca.us>

###



Santa Barbara County Animal Services

Project Team Report

Distributed May, 2006



TABLE of CONTENTS
VOLUME 1: The Report

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Executive Summary | |
| A. Overview | 1 |
| B. Major Recommendations | 1 |
| I. Background | |
| A. Historical Overview and General Description of Animal Control | 3 |
| B. Animal Reproductive Capacity | 4 |
| C. Shelter Size and Euthanasia Rates | 5 |
| D. Hayden and Vincent Bills | 5 |
| E. Best Practices for Animal Control | 6 |
| II. Introduction to the Study | |
| A. Study Scope and Objectives | 8 |
| B. Study Approach | 9 |
| C. Animal Control Organization | 10 |
| D. Personnel | 10 |
| E. Animal Control Service Area | 14 |
| F. Statistics | 14 |
| G. Budget | 15 |
| H. Cost Analysis | 16 |
| I. Mandates and Community Expectations | 17 |
| J. Summary of Survey of Other California Animal Control Entities | 21 |
| III. Administration and Governance | |
| A. Overview of Findings | 25 |
| B. Animal Control System within Santa Barbara County | 25 |
| • County Animal Shelter System | 25 |
| • Highly Unique Model in Santa Barbara County | 26 |
| • Partnerships with the Cities | 26 |
| • Private Animal Welfare Organizations | 27 |
| C. Organizational Structure and Management Practices | 28 |
| • Placement of Animal Control within Santa Barbara County | 28 |
| • Comparison with Other Counties | 28 |
| D. Supervision and Span of Control | 30 |
| E. Salaries and Turnover | 31 |
| F. Policies and Procedures | 32 |
| G. Mission Statement and Objectives | 33 |
| H. Staff Training | 34 |
| I. Use of Information Technology | 35 |
| J. Revenue Collection and Fees | 35 |

| | |
|--|----|
| K. Other Forms of Governance | 36 |
| • Animal Services as its own Department | 37 |
| • Joint Powers Authority | 38 |
| • Privatization | 38 |
| L. Performance Measurement and Accountability | 38 |
| M. Program Funding Sources | 39 |
| N. Moving Animal Services to the General Fund | 40 |
| O. Recommendations to Improve Administration and Governance | 41 |
| IV. Shelter and Field Operations | |
| A. Public Expectations for Animal Shelters | 43 |
| B. Overview of Findings for Shelter Operations | 43 |
| C. Hours of Operation – Shelters | 44 |
| D. Staffing | 45 |
| • Current Staffing Level | 46 |
| • Quantifying Staffing for Animal Care | 47 |
| • Fiscal Impact Estimations | 54 |
| • Quantifying Staffing for Animal Control Field Officers | 56 |
| • Quantifying Lost Time | 60 |
| E. Discussion of Staffing for Shelter and Field Operations | 61 |
| F. Recommendations to Improve Shelter and Field Operations | 61 |
| V. Community and Public Relations | |
| A. Overview of Findings | 62 |
| B. Volunteers and Donations | 62 |
| • ASAP | 62 |
| • BUNS | 62 |
| • K-9 PALS | 63 |
| • CAPA | 63 |
| • BUNS Lompoc | 63 |
| • Volunteer Donation Hours Past Year | 64 |
| C. Animal Care Foundation | 64 |
| • Fur Ball | 65 |
| • A Cause 4 Paws | 65 |
| D. Education Programs | 66 |
| E. Recommendations to Improve Community and Public Relations | 66 |
| VI. Veterinary Clinic Operations | |
| A. Overview of Findings | 67 |
| B. Spay and Neuter Clinic | 67 |
| C. Shelter Medicine Program | 72 |
| D. Treatable Animals | 72 |
| E. Recommendations to Improve Veterinary Operations | 73 |
| VII. Summary of Recommendations | 73 |

Exhibits

| | | |
|--------------|--|----|
| Exhibit I-1 | Public Health Department Organization Chart | 10 |
| Exhibit I-2 | Animal Services Organizational Chart | 13 |
| Exhibit I-3 | Salaries for Funded Positions in the Animal Services Division | 14 |
| Exhibit I-4 | Ten Year Animal Intake and Disposition Statistics | 15 |
| Exhibit I-5 | Euthanized Animals Trend Comparison | 15 |
| Exhibit I-6 | Seven-Year Budget Trend | 16 |
| Exhibit I-7 | Five-Year Cost Per Animal In Santa Barbara County | 17 |
| Exhibit I-8 | Comparison Benchmark Counties | 29 |
| Exhibit I-9 | Salaries Comparison Benchmark Counties | 31 |
| Exhibit I-10 | Santa Barbara County Staff Length of Tenure | 32 |
| Exhibit I-11 | Forms of Governance | 36 |
| Exhibit I-12 | Forms of Governance Ranked by Population Served | 37 |
| Exhibit I-13 | Budgets and Funding Sources for Survey Entities | 40 |
| Exhibit I-14 | Adoption and Kennel Hours of Operation | 44 |
| Exhibit I-15 | Santa Barbara County Animal Dispositions for FY 04-05 | 48 |
| Exhibit I-16 | Kennel Staffing Estimate Santa Barbara Shelter | 50 |
| Exhibit I-17 | Kennel Staffing Estimate Lompoc Shelter | 51 |
| Exhibit I-18 | Kennel Staffing Estimate Santa Maria Shelter | 52 |
| Exhibit I-19 | Kennel Attendant Positions | 54 |
| Exhibit I-20 | Five Year History Santa Barbara County Animal Control Officers Field Activities | 59 |
| Exhibit I-21 | Productive Time vs. Time Away Animal Care Staff and Field Officers | 60 |
| Exhibit I-22 | Animal Services FTEs | 61 |

VOLUME 2: Appendices

- I. Appendix A - Mandates and Expectations
- II. Appendix B – Animal Services Statistics
- III. Appendix C - Financial Comparison of Survey Entities
- IV. Appendix D - Operational Comparison of Survey Entities

Executive Summary

A. Overview

In August of 2004 the Animal Services Project Team was convened to study the funding, organization and governance of Santa Barbara County's Animal Services subdivision of the Public Health Department. The team reviewed mandates and service levels, collected and compared important operational benchmarks from other entities and analyzed this information to determine if the County is utilizing best practices.

Overall, the study results indicate that the Animal Services subdivision's operations follow many current best practices and policies for animal control organizations. In fact, recent operational reviews done on two animal control agencies in California, (Kern County and Sonoma County) make reference to Santa Barbara County's as an example of a well run program. Extensive progress has been made in the last five years in the areas of procedural guidelines, training, the use of information technology, veterinary care, facility upgrades and in lowering the numbers of animals euthanized.

The study concludes that the model of operating three shelters works well in Santa Barbara County and that placement of Animal Services within the Public Health Department is an acceptable fit. The study recommends the program be moved from the Public Health Special Revenue Fund into the General Fund. Additional options of governance, such as privatization, the establishment of a Joint Powers Authority, etc. were discussed, but were not analyzed in this study. The Project Team recommends that governance options could/should be considered further and that the Project Team should be expanded to include other (external) interested stakeholders to fully analyze governance options.

In spite of the extensive participation of volunteers in Santa Barbara County's program, the study indicates a staffing shortage exists. Insufficient staffing in animal care personnel creates a trickle down affecting the entire subdivision. Staffing in the Animal Control and Animal Care sections are analyzed and evaluated in Chapter IV. Additional animal care positions are recommended for the Lompoc and Santa Maria Animal Shelters.

Further study is recommended in the areas of recruitment and retention, classification and salary levels.

B. Major Recommendations

Recommendation 1- Continue to operate three shelters in Santa Barbara County. This model allows for regional services to cities and the unincorporated areas and strong local identification promotes community involvement. *Pages 25-26*

Recommendation 2- Continue the community partnerships with volunteer groups whose missions are to assist Santa Barbara County's abandoned and homeless animals in the animal shelters. *Pages 25-26 and 61-65*

Recommendation 3 – Maintain Animal Services as a program within the Public Health Department. If other forms of governance are considered, solicit the contract cities for their input and evaluate the viability. Pages 27-28

Recommendation 4 – The functions of field and sheltering services are interdependent in Santa Barbara County. Maintain both functions within the program and continue to contract for full services. Pages 29-30

Recommendation 5 – Evaluate the reasons for high turnover, recruitment and retention problems in supervisory positions. Pages 29-30

Recommendation 6 – Perform a comprehensive classification and salary survey to determine whether Santa Barbara County Animal Services salaries are competitive and equitable. Pages 30-31

Recommendation 7- Continue to prioritize training and consistency at all three sites through the Animal Services Academy and other training opportunities. While there is an aggressive program for training, vacant positions continue to impact training goals. Pages 33-34

Recommendation 8- Move the Animal Services program to the General Fund beginning in FY 2006-07. Pages 38-40

Recommendation 9- Continue the business hours at the three shelters as currently scheduled six days per week. City contracts contain these hours and the community is accepting of the hours as currently defined. The current business hours meet the state mandate regarding holding periods for animals. Pages 43-44

Recommendation 10- Perform the analysis to evaluate whether use of additional dedicated part time extra help staff to perform the annual license canvass program would be financially viable. Pages 44-46

Recommendation 11 – Reinstate the Kennel Attendant (1FTE) at the Lompoc shelter to 2002 level and add 1FTE. Pages 46-53

Recommendation 12 – Add a minimum of 2.0 Kennel Attendants at the Santa Maria Animal Center for FY 06-07. Pages 46-53

Recommendation 13 – Implement an in house spay/neuter program utilizing a full time veterinarian and full time veterinary technician. Pages 66-71

Each of these Recommendations is discussed in detail within the body of the Report on the pages noted above.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Historical Overview and General Description of Animal Control

In the United States, efforts to protect and control domestic animals, primarily horses, dogs, and cats, began early in the 19th century.

In April 1866 the New York legislature passed a charter incorporating the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA). Nine days later, the first anti-animal cruelty law was approved by the New York Legislature, and the ASPCA was given the right to enforce the law. The first anti-animal cruelty laws were designed to protect farm and work animals, primarily horses.

On April 18th, 1868, the San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) received its charter from the State of California, becoming the fourth SPCA in the nation, and the first animal welfare organization west of the Rockies. By 1888, 37 of the then 38 states had passed animal cruelty prevention laws and humane societies and animal shelters were opening across the nation.

Although the early efforts focused primarily on horses, the SPCA also protected dogs and cats. In the late 1800s dogs were often used to pull small carts and to turn treadmills. Many of these working dogs roamed the streets and scavenged for their food. According to the SPCA, animal control practices at that time consisted of rounding up several hundred dogs per day from the streets in Manhattan, placing them in a cage, and drowning them in the East River. Dog catchers were paid by the animal, not the hour, thus not particularly concerned with locating the owner of strays. Abuses became so prevalent, that in 1894 the SPCA was placed in charge of New York City's animal control.

Throughout the 1900s dogs and cats became more prevalent as pets. In the 1950s and 1960s canned pet foods and cat litter were introduced, making house pets even more popular. As pet ownership and life expectancy increased, controlling the rate at which animals reproduced became an increasing problem. Spay and neuter, although available was not widely promoted until the mid-1960s. As pet populations increased, the Humane Society changed the focus of their animal shelters towards the adoption of dogs and cats as pets.

Municipal animal control and sheltering has evolved as the overall development of animal cruelty prevention laws and humane societies spread. Originally, municipal animal control activities centered on impounding dogs to protect livestock. In 1937, at the height of a statewide rabies epidemic in California, municipal laws were enacted to prevent the spread of rabies through impoundment, vaccination, and quarantine of biting animals. Originally, little was done to expedite the return of impounded animals to their owners and few resources were expended in adopting impounded animals. Municipal

animal control activities were generally placed under agriculture departments at the county level and under police departments in the cities.

In the middle 1970's concerned citizens and non-profit animal welfare organizations throughout California began to exert influence through the legislative process to change what they perceived to be indifferent or in some instances inhumane treatment of animals at local government-operated shelters. Over the next few decades, the legislature passed several bills that have had a significant impact on the operations of local animal control programs. Among these were:

- The banning of altitude chambers for euthanasia.
- Requiring only one animal at a time be killed in carbon monoxide chambers.
- Requiring that cats be held for 72 hours before they could be euthanized.
- Requiring that animals be spayed or neutered before adoption or a certificate purchased to cover the cost of the sterilization.
- Requiring that Animal Control Officers obtain an 832 P.C. module a. certificate.
- Requiring that Animal Control Officers report instances of child abuse to Child Protective Services.
- Elimination of the use of carbon monoxide as an acceptable method of euthanasia.

In 1999, the Hayden bill was enacted. The Hayden bill states that it is the policy of the State that, "no adoptable animal should be euthanized if it can be adopted into a suitable home." The Hayden bill goes on to mandate minimum holding periods, veterinary care, and other requirements designed to further the policy of placing all adoptable animals. Clearly, the role of municipal animal control and sheltering has changed and will continue to evolve as pet ownership increases and the perception of pets as "family members" grows.

B. Animal Reproductive Capacity

The reproductive capacity of companion animals, especially dogs, cats and rabbits, far exceeds that of humans. The Humane Society of the United States has calculated that one female dog and her progeny can produce more than 67,000 offspring in seven years. One female cat is projected to produce more than 430,000¹ offspring. Rabbits are even more efficient breeders than dogs and cats. While these numbers represent a maximum potential and are not attained as the calculations are based on assumptions that all animals would achieve their maximum potential and live to the maximum life expectancy, they do demonstrate the reproductive potential that is the basis for the pet overpopulation crisis. Pet overpopulation and lack of responsible pet stewardship is one of the major challenges facing animal control agencies.

¹http://www.hsus.org/pets/issues_affecting_our_pets/pet_overpopulation_and_ownership_statistics/hsus_pet_overpopulation_estimates.html

C. Shelter Size and Euthanasia Rates

A shelter must be of a size consistent with the intake numbers of animals and factoring in the redemption, adoption, extended holding and immediate euthanasia of severely sick or injured animals. As municipal animal shelters, Santa Barbara County's three animal shelters are full access public shelters that accept all animals brought to them.

Approximately 45 to 50 percent of the space in a modern shelter is devoted to the housing of dogs. Extending the holding time for adoption of animals has been a trend in animal sheltering over the past decade. In spite of these efforts, there are still more animals than available homes. Extended holding periods have risks associated with them, including increased disease transmission and the need for enrichment and behavioral assessment on an ongoing basis.

The current holding period for shelter animals in the state of California is six days, plus the day of impoundment. This can be reduced to four days if the shelter is open one weekend day or one weekday evening until 7:00pm. Adoption rates will benefit if animals are held beyond the minimum holding period. The euthanasia rate will go down if there is a concerted effort to promote adoption and redemption of pets and to increase the number of animals in the community that are spayed and neutered.

It is a simple fact that shelters are of a finite size. Unless the adoption and redemption rates equal the intake rate of animals entering the shelter, animals will have to be euthanized in order to make room for incoming animals in full access public animal shelters.

D. Hayden and Vincent Bills

In 1998 and 1999 landmark legislation for animal shelters was introduced in California. Senate Bill 1785 (Hayden) and Assembly Bill (1856) modified various California Code sections relating to the holding periods for impounded and owner surrendered animals, the care they are to receive and spay/neuter requirements as follows:

- Stating that it is the policy of the State that "no adoptable animal should be euthanized if it can be adopted into a suitable home."
- Requiring all stray animals be held six business days not counting the day of impoundment.
- Reducing the holding requirement to four business days, not counting the day of impoundment, if the shelter is open until 7:00pm one weekday or the shelter is open one weekend day.
- Requiring that surrendered animals be held for two business days, not counting the day of impoundment. This holding period increased to the same as for strays animals noted above, effective July 1, 2001. The effective date of this provision was modified by Assembly Bill 2754 (House) to become operative July 1, 2002. AB 2754 also modifies the Hayden Bill to allow surrendered puppies and kittens to become available for adoption immediately. AB 2754 also requires that all animals be scanned for microchips.

- Requiring that efforts be made to provide veterinary treatment for ill or injured animals so as to make them suitable for adoption.
- Requiring specific records be kept on all animals impounded, surrendered and/or medically treated.
- Requiring that animals be turned over to non-profit rescue groups prior to the animal being euthanized.
- Requiring that reasonable efforts be made to reunite lost pets with their owners and specifies that owners and finders of pets be provided with specific information.
- Requiring that all animals adopted from public and non-profit shelters be spayed or neutered.
- Providing an exception to this requirement for agencies in counties having populations of less than 100,000.
- Requiring the imposition of fines on redeemed pets that are not spayed or neutered.

E. Best Practices for Animal Control

A number of the national animal organizations publish documents on recommendations for process improvements and best practices in animal control operations. The following list is not intended to be comprehensive, but includes many recent and recurring recommendations.

- A clearly defined mission statement and goals and objectives
- Clearly defined performance standards and goals
- Current, regularly updated Policies and Procedures Manual
- A standardized training program specific to the individual job duties, requirements/ over & above
- Spay and Neuter program and outreach
- Regular staff meetings and communications between all layers of the organization
- A structured volunteer program with policies and guidelines that offers training and meets regularly
- An emphasis on excellent customer service
- Appropriate use of information technology
- Professional and knowledgeable leadership
- Infrastructure that supports necessary administrative functions, such as responding to the press, processing requests for information, responding to surveys, program analysis and report writing, filing of SB 90 claims, answering Grand Jury inquiries
- Well designed and informative website
- Public accessible business hours
- Adequate facilities
- Safety program
- Education program

A review of Santa Barbara County Animal Services indicates that many of these best practices identified above have been incorporated into the County's program, as will be discussed within this report.

II. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

A. Study Scope, Objectives

Project Team Scope

The Animal Services Project Team was created in August of 2004 to analyze issues, recommend strategies and options, and develop regional support and community consensus for the short and long term funding, organization, and governance of Animal Services in Santa Barbara County.

The team reviewed models for Animal Services organizations and practices utilized by comparable California agencies to develop recommendations for best practices and increased efficiency, accountability, customer service and resource utilization within Santa Barbara County.

The recommendations contained within this report will be presented to the Board of Supervisors, interested stakeholders and the public no later than May of 2006.

Participants

The Animal Services Project Team consists of staff from the Public Health Department and the County Executive Office as follows

- Stacy Covarrubias, Senior Cost Analyst
- Suzanne Jacobson, Chief Financial Officer
- Michael Harris, Deputy Director
- Jan Glick, Animal Services Director
- Paula Beeman, Animal Services Program Analyst, and
- Lori Norton, County Executive Office, Principal Analyst

County Counsel and Auditor Controller staff served as consultants and responded to specific requests for information from the Project Team.

The Project Team forwarded recommendations to the Executive Team which consists of:

- Michael F. Brown, County Executive Officer,
- Elliot Schulman, MD, MPH, Public Health Director,
- Jim Laponis, Deputy County Executive Officer
- Ken Masuda, Assistant County Executive Officer

Areas of Analysis and Objectives

For each of the major areas identified for analysis, the Project Team developed objectives and recommended actions to be presented to the Executive Team. Recommended actions seek to balance fiscal resources, quality operations, and community service values. The following areas were identified for analysis:

- Mandates and Service Levels - Identify State, Federal, Local Mandates and Community Expectations as they pertain to Animal Services operations, programs, and service levels. Quantify the cost of providing these various service levels.
- Legal Issues – Identify any legal risk arising from the inclusion of Animal Services in the Public Health Special Revenue Fund. Identify and evaluate alternative to minimize any identified risks.
- Financial – Identify and quantify Animal Services expenditures and revenues by program and service and related to mandated and non-mandated services. Identify programs and services which are not self-supporting. Identify alternative service delivery options and service levels.
- Governance – Analyze governance and management options for Animal Services.

B. Study Approach

To address the study objectives described above, the Project Team outlined an approach that would facilitate the effective gathering of the necessary information. This process included:

- Meeting with the County's assigned Project Team to initiate the study.
- Meeting with members of the Executive Project Team to affirm approach and objectives.
- Interviewing selected County officials and employees of the Division to gain their perspective on the functions and operations of the Division, to identify issues, and validate finding and recommendations.
- Observing field and shelter operations and reviewing available documents and records.
- Reviewing the Animal Services Program activities in the context of other departmental functions to determine if opportunities exist to enhance organizational performance through the transition of the some or all of Animal Services functions to another County Department, or to reorganize functions internally.
- Performing benchmark comparisons with other entities, and best practices nationally.
- Presenting findings to the Executive Project Team and to the Board of Supervisors.

Throughout this process, the Project Team sought to validate the data, findings and recommendations with multiple sources in order to increase the accuracy of the information contained within this report.

C. Animal Control Organization

Animal Services is a program within the Public Health Department. It is part of the Community Health Division as illustrated below in Exhibit I-1:

Exhibit I-1
Public Health Department Organization Chart



D. Personnel

The Animal Services program is divided into two primary functional areas—Administration, and Field and Shelter Operations.

Administration

The Administration unit, which consists of the Animal Services Director, a Departmental Analyst, and a Senior Accounting Assistant, is responsible for the overall direction and management of the Animal Service program, policy and procedure development, cash handling, record keeping, purchasing, contract management, and training.

As a program within the Public Health Department, Animal Services also receives administrative, information technology, fiscal and human resources support from Public Health. Animal Services receives support in the areas of risk management, legal assistance, human resources, etc. which are provided by the appropriate County Department.

The Administrative unit also oversees the Volunteer and Community Outreach activities and Veterinary care.

Volunteer and Community Relations

Volunteer and Community Relations activities are coordinated by one paid staff position, the Coordinator of Community Outreach. The role of this position is liaison between the staff and volunteers and the community at large. Animal Services utilizes an estimated 350 volunteers at the three shelter locations and for various offsite activities. This is a ratio of almost 15:1 volunteers to paid staff. The department has enjoyed innumerable benefits from this extensive community involvement. It has improved the level of care for shelter animals and greatly enhanced the companion animal adoption program.

Volunteers assist with animal care, enrichment and training, perform behavioral and adoptability evaluations, provide grooming, subsidize or assist veterinary treatment or procedures, provide adoption counseling, foster animals and contribute capital projects, to name just a few of the benefits. The Coordinator of Community Outreach assists with special events and promotions throughout the County. Recruitment, training and retention of volunteers and supporting good communication between staff and volunteers are additional duties of the coordinator.

Veterinary Clinic

Historically, Santa Barbara County has outsourced all veterinary services for the approximately 10,000 animals handled annually in its three animal shelters. These services include medical care, examinations and vaccines for impounded animals and spaying and neutering for all adopted animals. Outsourcing of all veterinary services is inefficient and may result in a less than optimal standard of care. The ability to provide in-house veterinary services was accomplished when the new Santa Maria Animal Center opened its doors in June of 2005. The new facility contains a spay and neuter clinic which will provide for the mandated surgeries for adopted animals.

Beginning in FY 2005-06, Animal Services began to transition to in-house spaying and neutering of adopted animals. The staffing of the veterinary clinic includes a contract Veterinarian and a registered veterinary technician. Volunteers and other shelter staff assist in the spay and neuter clinic. Currently, the veterinarian is an independent contractor working four days a week. The subdivision is working toward a goal of performing all spays and neuters in-house in FY 06-07.

Shelter and Field Operations

Shelter and Field Operations is one functional area which is staffed by personnel that are cross-trained and frequently work interchangeably. Although the Shelters are not open to the public 7 days a week, the care of animals in the shelter is a 7 day a week responsibility and the public protection component of the program requires readiness for a 24 hours a day response.

Management of the Shelter and Field Operations consists of three Supervising Animal Control Officers, one based at each of the County's three shelter sites. Each of the shelters also has two customer care staff, usually classified as Office Assistants. Currently there are two animal care staff (Animal Shelter Attendants) assigned to the Santa Barbara and Santa Maria Shelters and one assigned to the Lompoc Shelter. Since

the elimination of a position in 2001, animal care duties in the Lompoc shelter have been performed by Animal Control Officers or by an extra help Animal Shelter Attendant (since November of 2002).

The position of Animal Control Officer is a flexible classification, which in addition to field and patrol work has typical job duties including animal care responsibilities. Officers are often assigned to assist in the shelters for animal care and/or customer care duties when absences occur. The use of Officers in customer care or animal care roles limits their availability to respond to requests for field activities or to patrol.

The Shelter Operations staff members are responsible for customer service, both in person and over the telephone, input of data, processing of animal adoptions and redemptions, license sales, input of officer activities, dispatching and tracking officer field activities, and providing for the humane care of animals impounded at the shelter, evaluations of adoptability and disposition of animals. Animal Shelter Attendants and Animal Control Officers are certified euthanasia technicians and euthanize animals when necessary.

The Field Operations staff consists of the three Supervising Animal Control Officers and nine Animal Control Officers. Field staff personnel are responsible for enforcing the animal control laws. Officers patrol for and impound stray animals, investigate nuisance and cruelty complaints, quarantine animals, canvass for dog licenses, and respond to citizen requests for services related to a variety of animal issues including injured animals, wild animal assistance, dog noise, livestock complaints and sanitation concerns. As stated earlier, Animal Control Officers may also be assigned to assist in the kennels with animal care or customer care at the shelter.

The following Exhibit (1-2) graphically depicts the organization of the Animal Services program. Exhibit I-3 lists the funded positions in Animal Services and their respective salary ranges. Animal Services has historically had a vacancy rate of approximately 20% to 25%.

Exhibit I-2 Animal Services Organizational Chart

Santa Barbara County Animal Services
Organizational Chart




Exhibit I-3
Budgeted Positions in the Animal Services Program FY 05-06

| Position | Staffing | Monthly Salary Range |
|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Animal Services Director | 1.0 FTE | \$5,799 - \$7,080 |
| Supervising Animal Control Officer | 3.0 FTE | \$3,371 - \$4,115 |
| Animal Control Officer I/II | 9.0 FTE | \$2,162 - \$3,223 |
| Animal Shelter Attendant | 4.0 FTE | \$1,996 - \$2,437 |
| Office Assistant II | 5.0 FTE | \$2,078 - \$2,537 |
| Accounting Assistant II | 1.0 FTE | \$2,184 - \$2,666 |
| Accounting Assistant Senior | 1.0 FTE | \$2,449 - \$2,990 |
| Departmental Analyst, Program | 1.0 FTE | \$3,895 - \$4,755 |
| Community Outreach Coordinator | 1.0 FTE | \$3,387 - \$4,135 |
| Registered Veterinary Technician | 0.75 FTE | \$3,066 - \$3,743 |
| Total Positions Budgeted | 26.75 FTE | |

E. Animal Control Service Area

Animal Services serves the unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County, which includes the communities of Santa Ynez, Los Olivos, Ballard, Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, Casmalia, Orcutt, Sisquoc, and Cuyama.

In addition, the cities of Buellton, Goleta, Guadalupe, Lompoc, Santa Maria, and Solvang contract with Animal Services for full animal control services. The cities of Santa Barbara and Carpinteria provide their own field services but contract with Animal Services for animal sheltering. Agreements are also in place for provision of animal control services to the Chumash Indian Reservation and Vandenberg Air Force Base. Animal Services is responsible for the efficient and effective operation of various important countywide programs, including:

- Rabies control
- Animal abuse and cruelty investigations
- Animal Licensing and Animal Business permits
- Spay and Neuter program
- Stray and abandoned animal impoundment
- Shelter system management
- Animal adoption program
- Animal bite investigations
- Public Education and Outreach
- Volunteer program
- Dog noise ordinance enforcement
- Deceased animal pick up and disposal

F. Statistics

Over the past ten years in Santa Barbara County the population has grown from 381,000 to 410,300, which represents a 7.7% increase. During this same period of time, the level of animal impounds has actually decreased from 10,829 (1994-95) to 9,218 (2004-05) or

approximately 15% reduction. The euthanasia rate has also decreased from 4,162 animals euthanized in 1994 to 2,085 euthanized animals in 2004, which represents almost 50% decrease. In 2003, Animal Services established a goal to become a no kill shelter for adoptable and treatable animals by the year 2010.

**Exhibit I-4
Ten Year Animal Intake and Disposition Statistics**

| | 1994-95 | | 2004-05 | |
|-------------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|
| Impounded | 10,829 | % of Total | 9,218 | % of Total |
| Redeemed | 2,082 | 19% | 2,009 | 22% |
| Adopted | 4,216 | 39% | 4,124 | 45% |
| Euthanized | 4,162 | 38% | 2,085 | 23% |

(Numbers do not tab to 100% due to dispositions of died, missing, and relocated animals)

As demonstrated in the statistics in Exhibit I-4, Santa Barbara County has made steady progress in reducing the number of animals euthanized. The County shelter system operates as an open admission shelter system, which means that the shelters accept all animals that are brought to them. Municipal animal shelters are mandated to take all strays and Santa Barbara County's stray animal shelters also accept owner turn in animals when these are not accepted by the private humane societies due to space limitations or other reasons. The accomplishment of the drastic lowering of the numbers of animals being euthanized in the County shelters is a commendable achievement that the staff and volunteers are very proud of.

**Exhibit I-5
Euthanized Animals Trend Comparison**

| Agency | 1994 | 1999 | 2004 | 10 Yr Change |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|
| Contra Costa | 10,420 | 9,743 | 5,802 | 44.3% reduction |
| Ventura | 8,546 | 9,163 | 4,797 | 43.9% reduction |
| Kern | 21,020 | 19,129 | 13,696 | 34.8% reduction |
| Santa Barbara | 4,162 | 2,814 | 2,085 | 50.0% reduction |

As demonstrated in the statistics in Exhibit I-5, Santa Barbara County leads the ten year trend of a substantial reduction in the numbers of animals euthanized among selected counties. While data was only readily available from these selected counties, these figures mirror a statewide trend typical of California shelters.

G. Budget

Santa Barbara County Animal Services program is funded through a combination of:

- 1) Fees for services to consumers;
- 2) Fees for contracted services to cities and other entities;
- 3) County General Fund; and,
- 4) Donations.

The following Exhibit I-6 shows the Animal Services subdivision approved budget, revenues, and General Fund contribution for a seven-year period:

**Exhibit I-6
Seven-Year Budget Trend**

| Animal Services | FY99-00 | FY00-01 | FY01-02 | FY02-03 | FY03-04 | FY04-05 | FY 05-06 |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenses | \$1,929,355 | 2,135,850 | 2,619,525 | 2,724,498 | 2,579,809 | 2,730,370 | 2,954,786 |
| Revenues | \$710,027 | 743,055 | 759,058 | 1,177,076 | 1,262,045 | 1,461,560 | 1,627,689 |
| Revenue % | 37% | 35% | 29% | 43% | 49% | 56% | 65% |
| Re-directed PHD General Fund | \$436,244 | 597,111 | 1,026,959 | 713,915 | 468,116 | 290,256 | -1,393 |
| Re-directed PHD GF % | 23% | 28% | 39% | 26% | 18% | 11% | 0% |
| General Fund | 783,084 | 795,684 | 833,508 | 833,508 | 849,648 | 914,640 | 1,022,565 |
| GF % | 41% | 37% | 32% | 31% | 33% | 33% | 35% |

(* Does not include Mustang one-time costs and General Fund contingency transfers of \$79,795 and \$83,393)

Exhibit I-6 Highlights

In the past seven years:

- Expenditures have increased by 53% (an average of \$170,900 annually)
- Revenues have increased by 172% (an average of \$203,900 annually)
 - Partnering cities financial support has increased from 16% to 32% of total cost
- General Fund Contribution has increased by 31% (an average of \$39,900 annually)
 - County General Fund support has decreased from 41% to 35% of total cost

The Animal Services subdivision of the Public Health Department has made excellent progress on cost recovery. The subdivision has an ongoing goal of making Animal Services as self-sustaining as possible.

The Public Health Department is precluded from and does not use special revenue funds for Animal Services. The funds that it has contributed over the years have been from its own General Fund contribution, which it has taken from other mandates to cover cost increases in Animal Services.

H. Cost Analysis

In FY 1999-00, revenues from consumer fees, contract services and other revenues (such as donations and other sources of funds) made up 37% of total revenues, with the General Fund making up the balance. In FY 2005-06, consumer fees, contract revenues, and SB90 payments will comprise 65% of the Animal Services budget. Thus, supplemental funding required to support the subdivision has decreased by 28%.

Exhibit I-7 below indicates the Cost per Animal during the past 5-year period has ranged from a low of \$201 to a high of \$298.

Exhibit 1-7
Five-Year Cost Per Animal In Santa Barbara County

| | FY 00-01 | FY 01-02 | FY 02-03 | FY 03-04 | FY 04-05 |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Total Expenditures | 2,135,850 | 2,619,525 | 2,724,498 | 2,579,809 | 2,730,370 |
| Total Impounds | 10,619 | 9,971 | 8,937 | 8,658 | 9,218 |
| Cost per Animal | \$201 | \$263 | \$305 | \$298 | \$296 |

I. Mandates and Community Expectations

Animal Services performs a number of mandated functions. In addition to these statutory requirements, the program has high visibility and continues to respond to the expanded expectations of the community, which are generally shared by the volunteers and staff. The first document developed by the Project Team was the table of Mandates and Expectations (Appendix A). This chart delineates the major functions currently performed by Animal Services- broken out by mandated duties (where applicable), the department's service level goal, community expectations and reference to the code section (for legal mandates). The State of California has a stated policy promoting adoption of shelter animals and a goal of reducing euthanasia. The County of Santa Barbara has made steady progress over the last five years toward a No Kill policy for adoptable and treatable animals in its three County-operated animal shelters (Appendix B, Animal Services Statistics). The County is mandated to provide programs to control rabies, control strays (animal impound services and animal shelter), to control animal population growth by spaying or neutering adopted animals prior to placement in a new home and to provide treatment to sick and injured impounded animals.

Discussion of Mandates

Rabies Control – Health & Safety Code Sections 120130 through 121705 defines the mandate that the local Health Officer is responsible for the administration and enforcement of Section 1920 of the California Health and Safety Code in officially declared rabies areas. The mandate includes responsibilities to quarantine rabies suspect animals or destroy the animal(s) at the discretion of the Health Officer, to distribute anti-rabies virus, to investigate reports of rabies (bite investigations), to enforce dog licensing and rabies vaccination requirements and to provide dog vaccination clinics.

Programs such as animal licensing and low cost rabies clinics help meet the rabies control mandate. In order to control rabies, the County performs approximately 700 bite investigations annually, quarantines animals involved in bites, processes brain specimens for rabies analysis and investigates reports of vicious or dangerous animals. When staffing permits, Animal Control Officers perform periodic license canvassing programs throughout the County to encourage compliance with the dog licensing mandate and to educate the public about rabies. Dog licenses are sold at all three animal shelters and by many of the veterinarians throughout the County. Low fee rabies clinics are offered regionally on an annual basis. Rabies vaccination clinics are currently available weekly at the new Santa Maria Animal Center.

Animal bites are responded to as priority investigations. These cases are often time-consuming if the identity of the biting animal is not clear. A protocol exists whereby the Public Health Communicable Disease staff is notified within a specific timeframe, for follow-up with the victim if the investigation does not result in quarantine of the biting animal. Santa Barbara County is a rabies endemic county. This means that the rabies virus is present in wild animal species (most commonly bats and skunks) and poses a threat to humans and domestic animals. Indeed, Santa Barbara County periodically experiences a rabies outbreak in the skunk population in the northern portion of the county. These outbreaks result in increased surveillance by the subdivision, processing of a larger number of rabies specimens, expanded outreach to the public to educate them on the risks of rabies and a higher number of quarantines. Animal Control personnel are vaccinated for rabies prophylaxis, due to the risk of handling rabid animals.

Stray Animal Shelter – Health & Safety Code Section 121690 (e) “It shall be the duty of the governing body of each city, city and county, or county to maintain or provide for the maintenance of a pound system and a rabies control program for the purpose of carrying out and enforcing this section.” This mandate requires that a location be provided for impoundment of strays.

Santa Barbara County operates three animal shelters and provides regional services at each site. The Santa Barbara Shelter serves the southern portion of the County including the cities of Santa Barbara, Goleta and Carpinteria as well as the unincorporated portion of the County from the Cachuma gate, the Gaviota tunnel and to the southern boundary at the Ventura County line. The Lompoc Shelter serves the central portion of the County including the cities of Lompoc, Buellton and Solvang, the Santa Ynez and Lompoc Valleys and unincorporated areas including Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, Ballard, Los Olivos, Santa Ynez, Cachuma Lake, the Chumash Reservation and the Vandenberg Air Force Base. The Santa Maria Animal Center provides services to Santa Maria, Orcutt, Guadalupe, Sisquoc, Casmalia, Cuyama, Los Alamos and unincorporated areas to the San Luis Obispo County line.

The animal shelters meet the mandate of providing a method to impound strays. Although this mandate could be met with only one animal shelter within the county, Santa Barbara County has chosen to provide three locations to serve the citizens by region. The Santa Barbara Shelter has enjoyed a very active community volunteer component for over fifteen years. Volunteers work in the cat shelter, dog area and rabbit center on a daily basis providing animal care, adoption counseling, veterinary treatment, lost and found services and much more. As a result of this support the shelter has achieved a 100% adoption rate for adoptable and treatable animals for over twelve years.

Over the years the concept of combining the Lompoc and Santa Maria Shelters has been explored in a number of ways. Property was purchased on Hwy 135 and Graciosa Road with the intent of building a new shelter to serve both areas. This concept was met with opposition from the community and the County dismissed the plan.

Recently the Board of Supervisors appointed Blue Ribbon Task Force also asked the Public Health Department to report on how much would be saved by combining the Lompoc and Santa Maria shelters. A cursory review revealed that less than \$50,000

would be saved. This is because the costs saved are further reduced by the revenue opportunities that are lost. In addition this would result in higher euthanasia rates due to decreased space to shelter animals.

In Fiscal Year 2003-2004, the Public Health Department attempted to reduce the hours at the Lompoc Shelter to that of a 'holding' facility as opposed to a full service shelter. An Animal Control Officer position was eliminated and it was proposed to eliminate a customer care position at the shelter. The result was a packed Lompoc City Council meeting, which resulted in some Council members speaking at the next Board of Supervisors meeting. The County elected to continue full operations at the Lompoc Animal Shelter and the concept of reducing hours (or eliminating the Lompoc shelter) was not discussed any further. The customer care position at the shelter was not eliminated, but the Animal Control Officer position was not reinstated. Animal care at the Lompoc Shelter has been performed by an extra help Animal Shelter Attendant since November of 2002. There have been a number of other examples of the strong community identification with the County's three regional animal shelters and these facilities provide valuable local resources and services to each region served.

In 2002, the Public Health Department made a commitment to replace the Santa Maria Shelter. The planning process began and funding sources were identified. The new shelter was planned to be situated on the County complex on Foster Road and the Graciosa Road property was sold. The new shelter capacity was designed to serve the Santa Maria service area and did not include absorption of the capacity of the Lompoc shelter.

The new Santa Maria Animal Center opened its doors in June of 2005. The facility replaces the previous shelter on Orcutt Road which was run-down and did not have adequate capacity to meet the needs of the growing community surrounding Santa Maria. The previous shelter had been the subject of wide criticism and Grand Jury investigations. The Santa Maria Animal Center project had been in the County's capital plan for over ten years. The new Center is the largest of the County's animal shelters and includes expanded capacity for animal holding, isolation facilities, an adoption center, designated space for volunteer services, an education center and a spay and neuter clinic.

Spay and Neuter of Adopted Animals – Food and Agricultural Code 30503 (dogs) "... no public animal control agency or shelter, society for the prevention of cruelty to animals shelter, humane society shelter, or rescue group shall sell or give away to a new owner any dog that has not been spayed or neutered." and 31751.5 (cats) "...no public animal control agency or shelter, society for the prevention of cruelty to animals shelter, humane society shelter, or rescue group shall sell or give away to a new owner any cat that has not been spayed or neutered." These code sections require that dogs and cats adopted from shelters be spayed or neutered.

Santa Barbara County's local ordinance requiring spaying and neutering of adopted dogs and cats preceded California's mandate. This requirement was previously met by outsourcing veterinary services to veterinarians throughout the county. With the opening of the new Santa Maria Animal Center, the County is making the transition to provide spaying and neutering of adopted animals in house. This allows animals to go into new

homes more quickly and provides a more efficient process for the required surgeries. It is also expected to result in cost savings for the program.

Treatment of Sick and Injured Animals - Penal Code 597f (b) "It shall be the duty of all officers of pounds or humane societies and animal regulation departments of public agencies to convey, and for police and sheriff departments, to cause to be conveyed all injured cats and dogs found without their owners in a public place directly to a veterinarian known by the officer or agency to be a veterinarian that ordinarily treats dogs and cats for a determination of whether the animal shall be immediately and humanely euthanized or shall be hospitalized under proper care and given emergency treatment." Penal Code 597.1 provides guidelines for the seizure of sick, injured, neglected, or abandoned animals and requires they receive care and treatment until the animal is deemed to be in suitable condition.

State law requires shelters to provide medical treatment to sick or injured animals received in animal shelters. In 2002, the County implemented the position of Registered Veterinary Technician to oversee treatment of animals in the shelters and in anticipation of having a clinic within the new Santa Maria Animal Center. In house treatment has improved over the past few years. In addition the new Center has isolation facilities and a hospital area to care for sick and injured animals. The addition of a veterinarian will offer additional opportunities to ensure the mandates for treatment and spay and neuter are met.

Mandates and Expectations

As noted previously, Appendix A is the summary of approximately 40 representative functions performed by the Animal Services division. It includes a column to indicate the level to which the function is mandated, the Department's service goal, the community's perception or expectation and the legal reference (where applicable).

In many instances, Santa Barbara County exceeds minimum mandates at the discretion of the department or through its active volunteer program and community participation. Examples of this are seen in the high standard of care provided to the animals in the shelters and in the quality of the pet adoption program. Volunteers contribute thousands of hours each year to ensure that shelter animals are well cared for, receive proper medical care, provide training and stimulation, and are placed into appropriate homes. The volunteer organizations working within the three shelters have provided capital upgrades to the facilities and frequently pay for veterinary medical care that is beyond the scope of the County's mandate.

Discussion of Community Expectations

In general, community expectations of animal control organizations nationally, and especially in California, have dramatically increased over the past fifteen to twenty years. Communities expect animals in shelters to receive a reasonable standard of care and to see a reduction in the killing of companion animals.

In Santa Barbara County, based on the extensive community response in volunteerism and activism, these expectations exceed those of many other California communities. Over the past twenty years in Santa Barbara County, volunteer groups have made

substantial capital improvements to the facilities at all three animal shelter sites. These volunteer groups have also been responsible for ensuring extensive medical treatment for many impounded animals. Through their organizations and training, the volunteers have assisted in providing excellent care and enriched environments, expanded medical procedures, adoption counseling, special diets and extensive outreach to the community.

The public expects animal control organizations will be service oriented with a rapid and responsive field staff, informed and helpful customer care representatives and a high standard of care for sheltered animals. The public expectation also encompasses that dangerous animals will not be placed up for adoption. Many members of the public would like to be assured that Santa Barbara County accepts all animals and that no adoptable or treatable animals are euthanized in the County's shelters.

In addition, the public frequently expects assistance with wildlife issues, advice on a broad variety of animal matters, resolution of complex investigations, including animal neglect and animal noise complaints, and intervention and prosecution of animal cruelty.

J. Summary of Survey of Other California Animal Control Entities

A comprehensive comparison survey of 13 agencies was compiled, including

- Population served and square mileage patrolled
- Staffing, hours of operation, and volunteer opportunities
- Agency placement
- Number of shelters and hours of operations
- Cities contracted with and methodology
- Budgets, consumer fees, and general fund contribution

The compilation of the survey results is attached as Appendix C (Financial Comparison) and Appendix D (Operational Comparison).

Overview of Survey Responses

1. Responding Entities: Response was quite positive with 87% of those contacted responding. Of the fifteen entities originally identified, one was determined not be a comparable program (Tulare County provides field services only, does not operate a shelter) and one did not respond to phone calls and email (San Joaquin)
2. Services Provided: Twelve of the thirteen entities surveyed provide field and shelter services, one provides sheltering only
3. Fee Methodology for other entities: Six entities utilized some method of per capita calculation to determine the fees charged to other entities. Of the six entities utilizing this methodology, Santa Barbara's County's per capita fee is midway at \$5.56. Santa Cruz County Animal Services (a newly formed JPA, formed when the SPCA stopped providing the service) reported their per capita fee is \$9.61. The lowest per capita fee reported is charged by Contra Costa County at \$2.46 who is just ending 20-year contracts with all of their cities.

Many of the entities contacted are moving to a per capita methodology; those who charge a fee for service appear to rely on a larger General Fund contribution.

4. **Percent of General Fund Revenue:** The percentage of General Fund in the total budget varied from 16.4% in San Diego County to 93.3% in the City/County of San Francisco.
5. **SB 90 Funding:** Only three of the 13 submitted SB 90 claims to recoup state funds for unfunded state mandates. Santa Barbara County received the largest amount of SB 90 funds. Santa Barbara County anticipates continued success with SB 90 claims; however, claims will be lower because more jurisdictions will participate.
6. **Agency Affiliation:** Two of the survey entities are housed within the Sheriff's Department. Two are subdivisions of the Health Department. Two are Joint Powers Authorities. One is within General Services and one is under the Ag Commissioner. The remaining five survey entities are independent departments.
7. **A87 Cost Allocation:** Four of the 13 entities surveyed report being charged A87 costs (County-wide cost allocation), including Santa Barbara County. In 2006-07 Animal Services will go into the General Fund.
8. **172 Safety Funds:** None of the entities report receiving Proposition 172 funds.
9. **Consumer Fees:** Of the five entities with a similar population of 400k-500k, Santa Barbara had the greatest percentage of consumer fees to total budget.

| | |
|------------------|-------|
| a. Santa Barbara | 22.8% |
| b. Monterey | 22.5% |
| c. Sonoma | 20.8% |
| d. Stanislaus | 20.8% |
| d. Solano | 13.8% |

The city of Berkeley and San Francisco (city and county) have the smallest percent of consumer fees to total budget, at 5.0% and 6.7% respectively.

10. **Donations:** Only five entities reported receiving donations directly to the Animal Services program. Santa Barbara has progressively increased donations to the shelters over the past three years. Santa Barbara County receives generous support from the internal volunteer groups working at each animal shelter and contributing their time and services, along with supplies, providing medical assistance and capital projects at all three animal shelters. Some of the other organizations report assistance through charitable 501 (c) 3 organizations.
11. **License Canvass Program:** Santa Barbara, Stanislaus and Southeast Area Animal Control Authority (SEACA) are the only entities to have dog license canvassing programs. Santa Barbara uses regular field officers to accomplish the canvass

program. Both Stanislaus and SEAACA have larger staff and utilize dedicated canvassing staff.

Financial Comparison Survey Data (Appendix C)

In general, the survey revealed the highly diverse ways that cities and counties have developed to provide animal control services. This makes any comparison a challenge and not necessarily "apples to apples". The program can be housed within a variety of departments, exist as its own department, be contracted privately or provided through a partnership model, such as a joint powers authority.

1. Sources of Funds

Funding sources also vary. Most agencies are funded through a combination of consumer fees, contract fees for services provided, and General Fund dollars. In most entities in this survey, donations and claims for unfunded mandates, such as the SB 90 claim monies, were not major sources of revenue. In analyzing the results of this survey, it is not uncommon that cities paying for contracted services are not charged for full reimbursement.

2. Percentage of General Fund

General Fund is a component of the budget for all entities surveyed. The percentage of the budget that it comprises is highly variable. The entities using a per capita methodology for fee calculations tended to have a lower % of General Fund. Entities using a fee for service methodology tended to have a higher General Fund contribution.

3. Ratio of Budget to Population Served

A comparison of the ratio of the Animal Control budgeted dollars to the population served also proved highly variable. The County serving the largest population, San Diego County, had the lowest ratio, at \$3.78. City of Berkeley, who serves the smallest population surveyed, had the highest ratio at \$12.46. The other entities fell in between, but not necessarily correlated to the size of population served. Santa Barbara County's ratio was \$7.21.

Operations Comparison (Appendix D)

The review of operations included number of shelters, plans to build or expand, hours of operation, number of staff, license canvass program, veterinary program, community partnerships and volunteer program.

1. Number of Shelters

Of the 13 entities, only two, Santa Barbara and San Diego counties, operate three shelters. San Diego County is the largest square mileage (4,281) of the survey entities. Three other counties operate two animal shelters and the remaining eight entities have one animal shelter. Ten of the thirteen plan to or have recently built a new shelter or expanded existing shelters.

2. **Business Days and Hours**
Nine of the thirteen are open 6 or 7 days a week (Santa Barbara County shelters are open 6 days a week). Business hours at the various facilities are variable. Seven facilities are open until 7 pm at least one night a week.
3. **Veterinary Services**
Nine of the entities have in house veterinary services and ten employ registered veterinary technicians.
4. **Volunteer Program**
All of the agencies utilize volunteers and ten of the thirteen have a Volunteer Coordinator to oversee volunteer services.
5. **Staffing**
Staffing numbers for the entities surveyed ranged from a low of 9 (Santa Cruz Animal Services Authority, newly formed JPA) to a high of 119 (San Diego County). As mentioned above, all entities report utilizing volunteers. In addition, three agencies use honor farm laborers or inmates as an additional resource for their programs.

For fiscal year 05-06, Santa Barbara County Animal Services has a total of 26.75 FTE budgeted staff positions. Most of the entities surveyed had a similar organization chart to that of Santa Barbara County, including a director or general manager, administrative support, shelter supervisors and animal care staff, field supervisor and animal control officers, dispatchers, customer care staff, veterinary staff and volunteer coordinator. Two agencies reported having dedicated license canvassing staff. Another position sometimes included is Humane Educator.

III. ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE

A. Overview of Findings

The Santa Barbara County Animal Services subdivision is currently operating well in all of its major program areas: Administration; Shelter and Field Operations; Volunteer and Community Relations and the Veterinary Clinic. The subdivision has minimal staffing to cover three full service and busy animal shelter sites. An active volunteer program that is well-managed has been a huge asset to help provide a high standard of animal care, a good quality companion animal adoption program, much-needed veterinary procedures, training and evaluation of adoption animals, responsive customer service for the public and to improve the facilities at all three of the shelter locations.

Process improvements implemented over the past 6 years have resulted in improved statistical reporting, more extensive and consistent training of staff, enhanced customer service and better care for the animals within the shelters. These improvements are discussed in more depth later in the report.

B. Animal Control System within Santa Barbara County

County Animal Shelter System

Santa Barbara County operates three regional animal shelters in Santa Barbara, Lompoc and Santa Maria. Services are provided to each community or city by the shelter serving that region. The Animal Services subdivision moves staff as needed to meet service requirements, when there are absences or increased service needs. This flexibility promotes the best availability for animal control services throughout the County.

Santa Barbara County Animal Services provides full services to the all of the unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County, which includes the unincorporated municipalities of Santa Ynez, Los Olivos, Bullard, Vandenberg Village, Mission Hills, Casmalia, Orcutt, Sisquoc, and Cuyama. The subdivision also provides full animal control services by contract to the cities of Buellton, Goleta, Guadalupe, Lompoc, Santa Maria, and Solvang. Full animal control services include provision of an animal shelter, opportunities for volunteerism, animal licensing program, stray animal patrol, rabies control, wildlife advice and assistance, pet adoption program, cruelty and neglect investigations, advice on animal and behavioral issues, dog noise investigations, dead animal pick-up, and 24-hour emergency response for injured stray animals, vicious animals, animals in traffic, police assistance and loose livestock. Agreements are also in place for provision of animal control services to the Chumash Indian Reservation and Vandenberg Air Force Base.

The subdivision provides animal sheltering for the cities of Santa Barbara and Carpinteria. These cities have their own animal control field staff. In Santa Barbara, Animal Control is part of the Police Department and in Carpinteria, Animal Control is part of Code Enforcement. Stray animals from these cities are impounded at the County's Santa Barbara Shelter.

While three shelters are not mandated, the model works well for Santa Barbara County. The distinct regions of the county have come to have strong community identification with each of the shelter locations. Volunteer groups dedicated to each site have augmented the quality of the program and made extensive improvements to both the animal care and facilities.

Highly Unique Model in Santa Barbara County

In the early 1990's volunteer groups formed with the goal of assisting Santa Barbara County's stray and abandoned animals in the animal shelters. These groups are unique in that they are partners to the shelters that co-exist with the County staff within the shelters. Each group has a mission statement that defines the commitment to assist with the care and placement of homeless animals in the County's animal shelters. The groups are non-profit 501 (c)3 organizations and perform fund raising and services for the benefit of the County's sheltered animals. This is a very unusual model, that has been highly successful in Santa Barbara County to help reduce euthanasia and to continue to improve the animal care, veterinary treatment and adoption programs. Santa Barbara County was a leader in this model and has achieved remarkable results through these community partnerships.

A more common model for municipal animal shelters is outside non-profit animal shelter partners that are breed rescue groups or organizations with their own facilities and separate operations. These partners may adopt animals from the shelters, but do not provide direct resources as in Santa Barbara County's model. Santa Barbara County also partners with groups outside the shelters, but to a much lesser extent than the extensive work that is done by the shelter volunteer groups.

Partnerships with the Cities

Although this report speaks to the contracts with Cities and other agencies, it is important to illustrate the symbiotic financial relationship that exists between the Animal Services program and our municipal partners, mostly experienced with those with full service contracts.

In FY 2002-2003 the Public Health Department instituted a per capita rate that encompassed both field and sheltering services that covered the reasonable costs of providing the services. The Board of Supervisors approved the methodology and the Public Health Department's recommendation that the cities have a four-year payment plan (in order to mitigate the financial hardship) to reach 100% of cost.

In the per capita rate methodology, consumer revenues received are reduced from the costs of providing services to derive the "net" cost of services. This "net" unfunded cost is then distributed to the cities and County (unincorporated area) based on population. This simple example is further complicated by the fact that the cities of Santa Barbara and Carpinteria pay fee-for-service for sheltering only and have their own field staff for patrol activities.

It is the desire of the Public Health Department to meet with the cities of Santa Barbara and Carpinteria in order to learn more about the history and consideration involved in these decades-old arrangements and explore other contracting models.

The per capita relationship (shared "net" costs) with the six full service cities is hydraulic:

- Increased costs mean a proportionate per capita increase for all
- Increased revenues mean a proportionate per capita decrease for all

However, because population growth is different in each jurisdiction, the dollar amount of increase or decrease is disproportional. For example, a .06 cent per capita increase represents approximately a 1% contract increase. If two cities each have \$100,000 contracts, proportionally they would increase by 1% for a new amount of \$101,000. But, if one city has a population growth and the other city remains the same, then the growing city will experience a greater contract increase even though the per capita rate is the same for all entities. Thus, growing cities will experience greater increases in contracts while other cities may experience contract decreases.

This detail is included because it is important to know that the county and full service cities truly do have a symbiotic financial relationship. If one city chose to "back-out" of the current system, all other cities and the unincorporated County would be adversely affected. Conversely, if a city (Carpinteria or Santa Barbara) chose to join as full service, all other cities and county would be positively affected.

This partnering relationship is further enhanced and subsidized by the volunteer groups' time and donations. The Santa Barbara County Animal Services system is like a triangle with County, Cities and Volunteer entities at the apexes. A change to any point disrupts the whole and its balance. With careful planning and the continued partnership, disruptions can be minimal.

Private Animal Welfare Organizations

Santa Barbara County is home to a number of non-profit organizations dedicated to animal welfare. There are three regional humane societies that accept owned animals for adoption when there is space available, the Santa Barbara Humane Society, the Santa Ynez Valley Humane Society and the Santa Maria Valley Humane Society. These organizations all provide pet adoptions and low cost spay and neuter services and vaccinations to the public. The County also has other non-profits for the benefit of animals, examples include DAWG (Dog Adoption and Welfare Group), a shelter dedicated to dog welfare in Goleta, VIVA (Volunteers for Inter Valley Animals), an independent shelter in Lompoc, and Catalyst for Cats, a feral cat organization based in Santa Barbara that serves the entire County. Fortunately for the animals, there are numerous other animal organizations in Santa Barbara County promoting various causes on behalf of animals.

Recommendation 1- Continue to operate three shelters in Santa Barbara County. This model allows for regional services to cities and the unincorporated areas and strong local identification promotes community involvement.

Recommendation 2- Continue the community partnerships with volunteer groups whose missions are to assist Santa Barbara County's abandoned and homeless animals in the animal shelters.

C. Organizational Structure and Management Practices

Placement of Animal Control within Santa Barbara County

In Santa Barbara County, Animal Services is currently a program within the Public Health Department. This organizational structure has been in place for approximately the last decade. Previously, in a five year period, Animal Services was moved three times: From Health Care Services in 1991 to Environmental Health, from Environmental Health to the Agriculture and Environmental Management Department, and in 1996 back to Public Health.

There are a variety of ways a County can elect to provide its Animal Control program:

- A program within a department
- As its own department
- As a service provided by another entity
 - Contracting with another agency to provide the services – such as contracting with a humane society
 - Formation of a separate entity to provide services – such as formation of a joint powers authority, of which the county would be a member

Comparison with Other Counties

The Project Team did a comprehensive comparison survey of 12 agencies. Data was collected for comparison including the following

- Population served and square mileage patrolled
- Staffing, hours of operation, and volunteer opportunities
- Agency placement
- Number of shelters and hours of operations
- Cities contracted with and methodology
- Budgets, consumer fees, and general fund contribution

The comparison agencies were selected using the following criteria:

- Benchmark counties as delineated for the County of Santa Barbara:
 - Ventura
 - Stanislaus
 - Sonoma
 - Monterey
 - Solano
 - San Luis Obispo
 - Tulare (eliminated as determined not comparable, field services only)
 - San Joaquin (eliminated due to no response)

- Agencies of Interest – other criteria/reason
 - City of Berkeley – performs Health Officer function
 - Contra Costa County – multiple shelters/contracts to cities/best practices
 - San Diego County – contracts to cities/best practices/multiple shelters
 - San Francisco City/County- best practices
 - Santa Cruz JPA- model/Joint Powers Authority
 - SEAACA – services to cities/Joint Powers Authority

Of the above-referenced entities, twelve were included in the survey.

The following table, Exhibit I-9, shows the comparison benchmark counties surveyed and the respective population, square mileage, scope of services, number of staff, staff per population ratio, staff per square mileage ratio and organizational placement within the county.

Exhibit I-8
Comparison Benchmark Counties

| Entity | Population 2004 | Square Miles | Scope of Services | Staff FY 04/05 | Staff per 1000 Population | Staff per 100 Square Miles | Organizational Placement |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Monterey | 415,800 | 3,324 | Shelter Only | 24 | .06 | .73 | Public Health |
| San Luis Obispo | 256,300 | 3,326 | Shelter & Field | 21 | .09 | .64 | Sheriff |
| Santa Barbara | 410,300 | 2,745 | Shelter & Field | 26.75 | .07 | 1.01 | Public Health |
| Solano | 412,000 | 872 | Shelter for Cities Shelter & Field for uninc. | 15 | .04 | 1.72 | General Services |
| Sonoma | 472,700 | 1,598 | Shelter & Field | 26 | .06 | 1.63 | Ag. Comm. |
| Stanislaus | 481,600 | 1,521 | Shelter & Field | 37 | .08 | 2.44 | Sheriff |
| Ventura | 791,500 | 1,864 | Shelter & Field | 50 | .07 | 2.69 | Separate Department |

Recommendation 3 – Maintain Animal Services as a program within the Public Health Department. If other forms of governance are considered, solicit the contract cities for their input and evaluate the viability.

D. Supervision and Span of Control

The Organizational Chart for Santa Barbara County is included in this report as Exhibit I-2 on page 13. The chart illustrates the four functional areas: Administration, Shelter and Field Operations, Volunteer and Community Relations and the Veterinary Clinic.

The Animal Services Director supervises the entire subdivision. The Animal Services Director currently has seven direct reports: Departmental Analyst, Accounting Assistant Senior, Registered Veterinary Technician, Coordinator of Community Outreach, and the three Supervising Animal Control Officers. In the event of vacancies in the position of Supervising Animal Control Officer at one of the shelter sites, the Director has filled in during the recruitment process, which on one occasion took 9 months to fill. This would then add all of the staff supervised by the vacant position to the number of direct reports for the Director. In such instances, the span of control is not appropriate. The Director cannot perform the oversight responsibilities and other core functions of the Director position while acting as supervisor for one of the shelters. Because of extensive turnover and the impact to the system and its director, two solutions must be addressed: the addition of a county-wide operations supervisor or an addressing of low salaries that perpetuates significant staff turnover.

In the Shelter and Field Operations unit a Supervising Animal Control Officer is responsible for the supervision of each of the three animal shelter sites: Santa Barbara, Lompoc and Santa Maria. These supervisors have between 5 and 8 direct reports, including the customer care staff, the animal care staff and the field officer staff. Each Supervising Animal Control Officer has extensive responsibilities including monitoring the care, treatment and health status of all animals sheltered at the site, ensuring adequate officer field coverage and response to service requests (which often includes the supervisor performing field duties), oversight of office operations and customer service at the shelter, interaction with volunteers working at the shelter, maintenance of vehicles assigned to the site and overall upkeep of the physical plant. Within the last two years a vacancy in the position of Supervising Animal Control Officer at one of the shelters was addressed by appointing a supervisor at another shelter to supervise both sites. This expanded the span of control unacceptably.

The Volunteer and Community Relations unit is managed by the Coordinator of Community Outreach. This position is responsible for oversight of the extensive volunteer program that provides services at all three sites. There are six volunteer groups that provide internal services at the animal shelters. Additionally, the coordinator is liaison to other external groups, the media and various individuals seeking information about the Animal Services program. The Coordinator develops various outreach documents including brochures, flyers and public service announcements. The coordinator participates in special events throughout the County and frequently facilitates special projects or activities. A current example is the compilation of a comprehensive Animal Disaster and Evacuation plan for the entire county.

The Veterinary Clinic began in-house spay and neuter surgeries in June of 2005 when the new Santa Maria Animal Center opened. Animal Services has had a Registered Veterinary Technician on staff since 2002. This position was implemented to provide a

staff position to ensure proper medical care for impounded animals. The division previously used contract veterinarians and veterinary hospitals for spaying and neutering of adopted animals, for shelter medicine, and for all medical procedures performed on impounded animals. With the inclusion of a surgical clinic and isolation facilities in the new Center, the division is transitioning to performing spays and neuters of adopted animals and to providing hospitalization for some patients. A contracted veterinarian is currently on site 4 days a week. The subdivision has a goal of implementing a full time staff veterinarian position in FY 2006-07.

Recommendation 4 – The functions of field and sheltering services are interdependent in Santa Barbara County. Maintain both functions within the program and continue to contract for full services.

Recommendation 5 – Evaluate the reasons for high turnover, recruitment and retention problems in supervisory positions

E. Salaries and Turnover

The cost of living in Santa Barbara County is expensive, largely due to the cost of housing. High property values make home ownership difficult for many people and rental rates are high, particularly in the south part of the county. Salaries in the Animal Services subdivision appear to be somewhat low as compared to the benchmark counties surveyed, as shown in Exhibit I-10. The Project Team did not undertake a salary survey as part of its study, but used available data from a similar study. A complete salaries comparison would be recommended to determine the competitiveness of Santa Barbara County with other entities.

Exhibit I-9
Salaries Comparison Benchmark Counties

| Entity | Animal Control Officer I | Animal Control Officer II | Supervising Animal Control Officer | Animal Care Tech | Director |
|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Monterey | \$2400-3122 | | \$2788-3626 | \$2183-2838 | \$4891-6358 |
| San Luis Obispo | \$2723-3312 | \$3194-3884 | | | \$5287-7718 |
| Santa Barbara | \$2162-2640 | \$2640-3223 | \$3371-4115 | \$1996-2437 | \$5799-7080 |
| Solano | \$2800-3404 | | \$3735-4540 | \$2596-3155 | \$5054-6143 |
| Sonoma | \$2767-3366 | \$3324-4040 | \$3971-4826 | \$3165-3847 | \$5171-6285 |
| Stanislaus | \$2464-2995 | \$2712-3296 | \$2983 - 3626 | \$2127-3250 | |
| Ventura | \$1989-2786 | \$2228-3129 | \$3653-6001 | \$2454-3600 | \$5456-9800 |

The turnover rate in the animal sheltering business warrants discussion because of the uniqueness of the work. In fact, Animal Control is considered a public protection function. Animal Control personnel face many challenges similar to other public safety

workers, such as fire or police. They are often faced with volatile domestic or neighbor confrontations, angry citizens who may be violent or intoxicated. They often assist the police and fire departments in emergencies. Animal Control Officers may also face vicious or dangerous animals on a daily basis. Shelter workers work in a highly emotionally charged environment and may have to go from an irate, argumentative citizen to a bereaved client who has just learned of the loss of their beloved pet, in a matter of minutes. Another strong factor for overall morale for personnel is public perception. There still exists a faction of the population that has a negative perception of shelter workers and frequently voices this. All of these factors contribute to morale and turnover rates in shelters.

The term “compassion fatigue” describes a condition in which a person becomes worn down from an environment that continually demands they emotionally support and console clients, co-workers or even themselves. Compassion fatigue affects shelter workers as they extend themselves to owners who may be upset and searching for a lost pet, grieving over the death of a pet, or angry and irate over the impound of their animal. The staff continually reaches out to citizens requesting resolution of a perceived problem, mediating neighborhood disputes or capturing threatening or dangerous animals. Staff also extends compassion to the animals when they come in neglected, injured or sick, or must be euthanized. Compassion fatigue has been well-documented in the profession and Santa Barbara County has held workshops and provided training and assistance to staff on recognition and management strategies.

The following table provides information on the tenure of current staff at Santa Barbara County Animal Services. The turnover rate indicates a majority of the staff has less than 5 years of service. There are some long term staff members, a few exceeding twenty years of service.

Exhibit I – 10
Santa Barbara County Staff Length of Tenure

| Length of Service | Number of Staff |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| < 1 year | 3 |
| 1 to 5 years | 11.75 |
| 5 to 10 years | 3 |
| Exceeding 10 years | 6 |
| Vacant | 3 |
| Total | 26.75 |

Recommendation 6 – Perform a comprehensive classification and salary survey to determine whether Santa Barbara County Animal Services salaries are competitive and equitable.

F. Policies and Procedures

Animal Services has a comprehensive Policy and Procedures Manual that covers all aspects of the program. The division did a complete revision of its policy and procedures

manual in 2001. A work group consisting of the Supervising Animal Control Officers, the Director, and the Departmental Analyst reviewed and re-wrote the entire manual. Employees from the various operational sections – office, field, kennel and clinic, provided input on their specific chapters in the book. The Policy and Procedures manual has six sections and covers all aspects of operations. Chapters include General and Administrative, Field, Office, Kennel, Volunteer and Veterinary Operations. The manual was reviewed and updated in September of 2004 and re-issued to all staff. Every employee is issued their own copy of the manual and it is used as a training guide and reference for new and existing employees. Staff input on policies and their application is solicited. Policies are periodically reviewed and new policies or procedures drafted and distributed as needed. The Policy and Procedure manual is a valuable resource for the staff and volunteers and is a cornerstone for the Animal Services Academy (discussed under Section H).

G. Mission Statement and Objectives

The subdivision developed a mission statement and objectives for all staff. The Animal Services mission is to establish and maintain a safe and healthy environment between humans and animals in Santa Barbara County. Further, to protect the human and domestic animal population from rabies. To protect the animal population from the dangers of the streets and the wild, and from other potential harm.

The objectives of the subdivision are stated below:

- To assure that a minimum of 90% of Santa Barbara County's dog population has been vaccinated against rabies.
- To protect the public's safety by enforcing animal codes and ordinances and animal quarantines.
- To prevent and investigate the inhumane treatment of animals.
- To educate and inform the public in the areas of animal codes, animal ordinances, and responsible pet ownership.
- To implement and maintain an automated licensing program for dogs, and animal related businesses.
- To respond to emergency service requests from the public or law enforcement as quickly as possible and no later than one hour after receiving the call.
- To respond to routine service requests from the public within forty-eight hours.
- To impound (domestic and wild) stray animals.
- To provide services to the public to aid them in locating their lost animals.
- To implement, maintain, and encourage an adoption program for impounded animals.
- To provide, with veterinary supervision and/or assistance, medical attention for all impounded animals.
- To manage unclaimed animals through adoption, or humane euthanasia.

H. Staff Training

Santa Barbara County Animal Services has made great improvements in the staff training program over the past five years. A training budget exists for each functional unit of Animal Services and administration has a commitment to a well-trained and informed staff. Staff are sent to outside training as resources and time permits. In addition, the subdivision has an extensive program in place for all staff through the Animal Services Academy. This program has a standardized training curriculum for each position. The training program for new staff members varies from six to ten weeks, depending on the position, the experience level of the employee, and the rate the employee is able to master the training material. As a new employee is trained, they work one-on-one with the Training Officer or other assigned trainer. The trainer has an individualized training schedule and a record is kept of progress through the coursework. Milestones are recorded and testing performed for certain skills. When the trainee completes the Academy, a certificate is issued. An experienced, long term Animal Control Officer, who has excellent training skills and knowledge of the Division, serves as the training officer. This standardization of training has improved consistency.

Animal Control Officers in the state of California are mandated to acquire a Penal Code 832 Module A certificate. This training is curricula proscribed by the California Commission on Peace Officers and Training. The Arrest and Firearms course (PC 832) consists of two components, which total a minimum of 64 hours. The Arrest component has a 40-hour requirement and the Firearms component has a 24-hour requirement. Santa Barbara County requires its officers complete PC 832 training within one year of hire.

Staff also participates in training through a variety of animal welfare specific seminars and conferences. National organizations, such as American Humane Association (AHA), the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), the American Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) and the National Animal Control Association (NACA) sponsor trainings around the country. The California Animal Control Directors Association (CACDA) coordinates an annual training conference with the State Humane Association of California (SHAC) and the California Veterinary Medical Association (CVMA) specifically for animal shelter workers. This seminar is held in California and has been well attended by Animal Services employees.

Santa Barbara County also has its own Employees University that provides coursework to enhance job skills. Animal Services employees are encouraged to take advantage of this opportunity and enroll in courses to improve computer skills, interpersonal, communication or customer service abilities and supervisory techniques for better job performance.

The Public Health Department also provides training for all of its employees. Public Health has a focus on excellent customer service and has a number of courses centered on this topic. Animal Services has mirrored this emphasis and actively seeks customer service skills in new staff. Additionally, training on information technology, HIPAA, contagious diseases and other pertinent subjects are offered for all staff.

Recommendation 7- Continue to prioritize training and consistency at all three sites through the Animal Services Academy and other training opportunities. While there is an aggressive program for training, vacant positions continue to impact training goals.

I. Use of Information Technology

In May of 2000 Santa Barbara County Animal Services implemented the Chameleon animal shelter software program. This industry specific program replaced the internally developed computer system that had been in use for many years. Chameleon software encompasses all of the normal operations of animal welfare agencies including field activities, dispatching, animal intake, tracking of animals in the shelter, adoptions and redemptions of animal, veterinary treatment, lost and found, ability to post on the internet, and a multitude of reports. The system has an integrated cash reporting system and functions on a "real time" basis, recording activities, intakes and outcomes of animals and other operations as they occur at the animal shelters.

An advantage of the Chameleon software is that it connected all three of the animal shelter sites on one network. It has the ability to look at one site's activities or the entire shelter network at any given time. The system produces reports through Crystal reporting. It has the capability of tracking service activity calls and the status of officers in the field.

Chameleon is designed to track an animal's case information and any information connected to that animal. Each animal is assigned a unique ID as it is entered into the database. As an animal passes through the system, anything related to that animal can be added to the database. Chameleon provides an overall summary profile for an animal, which can aid in making appropriate matches for adoption.

Prior to the Chameleon software implementation, kennel census and operational statistics were not as reliable as needed. Partnering jurisdictions were somewhat reluctant to use the data for contract negotiations. Chameleon has helped foster a better relationship with partnering jurisdictions because the statistics are reliable.

J. Revenue Collection and Fees

Santa Barbara County Animal Services performed an extensive fee study through an outside consultant that was completed in 2002. The fee study quantified costs for the main aspects of animal control operations. As a result of the study, in FY 2002-03, updated consumer fees and a new fee methodology utilizing a per capita formulation was developed for cost recovery on contracts with cities for animal control services. The new methodology represented a large increase for city contracts and the County phased the increase over a four year period. The fee increases implemented in FY 2002-03 resulted in a progressive improvement in Animal Services' cost recovery over the next four years. This is shown on Exhibit I-6, Seven-Year Budget Trend, on page 18.

In January 2006, the Board of Supervisors approved a cost of living increase of 11.4% to the Animal Services consumer fees. This increase represented the past few years of

salary increases. It is important to return to the Board with updated fee resolutions because the consumer fee revenues are 'shared' with the full service cities. The per capita rate passed on to the partnering cities is not the revenue received from consumers. Therefore, the County would be remiss if it didn't assist the cities in keeping the per capita as low as possible.

Most Animal Control agencies continually adjust fees to offset costs. An attempt is made to assess a fee that covers the cost of the service being provided. In certain cases, an informed decision is made not to charge for full recovery as it might adversely affect compliance, in the case of licensing, or decrease desired activities, such as pet adoptions. Other examples would be increased revenue projected from increases in redemption and owner surrender fees. Increases in these fees and the expected increase in revenue derived must be weighed against the operational costs of owners not redeeming their animals or declaring owned animals as stray to avoid payment of the surrender fee. Santa Barbara County continues to have an open access system and accepts owned animals. If the decision was made not to accept owned animals, it is anticipated that many of these animals would be received as strays.

K. Other Forms of Governance

Animal Control programs within counties are provided in a variety of ways. If the function is provided by the county, it can be its own department or a program within a department. In the survey conducted for this report, the following chart shows the breakdown of how each animal control unit is governed:

Exhibit I-11 Forms of Governance

| Independent Department | Public Health | Agriculture Commissioner | Sheriff | General Services | Joint Powers Authority | Total |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------|------------------|------------------------|-------|
| 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 13 |

The next chart, Exhibit I-12, ranks the survey entities by population. The chart details a trend to establish Animal Services as its own department in counties with larger populations.

Exhibit I-12 Forms of Governance Ranked by Population

| Entity | Population | Governance |
|------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| San Diego, County | 2,961,600 | Independent Department |
| Contra Costa, County | 994,900 | Independent Department |
| San Francisco, City & County | 791,600 | Independent Department |
| Ventura, County | 791,300 | Independent Department |
| SEAACA, JPA | 740,000 | Joint Powers Authority |
| Stanislaus, County | 481,600 | Sheriff |
| Sonoma, County | 472,700 | Agriculture Commissioner |
| Monterey, County | 415,800 | Public Health Department |
| Solano, County | 412,000 | General Services |
| Santa Barbara, County | 410,300 | Public Health Department |
| Santa Cruz, JPA | 259,800 | Joint Powers Authority |
| San Luis Obispo, County | 256,300 | Sheriff |
| Berkeley, City | 100,000 | Independent Department |

When not classified as its own department, the animal control function can be placed within a variety of departments, including Public Health, Environmental Health, Sheriff, Agriculture Commissioner, General Services, Community Services, Parks and others. Whether a separate department or structured differently, all of the entities surveyed reported receiving funding from the General Fund. As stated earlier, status quo in Santa Barbara County is as a program within the Public Health Department. As such, the program receives administration, infrastructure and technical support through Public Health.

There are a variety of ways a County can elect to structure its Animal Control program:

- As a program within a department
- As its own department
- As a service provided by another entity
 - Contracting with another agency to provide the services – such as contracting with a humane society
 - Formation of a separate entity to provide services – such as a joint powers authority

Animal Services as its Own Department

As noted above in Exhibit I-12, counties with larger populations often establish Animal Services as a separate Department. In this model, the administrator is usually supervised by the County Administrator. If a separate department, Animal Services would require

its own infrastructure for fiscal management, human resources, information technology and other functions.

Joint Powers Authority

Formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to provide regional animal control services has been successful in some communities. A JPA can be formed as a partnership of entities where each member holds a position on a governing commission. Commission members are usually city council members or other elected officials. The commission sets policy for the organization, authorizes budgets and oversees the agency. Usually one member agency performs fiscal operations and payroll and provides other administrative functions. Retirement may be provided by an outside entity, for example ICMA. One JPA included in this survey, Southeast Area Animal Control Authority (SEAACA) has been in existence successfully for about 25 years. Cities may be interested in this model as the position on the commission offers each member a voice in policy and operations. If a JPA was formed to provide animal services in Santa Barbara County, the County could be a member organization.

Privatization

Animal Control services can also be provided by contracting with a private organization to provide the service. The most common model of this type is contracting with a humane society or other 501 (c) 3 organization to provide sheltering and/or full services. This is often done in smaller communities where the numbers of animals impounded are relatively low. An advantage for a county to this type model is that the county does not have to provide or maintain the animal shelter facility or in the case of full services, the vehicles, radios, uniforms, computers and variety of other equipment required to operate the program. Since the passage of Senate Bill 1785 (Hayden) in 1999 and the focus on reducing euthanasia in animal shelters, the trend in California has been for private humane societies to give up these animal control contracts due to the increased cost and mandates of the Hayden Bill.

Any of these models could potentially be successfully implemented in Santa Barbara County. Any change in the governance of the subdivision should involve input from the staff, the volunteer organizations within the shelters, the contract cities and the community at large. The Animal Services subdivision is an acceptable fit in the Public Health Department and has made numerous improvements over the past six years with the support of Public Health administration. There is merit to exploring other models in regard to cost projections and whether moving Animal Services out of County government would result in savings.

L. Performance Measurement and Accountability

Animal Services develops performance measures annually as part of the Public Health Department business plan. Each year these measures are reviewed and modified. The following is an overview of Animal Services Performance Measures for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 through Fiscal Year 2005-2006.

1. Percentage of Adoptable Animals placed: "By 2010 achieve a 100% adoption rate for an estimated 5,200 adoptable dogs and cats."

This performance measure established in 2002-03 initially set a goal to adopt at least 60% of adoptable dogs and cats. This goal has been met each year and will continue to be tracked until 2010.

2. Licensing: Two performance measures have been developed to encourage expansion of dog licensing.
In the Fiscal Years 2002-03 and 2003-04 the goal was to perform 600 license checks per fiscal year. This goal was met each year.
In the Fiscal Years 2004-05 and 2005-06 the goal was to increase license sales by 5% per year. This corresponded to a year when the subdivision piloted a canvassing program. The goal in Fiscal Year 2004-05 was 17,400 licenses; actual number sold was 19,100, which was 112% of the stated goal.
3. Rabies clinics: In the Fiscal Years 2002-03 and 2003-04 the Performance Measure was to ensure that at least six rabies vaccination clinics were held county-wide. In FY 2002-03, seven clinics were recorded, which exceeded the goal. In FY 2003-04, four clinics were recorded; which did not meet the goal. As public low cost clinics are readily available throughout the County, this performance measure was discontinued for subsequent years.
4. Off-site adoption events: In the Fiscal Years of 2002-03 and 2003-04 a performance measure was developed to hold 14 off site adoption events per month or 168 per year, county-wide.
In FY 2002-03, 184 events were recorded; 108% of goal.
In FY 2003-04, 204 events were recorded; 120% of goal.
This performance measure was discontinued for subsequent years.
5. Employee Training: For Fiscal Years 2002-03 and 2003-04, the performance measure was to have 5 employees per month attend relevant job training equaling 60 trainings per year.
In FY 2002-03, 117 trainings were attended; 195% of goal.
In FY 2003-04, 106 trainings were attended; 177% of goal.
This performance measure was discontinued for subsequent years.
6. Customer Service: In the Fiscal Year 2004-05 a performance measure was established to conduct a survey of 200 customers with a goal of a response of "satisfactory service" or better from at least 80% of customers surveyed.
In FY 2004-05, a "satisfactory" or better response was received from 100% of those surveyed.
This performance measure is still in place for the current Fiscal Year 2005-06.

Animal Services strives to develop Performance Measures that integrate the mandated functions and the business plan and emphasize best practices within the subdivision.

M. Program Funding Sources

Animal Control programs receive some revenues from fees charged to citizens for services provided. These include fees for impoundment, boarding, animal adoptions, vaccinations, licensing, penalties, and other miscellaneous sources of revenues. All of the entities surveyed reported some funding that came from the General Fund. The percentage of General Fund to total budget ranged from a low of 17% to a high of 93.3%. Santa Barbara County is in the low end of the range, at 34.6%. For agencies that provide contracted services, the contracts are also a source of revenue.

The following table, Exhibit I-13, shows the survey entities' budgets along with the percentage of General Fund, amount of consumer fees and city contract portion where appropriate.

**Exhibit I-13
Budgets and Funding Sources for Survey Entities**

| <u>Entity</u> | <u>Total Budget</u> | <u>Fiscal Year</u> | <u>General Fund</u> | <u>Percent GF</u> | <u>Consumer Fees</u> | <u>City Fees</u> |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| San Francisco, City/Co | \$3,000,000 | 04-05 | \$2,800,000 | 93.3% | \$200,000 | |
| Berkeley, City | \$1,246,058 | 04-05 | \$1,152,908 | 92.5% | \$52,150 | \$34,000 |
| Santa Cruz, JPA | \$2,469,531 | 04-05 | \$2,107,067 | 85.3% | \$348,605 | |
| Monterey, County | \$1,972,288 | 04-05 | \$1,326,007 | 67.2% | \$442,920 | \$139,770 |
| Contra Costa, Co | \$8,500,000 | 04-05 | \$4,500,000 | 52.9% | Unavailable | Unavailable |
| Solano, County | \$1,863,487 | 04-05 | \$907,339 | 48.7% | \$256,230 | \$109,231 |
| San Luis Obispo, Co | \$1,935,500 | 04-05 | \$903,518 | 46.7% | \$606,172 | \$425,810 |
| Stanislaus, County | \$2,558,298 | 05-06 | \$1,154,152 | 45.1% | \$532,932 | \$854,914 |
| SEAACA, JPA | \$3,087,700 | 04-05 | \$1,344,300 | 43.5% | \$549,000 | \$1,103,700 |
| Ventura, County | \$4,341,983 | 04-05 | \$1,525,000 | 35.1% | \$1,275,800 | \$1,541,183 |
| Santa Barbara, Co | \$2,954,786 | 05-06 | \$1,022,565 | 34.6% | \$672,532 | \$944,377 |
| Sonoma, County | \$2,853,237 | 04-05 | \$866,689 | 30.4% | \$594,000 | \$1,249,000 |
| San Diego, County | \$10,822,770 | 04-05 | \$1,838,625 | 17.0% | \$2,220,900 | \$7,099,120 |

* Revenues do not add to 100% due to other sources; donation, SB90 reimbursements, etc.

N. Moving Animal Services into the General Fund

Working with the County Executive Office, Auditor Controller, and County Counsel, it is the goal and priority of the Public Health Department to shift the Animal Services cost center into the General Fund for fiscal year 2006-2007. Animal Services functions are more in line operationally with General Fund public protection programs, not health programs. Similar to Fire and Sheriff, Animal Services runs a 24 hour, 7 day a week operation. More importantly, there are no state or federal funding sources or major funding sources other than the General Fund and the partnering cities and consumer fees to support the program. According to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) for Governments: "The purpose of a Special Revenue Fund is to account for the proceeds of specific revenue sources that are legally restricted to expenditures for specified purposes". The specific revenue source of Federally Qualified Health Center revenues and other State/Federal revenue sources cannot legally be used to support Animal Services operations. In addition, because Animal Services programs are presented in the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) as part of the PHD Special Revenue Fund, this does not appropriately identify these programs as a general fund liability.

By statute (Government Code 51350), partnering cities are not required to pay the general costs of government. In Santa Barbara County, these costs have not been clearly delineated from other overhead (A87). These costs are reimbursed by the Animal Services program currently, although there are only reimbursement sources for approximately 15% of the costs. The A87 costs are paid by diverting general fund resources from other Public Health Department programs. If the Animal Services program were shifted to the General Fund, the program would not be required to pay these costs and would be treated in the same manner as those other programs and departments that derive the majority of their funds from the general fund and none from State/Federal sources. Similar to the Human Services public assistance program, the Animal Services program would remain within the Public Health Department, but operate through the General Fund.

Cost of Living salary increases would be covered through the General Fund at the percentage by which the program received General Fund support.

Meetings between the Public Health Department and the County Executive Office and the Auditor-Controller's Office have indicated consensus that moving the Animal Services program into the General Fund would result in better revenue and cost accounting. The Fiscal Year 06-07 includes this action.

Recommendation 8- Move the Animal Services program to the General Fund beginning in FY 2006-07.

O. Recommendations to Improve Administration and Governance

Animal Services is functioning well as a subdivision of the Public Health Department in Santa Barbara County. Over the past six years a number of process improvements and capital improvements have positioned the division well to continue to work toward the goal of a 100% adoption rate for adoptable and treatable animals by the year 2010. The following recommendations as identified above are re-stated here:

Recommendation 1- Continue to operate three shelters in Santa Barbara County. This model allows for regional services to cities and the unincorporated areas and strong local identification promotes community involvement.

Recommendation 2- Continue the community partnerships with volunteer groups whose missions are to assist Santa Barbara County's abandoned and homeless animals in the animal shelters.

Recommendation 3 - Maintain Animal Services as a program within the Public Health Department. If other forms of governance are considered, solicit the contract cities for their input and evaluate the viability.

Recommendation 4 - The functions of field and sheltering services are interdependent in Santa Barbara County. Maintain both functions within the program and continue to contract for full services.

Recommendation 5 – Evaluate the reasons for high turnover, recruitment and retention problems in supervisory positions

Recommendation 6 – Perform a comprehensive classification and salary survey to determine whether Santa Barbara County Animal Services salaries are competitive and equitable.

Recommendation 7- Continue to prioritize training and consistency at all three sites through the Animal Services Academy and other training opportunities. While there is an aggressive program for training, vacant positions continue to impact training goals.

Recommendation 8- Move the Animal Services program to the General Fund beginning in FY 2006-07.

IV. Shelter and Field Operations

A. Public Expectations for Animal Shelters

The introduction of legislation in California, such as the Hayden bill and the Vincent bill, is an indication of the growing expectations on the part of the public for the improvement of the welfare of stray and abandoned animals in animal shelters. Unfortunately, in many places today's public perception of animal shelters generally remains a negative one, characterized by the concern that animals are killed and the image of the "dog catcher". The animal welfare industry has made great strides in many communities by providing public education and outreach programs, improving the public image through professional development and training, use of specialized equipment and vehicles, and building or renovating animal care facilities to create a customer friendly and inviting environment with efficiency and animal comfort incorporated in the design.

B. Overview of Findings for Shelter Operations

Santa Barbara County operates three animal shelters that serve distinct regions of the County, Santa Barbara, Lompoc and Santa Maria. These community shelters are the stray animal shelters for the entire County. The County also accepts owned animals that are not taken by private humane societies or other animal groups. The County's shelters are open admissions facilities and do not turn animals away if the facility is full. Each shelter site has a night deposit kennel, where animals can be left if the shelter is not open. If the County adopted a policy of not accepting owned animals, it is believed that these animals would still end up in the County's shelters as "strays". By accepting the animal from the owner as an owned animal, a history can be obtained and a relinquishment fee is charged.

The Santa Barbara Shelter is at 5473 Overpass Road in Goleta. The shelter has an office/administration building, a kennel with 38 indoor/outdoor dog runs, a separate building with 8 dog runs and 10 cat cages, an extensive rabbit shelter, a large cat shelter with isolation rooms, a small surgical area and three enclosed cat exercise runs, exercise areas for dogs around the grounds, and various storage buildings.

The Lompoc Shelter is located at 1501 West Central Avenue in Lompoc. The shelter is comprised of an office/administration area which includes the cat room, 32 indoor/outdoor dog kennels, an outdoor rabbit area, a separate isolation building, exercise areas and two get acquainted yards.

The new Santa Maria Animal Center is the largest of the three shelters and is located in the County complex at 548 West Foster Road in Santa Maria. The holding areas are indoors and include 78 dog kennels, 101 cat enclosures, a large volunteer room, administrative wing, spay and neuter clinic, education center and a central adoption courtyard. The ribbon cutting for the new facility was June 29, 2005. The Center replaced the small and dilapidated facility on Orcutt Road which did not have adequate capacity and had been the subject of public criticism and Grand Jury reports.

All three shelters are operated by paid staff and volunteers. Staff are cross trained and work at alternate shelters when shortages occur. As mentioned earlier, field officers often fill in for animal care work, due to the shortage of staff or absences. At the Lompoc shelter, an animal control officer is scheduled to cover the shelter, adoptions, lost and found and animal care, as well as cover field priorities routinely on Saturdays and Sundays. At the Santa Barbara Shelter the field officer routinely covers the animal care and field priorities on Sundays. Due to the higher amount of animal intakes and field activities, shelter and field staff are scheduled seven days a week at the Santa Maria location.

Volunteers provide all of the animal care and adoption counseling for the rabbits and cats, and behavioral assessment, enrichment and adoption counseling for the dogs at the Santa Barbara Shelter. This generous provision of services by volunteers greatly augments operations. Volunteer services are discussed in greater detail in a later section.

C. Hours of Operation - Shelters

Santa Barbara County's animal shelters are open to the public six days a week. Adoption and kennel hours are from 10AM to 4:45PM Monday through Friday and 10AM to 4PM on Saturdays. The staff hours are 8AM to 5PM, Monday through Saturday. Staff are present at all three shelters on Sundays and holidays when the shelters are closed to the public, in order to provide care for the animals.

The following table, Exhibit I-15, shows the Adoption and Kennel Hours for the survey entities:

**Exhibit I-14
Adoption and Kennel Hours of Operation**

| Entity | Monday – Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Notes |
|------------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|
| Berkeley, City | 10-4, until 7 Weds | 10-4 | 11-3 | |
| Contra Costa, Co | 10-5, until 7 Weds | 10-5 | Closed | |
| Monterey, Co | 12-5:30 | 12-5:30 | Closed | |
| San Diego, Co | 9:30-5:30 | 9:30-5:30 | Closed | |
| San Francisco, City/Co | 12-6, until 7 Weds | 12-6 | 12-6 | |
| San Luis Obispo, Co | 8-5, until 7 Weds | 10-4 | Closed | |
| Santa Barbara, Co | 10-4:45 | 10-4 | Closed | |
| Santa Cruz, JPA | 12-5:30 | 12-5:30 | 12-5:30 | |
| SEAACA, JPA | Tue – F 11-6 | 11-5 | Closed | Closed Mon |
| Solano, County | 10-6 | 10-2 | | Closed 12-1 lunch |
| Sonoma, County | Mon 12-5, T-F 12-7 | 12-4 | Closed | |
| Stanislaus, Co | 9-5, until 7 Weds | 10-5 | Closed | |
| Ventura, County | Mon 10-7, T-F 3-7 | 9-4 | Closed | |

Recommendation 9- Continue the business hours at the three shelters as currently scheduled six days per week. City contracts contain these hours and the community is accepting of the hours as currently defined. The current business hours meet the state mandate regarding holding periods for animals.

D. Staffing

Staffing for the Shelter and Field operations in Santa Barbara County relies on cross training and flexible use of staff. The current staffing level is considered to be inadequate for the needs of the division as shown by the calculations for recommended staffing. Staff is frequently required to report to an alternate location or perform a different work assignment as a result of absences and work load requirements. Current staffing levels do not provide adequate coverage for the 24 hours per day coverage by field staff and the 7 days per week requirement for animal care at the three shelters as demonstrated by the calculations provided in this section of the report.

An effective *Animal Sheltering* program must accomplish the following:

- Take in dogs, cats, rabbits, livestock and other types of animals
- Provide customer service to visitors to the shelter and in response to telephone inquiries
- Input records on all animals coming in
- Provide care, including food, water and shelter, for animals in the care of the shelter
- Give routine vaccinations to impounded animals
- Identify animals in need of veterinary care
- Provide required veterinary care
- Keep accurate records of all treatment provided
- Notify owners of impoundment of known owned animals
- Redeem owned animals and collect appropriate fees and fines
- Hold animals for the minimum required impound period
- Identify animals suitable for adoption, i.e. adoptable animals that are healthy, old enough to be adopted and non-aggressive
- Identify animals suitable for treatment
- Provide treatment, veterinary medical care or behavioral modification, to promote adoptability
- Humanely euthanize unadoptable or irremediably suffering animals
- Dispose of animal carcasses

A successful animal shelter program delivers prompt and helpful customer service to clients at its facilities or on the telephone and provides humane care for all of the animals in its custody. Accurate records of animals and activities are accessible and professionally maintained.

An efficient *Field Services* program must accomplish the following:

- Receive and record citizen requests for animal control field services
- Respond to field activities in a timely and effective manner
- Patrol the community on a regular schedule to enforce local ordinances and make the public aware of animal control

- Enforce all licensing and permit provisions of applicable local and state laws
- Impound animals in violation of the ordinance
- Investigate animal bites and quarantine animals
- Issue citations to persons found in violation of animal laws
- Perform cruelty and neglect investigations
- Inspect and issue permits to animal related businesses
- Rescue animals in danger or distress on an emergency basis 24 hours a day
- Educate the public about responsible animal care, safe confinement, and animal laws and regulations

Simply stated, a viable and effective field services program contributes to the education of the community and wins public support for and compliance with the jurisdiction's animal control program. This is achieved by offering responsive, helpful, courteous and efficient service as Animal Control Officers respond to complaints and provide animal rescue services.

When considering staffing models for animal control organizations, a comparison to other public safety agencies is appropriate. As a result of caring for live animals 365 days a year and providing animal control services 24 hours a day, these organizations require a "readiness factor" for around the clock availability. Police and fire departments generally run multiple shifts to provide coverage. Many animal control agencies utilize at least 2 shifts, and some even run day, swing and graveyard shifts. This type of scheduling eliminates the need for an officer to be "on call", for example in Santa Barbara County's case, from 5:00pm to 8:00am every night. As stated earlier, Santa Barbara County Animal Control Officers regular shifts are from Monday through Friday from 8:00 to 5:00. The service model and animal control contracts provide for emergency services outside these hours. Multiple shifts or regular weekend patrol coverage would require additional staff.

Current Staffing Level

For fiscal year 05-06, Santa Barbara County Animal Services has a total of 26.75 FTE budgeted staff positions. Most of the entities surveyed had a similar organization chart to that of Santa Barbara County, including a director or general manager, administrative support, shelter supervisors and animal care staff, field supervisor and animal control officers, dispatchers, customer care staff, veterinary staff and volunteer coordinator. Another position commonly included is that of Humane Educator.

A position that is a standard in agencies performing field services is that of Dispatcher. Santa Barbara County has no Dispatcher position and the functions are performed by the Customer Care staff at each site. The Dispatcher responsibilities include advising Officers of pending activities, recording the times of dispatch, arrival and completion of the activities and logging the results. Santa Barbara County uses the Customer Care staff to dispatch activities to the field officers. This may result in delayed time before the officer is made aware of the call, which will also delay response time. A dedicated dispatch position would be more effective for delivery of field service. Additionally, the Dispatcher keeps track of the officers in the field. This would augment officer safety. A single Dispatcher Monday through Friday would be capable of tracking all three shelter sites through the Chameleon program. If the Field Operations service model remains as

the current Monday through Friday for regular services, the majority of Dispatcher services could be performed with one FTE. This requires further analysis.

In contrast to Santa Barbara County, the two agencies reported performing license canvassing activities utilized dedicated license canvassing staff for this function. Santa Barbara County implemented a license canvassing program in 2003 which utilizes existing staff. The program has been sporadic due to expanded service demands, such as extensive cruelty investigations, and functional absences of staff. A license canvassing program provides the benefit of increasing dog license compliance, educating the public on the importance of rabies vaccinations for their pets, promoting the wearing of tags (which is often the pet's ticket home) and expanding community outreach. Santa Barbara County's canvassing program would be more consistent if modeled after other successful programs that utilize dedicated staff for this function.

Recommendation 10- Perform the analysis to evaluate whether use of additional dedicated part time extra help staff to perform the annual license canvass program would be financially viable.

Santa Barbara County's current Organizational Chart is Exhibit I-2, shown on page 13.

The staffing model must relate to the business hours, business days and required services to be provided. Animal shelters and animal control programs generally require service provision 7 days a week, to provide daily care for the animals and to respond to animal related activities in the field. Some facilities run multiple shifts for field operations or to cover around the clock at the animal shelter(s). For agencies operating more than one shelter facility, the number of staff needed is increased to provide the same services at multiple locations.

The Santa Barbara County Animal Services staffing model for each animal shelter includes:

- Supervisor - oversees field, kennel and customer service at each animal shelter
- Customer care staff - provide services for six business days/week on phones, in person, redeem and adopt pets, input data, dispatch and track officer activities - 2 at each site
- Animal Control Officers - provide field services and back-up for animal care and customer care staff at the shelters - variable number based on the activity level at the site
- Animal Care staff - staff that cares for the animals, assists clients searching for lost pets or wanting to adopt a companion- number varies by size of shelter and number of animals cared for at the shelter
- Volunteers - unpaid staff that supports activities at all three County animal shelters

Quantifying Staffing Requirement for Animal Care at the Animal Shelters

While there is no known methodology for determining the correct staffing for public animal shelters, different variables provide guidance to an appropriate staffing level.

The number of personnel needed to perform animal care duties at an animal shelter is dependent on the following factors:

- ❖ The number of animal holding rooms
- ❖ The number of kennels
- ❖ The number of cat cages
- ❖ The size of the facility
- ❖ The number of animal intakes
- ❖ The number of animals euthanized
- ❖ The number of adoptions
- ❖ The number of owner redemptions
- ❖ The hours of operation
- ❖ The cleaning protocols and equipment utilized
- ❖ The frequency of routine and extraordinary cleaning
- ❖ The number of sick animals held and treated
- ❖ The length of animal holding
- ❖ The availability of veterinary care (onsite or offsite)
- ❖ The availability of spay and neuter (onsite or offsite)
- ❖ The number of visitors needing assistance with adoptions, lost and found, animal advice
- ❖ The availability of a computer system

Exhibit I - 15
Santa Barbara County Animal Dispositions for FY 04-05

| Disposition | Santa Barbara | Lompoc | Santa Maria | Total |
|--------------------|---------------|--------|-------------|-------|
| Impounded | 3056 | 2481 | 3681 | 9218 |
| Redeemed | 1010 | 414 | 585 | 2009 |
| Adopted | 1385 | 1384 | 1355 | 4124 |
| Euthanized | 262 | 430 | 1393 | 2085 |
| Died/missing/reloc | 171 | 135 | 184 | 490 |

The most time consuming activity for animal care workers is cleaning. Animal enclosure cleaning generally requires removal of the animal from the space to be cleaned, cleaning and/or replacement of food and water containers, disinfection of the area, time to dry in dog kennels that are hosed, replacement of litter pans for cats, and cleaning or replacement of bedding. Additionally, for proper disease control, all areas of the animal shelter must be cleaned periodically.

The following is a list of areas that should be cleaned in an animal shelter:

- ❖ Office areas
- ❖ Main lobbies and hallways
- ❖ Dog runs including central walkways, walls, doors, gates, drains, food & water bowls
- ❖ Cat rooms including cages, floors, walls doorknobs, food, water, litter receptacles
- ❖ Quarantine areas
- ❖ Isolation areas
- ❖ Medical/surgical areas, including instruments and equipment
- ❖ Other animal areas, such as grooming, treatment rooms, intake rooms, visiting rooms, training areas.
- ❖ Exercise yards or other outside animal areas
- ❖ Vehicles
- ❖ Carriers and transport cages
- ❖ Bedding
- ❖ Toys
- ❖ Tools, such as pooper scoopers and mops
- ❖ Ventilation and heating ducts
- ❖ Storage areas

The time it takes to complete the above cleaning tasks is dependent on the frequency of occurrence, size of the facility, the number of rooms, the number of animals, and the distance between work areas.

The animal shelter operation is a 365-day per year operation. Not all tasks are performed each day; however someone needs to be there daily. An analysis for each shelter has been performed averaging the tasks over an entire year, taking into account that some are only performed when the shelter is open or during normal business hours. This analysis includes calculations at the productive hours of 1,800. The productive hours (or days) per staff member after vacation, holiday, and sick days are factored, is 1,800 hours (or 225 days) each year. Although this is considered the "norm" for some administrative positions, when caring for live animals it is unacceptable. The remaining 140 days must be staffed.

A simple illustration calculates: 365 days * 3 shelters equal 1,095 days staff are required. If each staff's productive days are 225, then 5 "bodies" are needed ($225 * 5 = \text{appx. } 1,095$) county-wide. This is a reasonable way to get a base need; however, it does not address capacity. Incidentally, although this 7 day a week need demonstrates a required minimum of 5 "bodies", the current budgeted staffing for the Kennel Attendant position county-wide is 4.

The following charts delineate the service requirement based on capacity of each shelter.

Exhibit I-16 Kennel Staffing Estimate
Santa Barbara Shelter

| Activity | Number of Item | Minutes | Times Per Day | Total Minutes | Minutes Per Week | Minutes Per Year |
|----------------------|----------------|---------|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| Clean dog | 48 | 10 | 2 | 960 | 6,720 | 349,440 |
| Clean cat | NA*** | | | | | |
| Laundry | | 20 | 1 | 20 | 140 | 7,280 |
| Euthanasia rm | | 10 | 1 | 10 | 70 | 3,640 |
| Clean halls | | 30 | 1 | 30 | 210 | 10,920 |
| Temperament ev | 1258 | 15 | | | | 18,870 |
| Assist public | | 15 | 12 | 180 | 1,080 | 56,160 |
| Feeding | | 20 | 2 | 40 | 280 | 14,560 |
| Animal Intake * | | 12 | 4 | 48 | 336 | 17,472 |
| Euthanize ** | 262 | 15 | | | | 3,930 |
| Other | | 60 | 1 | 60 | 420 | 21,840 |
| Small animals | | 20 | 1 | 20 | 140 | 7,280 |
| Rabbits | NA*** | | | | | |
| Total Minutes | | | | 1,368 | 9,396 | 511,392 |

Hours per year

8,523

(8,523 minutes / 1,800 productive hours = 4.7)

Employees needed @ 1,800 Hours Per Employee Per Year is 4.7 annually to operate a 7 day per week operation.

Exhibit I-17 Kennel Staffing Estimate
Lompoc Shelter

| Activity | Number of Enclosures | Minutes | Times Per Day | Total Minutes | Minutes Per Week | Minutes Per Year |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Clean dog | 32 | 10 | 2 | 640 | 4,480 | 232,960 |
| Clean cat | 45 | 5 | 1.5 | 337.5 | 2,362.5 | 122,850 |
| Laundry | | 20 | 1 | 20 | 140 | 7,280 |
| Euthanasia rm | | 10 | 1 | 10 | 70 | 3,640 |
| Clean halls | | 20 | 1 | | | |
| Temperament evaluations | 1014 | 15 | | | | 15,210 |
| Assist public | | 15 | 6 | 90 | 540 | 28,080 |
| Feeding | | 20 | 2 | 40 | 280 | 14,560 |
| Animal Intake * | | 12 | 2 | 24 | 168 | 8,736 |
| Euthanize ** | 430 | 15 | | | | 6,450 |
| Other | | 60 | 1 | 60 | 420 | 21,840 |
| Rabbits/ small Animals | 20 | 4 | 1 | 80 | 560 | 29,120 |
| Total Minutes | | | | 1,301.5 | 9,020.5 | 490,726 |

Hours per year

8,179

(8,179 minutes / 1,800 productive hours = 4.5)

Employees needed @ 1,800 Hours Per Employee Per Year is 4.5 annually to operate a 7 day per week operation.

**Exhibit I-18 Kennel Staffing Estimate
Santa Maria Shelter**

| Activity | Number of Enclosures | Minutes | Times Per Day | Total Minutes | Minute Per Week | Minutes Per Year |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Clean dog | 78 | 10 | 2 | 1560 | 10,920 | 567,840 |
| Clean cat | 101 | 5 | 1.5 | 757.5 | 5,302.5 | 37,117.5 |
| Laundry | | 30 | 1 | 30 | 210 | 10,920 |
| Euthanasia Rm. | | 10 | 1 | 10 | 70 | 3,640 |
| Clean halls | | 20 | 1 | 20 | 140 | 7,280 |
| Temperament evaluations | 1909 | 15 | | | | 28,635 |
| Assist public | | 15 | 6 | 90 | 540 | 28,080 |
| Feeding | | 20 | 2 | 40 | 280 | 14,560 |
| Animal Intake* | | 12 | 5 | 60 | 420 | 21,840 |
| Euthanize ** | 1393 | 15 | | | | 20,895 |
| Other | | 60 | 1 | 60 | 420 | 21,840 |
| Rabbits/ small ar | 25 | 4 | 1 | 100 | 700 | 36,400 |

Total Minutes 2,727.5 19,002.5 799,047.5

Hours per year 13.317

(13.317 minutes / 1,800 productive hours = 7.4)

Employees needed @ 1,800 Hours Per Employee Per Year is 7.4 annually to operate a 7 day per week operation.

* Includes: Receiving animal from the public, taking animal to intake area, scanning for microchip, vaccinating the animal, making a computer entry, printing a kennel card, placing the animal in a kennel or cage and hanging the kennel card.

** Includes: Taking animal from kennel or cage, verifying animal is to be euthanized, obtaining euthanasia supplies, euthanizing animal, making manual and computer record, verifying death, placing animal in cooler, securing supplies (controlled substance)

***Cat and rabbit care are not included as these functions have been entirely provided through volunteer services for over a decade at the Santa Barbara Animal Shelter

In spite of volunteer assistance, kennel staffing levels are inadequate to provide the basic, required care for animals at the Lompoc and Santa Maria Shelters.

As a result of the proposed service reduction at the Lompoc Shelter, discussed earlier in this report, an animal control officer position was eliminated at the Lompoc Shelter. The need for animal care resulted in an extra help Animal Shelter Attendant position that has been in effect since November of 2002. The department requested 1 new Kennel Attendant for the Lompoc shelter during the FY 2005-2006 budget hearings but it was not considered.

When Animal Services moved into the new Santa Maria facility, animal capacity increased by approximately 100%, and there were no new Kennel Attendant positions

added. The department requested a .75 new Kennel Attendant position for the Santa Maria shelter during the FY 2005-2006 budget hearings but it was not considered. Currently extra help is hired using salary savings from lost time and vacancies.

A more illustrative way to look at shelter staffing and the 7-day per week requirement is by day and location. Chart A shows FY 2005-2006 budgeted Kennel Attendant staff at 4. Chart B shows a minimum need. These charts are without coverage for holidays, vacation, and sick days, meaning that for every "body" shown, 1.6 are needed annually.

Chart A

| | Budgeted Staff | Mon | Tue | Wed | Thu | Fri | Sat | Sun |
|---------------|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Santa Barbara | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Lompoc | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Maria | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

Chart B

| | Staff Need Min. | Mon | Tue | Wed | Thu | Fri | Sat | Sun |
|---------------|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Santa Barbara | 2.2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Lompoc | 1.5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Santa Maria | 4.0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

These charts show logistically how 3 shelters would still have 'vacant' days on weekends with the continued practice of officers rotating on weekends and for paid leave coverage. Mondays are busy because Sundays are not open to the public and more work is required matching owners to animals and to input Officer activity requests from the weekend. Volunteers are integral to the sheltering operations countywide as detailed in Section III and V. Therefore, daily staffing with Kennel Attendants, and the utilization of volunteers allow for modified staffing recommendations.

For comparison, if no volunteers were utilized and if no officers were rotated through the shelter work, then to cover all paid time off and capacity for 7 days a week, 16.4 Kennel Attendant positions would be needed. This chart shows FY 2005-2006 budgeted Kennel Attendant positions county-wide with each column adding positions until the total position count of 16.4 is shown.

Exhibit I-19 Kennel Attendant Positions

| | Current Budgeted Positions | Bring Lompoc to 2002 level | Address SM increase in capacity | 7 day per week operation recommend w/officers and volunteers | Need if no volunteers or officers | Total Required without Volunteers and officers |
|---------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Santa Barbara | 2 | | | | 2.7 | 4.7 |
| Lompoc | Zero | 1 | | .5 | 2.5 | 4.5 |
| Santa Maria | 2 | | 1 | 1.0 | 3.9 | 7.4 |
| Countywide | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1.5 | 8.9 | 16.4 |

Recommendation 11 – Reinstate the Kennel Attendant (1FTE) at the Lompoc shelter to 2002 level and add 1FTE or .5 FTE.

The Santa Maria Animal Center has a greatly increased animal holding capacity. In addition to increased capacity, the facility contains more rooms, and separate areas for stray and adoptable animals, separate areas for dog and cat isolation, treatment rooms for sick animals, holding areas for dogs, cats and rabbits in the veterinary clinic and expanded square footage. A minimum of 2.0 additional animal care staff positions are needed to care for the animals seven days a week.

Recommendation 12 – Add a minimum of 2.0 Kennel Attendants at the Santa Maria Animal Center for FY 06-07.

For both the Lompoc and Santa Maria facilities, staff works overtime and in the long term exacerbates lost time. Additionally, the Civil Service Commission is routinely granting extensions and at some point staffing must be addressed and changed. Even adding one Kennel Attendant to the Santa Maria shelter addresses only the increase in capacity, not the 7 day per week requirement.

Fiscal Impact Estimations

Although any increase in staffing levels are requested through the Board of Supervisors, the partnering cities must be included in the decision, unless the increase is funded exclusively by County General Fund.

For FY 2006-2007, the Animal Services recommended budget is \$2,710,000 of which consumer fees recover approximately 27%, or \$729,000. The unfunded difference is then shared with the partnering six full service cities (Buellton, Goleta, Guadalupe, Lompoc, Santa Maria, and Solvang) at a per capita rate. The current per capita rate is \$5.56.

Using this method, any increase in cost is shared approximately 60% county 40% full service cities. As part of the recommended budget, a Budget Expansion Request has been submitted with a net County General Fund increase of \$118,511. In summary, this request:

1. Reduces contracted veterinarian services and replaces with a veterinarian position on staff,
2. Increases the veterinarian tech position by .25,
3. Adds one Kennel Attendant position in Lompoc, and
4. Adds .75 Kennel Attendant position in Santa Maria. Because conversations with the cities have not taken place, the department is requesting 100% County General Fund.

In addition to the Budget Expansion Request, this report is recommending an additional 1.75 FTE Kennel Attendant positions (for a total of 3.5). Each Kennel Attendant position costs between \$43,000 and \$48,000 depending on the level of pay. The additional 1.75 FTE would increase costs approximately between \$72,250 and \$84,000. Using the high end of the range, this would increase full service city contracts by approximately .19 cents per person or \$33,600 cumulatively for all six cities. This \$33,600 represents an approximate increase of 3.5% per city, which is very reasonable. (Using the County's Salary Model tool, salaries and benefits have increased 4.3% between FY 2005-2006 and FY 2006-2007.) The difference of \$50,400 would be a County General Fund request.

The calculation of Public Health Department administrative overhead is extremely important since it is the charge of the county to be reimbursed full costs. Many allowable techniques can be used. Most popular is to apply the approved indirect cost rate percentage (ICRP) to all costs. Currently, this percent, less A87 Plan overhead (considered general cost of government), is 13.73%. This method of calculation increases Animal Services costs by approximately \$372,000.

Rather than use a formula for the basis of allocation, the Public Health Department has worked very hard to analyze and clearly identify those direct administrative costs that are allocated to Animal Services: Administration, IT, fiscal, payroll, mail courier, etc. These direct administrative activities have been quantified at \$158,513, in which \$104,450 have historically already been included in the Animal Services budget. This FY 2006-2007 administrative increase of approximately \$54,000 is \$318,000 less than the formula method.

Although Public Health has a clear basis to charge 13.73%, it is also a high priority to have fair, equitable, and judicious allocations for our consumers and partnering cities. Therefore, to demonstrate this commitment and to encourage the cities and county to make an educated, affordable decision, the Public Health Department is recommending the \$119,768 allocation for the FY 2006-2007 recommended Animal Services budget. To quantify this differently, approximately .81 cents per capita will not be added in order to assist the Animal Services cost center and partnering cities to achieve adequate shelter staffing.

For city and county consideration, the Public Health Department is committed to adequate staffing at the shelters and relief for staff who are on call continuously or work

routine overtime. It is the belief of the department that adding Kennel Attendant positions will, in the long term, reduce lost time. Thus, the request for cities to cumulatively increase by \$33,600, and county General Fund to increase an additional \$50,400 (at the high end of the range) is actually very inexpensive when considering that the Animal Services position count could increase by 4.75 FTEs, particularly given the Public Health Department's "commitment" of reduced allowable administrative overhead.

Also, this estimated increase does not 'net' any additional consumer revenues that might be collected. It is possible that more animal owners will redeem their animals and that officers can check on license status (a service that is not a high priority due to shortage of staff); thus increasing consumer revenue, which is not quantifiable at this time.

Lastly, because of the Hayden mandate, increased costs can now be partially off-set by SB90 annual claims. Some activities, such as temperament evaluation or assisting the public with lost and found, will be reimbursed at 100%. Remaining sheltering activity increases are reimbursed at a much lower discounted percentage, which is based on euthanasia counts. This is reasonable since the Hayden mandate's intention is to reduce euthanasia rates. Additionally, cities who participate in full service contracts, and which pay 100% of the cost via per capita, are eligible for SB90 reimbursement.

Quantifying Staffing Requirements for Animal Control Field Officers

The Animal Services Subdivision provides field animal control service 24 hours a day, 365 days per year. Among all three shelters officers work an 8:00AM to 5:00PM schedule on a rotational shift to provide 7 day per week coverage. Weekends off are rotated among the 9 field officers and the 3 Supervising Animal Control Officers. Officers also are assigned standby duty for the hours between 5:00PM and 8:00AM. There is compensation for being on standby and overtime pay when Officers are required to respond after hours. Currently, two officers are on standby each night, one covering the Santa Barbara zone and the second Officer covering the combined areas of the Lompoc and Santa Maria Shelters.

Dog bites, animal cruelty, loose dogs, dog noise nuisances and similar calls occur at times other than when officers are available. There are 168 hours in a week. There are 128 hours when animal control is not able to respond except on an on-call basis. This can lead to long response times.

Last year the subdivision completed 15,632 field activities. The Department contracts with the cities of Buellton, Goleta, Guadalupe, Lompoc, Santa Maria, and Solvang along with the entities of Vandenberg Air Force Base and the Chumash Reservation for full animal control services. It is also responsible for full animal control services to all of unincorporated Santa Barbara County.

Animal Control Officers are limited peace officers who may exercise the powers of arrest of a peace officer as specified in California Penal Code 836. They have the power to serve warrants as specified in California Penal Code sections 1523 and 1530 during the course and within the scope of their employment, if those officers successfully complete

a training course in the exercise of those powers pursuant to California Penal Code section 832.

Animal Control Officers are tasked with enforcing local ordinances and state laws throughout the district. Officers must be familiar with the laws of each city in which they work, the ordinances of the unincorporated County and the state laws. Officers are provided copies of local ordinances and the County ordinance and are issued a copy of the handbook of state laws pertaining to animals each year.

Typical tasks performed by Animal Control Officers include:

- Investigate bites and quarantine animals involved in bites
- Capture suspected rabid animals
- Control vicious or aggressive animals
- Respond to reports of loose animals or livestock creating traffic or other hazards
- Investigate, prosecute and resolve complaints of animal neglect or cruelty
- Rescue animals in a variety of dangerous circumstances
- Answer service requests involving animals and take appropriate action
- Patrol for animal ordinance violations
- Impound stray animals
- Collect dog license fees and/or impound fees and issue receipts
- Explain and enforce animal laws and ordinances with the public
- Issue citations for violations observed or based on third party reporting
- Prepare written reports of investigations and actions taken
- Transport sick and injured animals for appropriate veterinary treatment
- Pick-up deceased animals
- Euthanize animals as necessary
- Assist at the animal shelter in the kennel or office as requested
- Assist in accurate record keeping

There are a variety of methods used to estimate the optimum or desirable number of Animal Control Officers needed to serve a specific district. Several professional groups have tried to develop a model to identify the desired level of officers. In some jurisdictions the model has done nothing more than measure the volume of work and provide a basis for deploying personnel. The service spectrum in each Animal Control Department varies according to the policies of government, the community expectations, and the management style and philosophy of the administration and director. If the only measurement taken into consideration is the number of field activities performed, other factors are left out of the equation. These factors include officer safety, citizen safety, and the amount of time required to effectively handle each service activity. Other factors affecting the overall staffing needs are population density, size of the area coverage and desired maximum response times. Policies and ordinances also affect staffing needs. Attendance in court by officers and extensive investigative cases affect officer availability. In Santa Barbara County's case, the use of field staff in other capacities affects the ability to respond to field service requests.

Three models have been identified for determining an appropriate number of personnel.

- ❖ Evaluate the estimated growth in residential and business activity and predict the need for additional personnel
- ❖ Use comparative data from the National Animal Control Association Data Survey (NACA) factoring in population, square miles served and whenever possible, enforcement responsibilities
- ❖ The requests for service model is primarily used as a workload indicator. The data is a measurable demand for Animal Control service, but does not reflect the variety of calls, variable amount of time that may be required to resolve the situation, differing level of priorities, distance to travel to and from the activity or other factors affecting the amount of time needed.

To determine the number of officers needed, consideration must be given to assess citizen requests for service, citations, warnings, officer initiated activities, time required for investigations, report writing and data entry, assistance to other officers or other agencies, the need for safety and security, preventative patrol, desired license canvassing activity and the service expectation of the public.

In accordance with the National Animal Control Association (NACA) "The basic elements of the "calls for service"² model are as follows:

- Each 8-hour Animal Control position requires 2,920 hours to fill one shift for 365 days
- Officer availability for staffing is determined by deducting from 2,080 (the maximum for one year), and the time required for vacation, sick leave, court time, "flex" days and training. In using this model, the average number of hours dedicated to Animal Control for Animal Control will be 1,800 hours (a standardized ratio) or 225 days.

"In most situations, the National Animal Control Association utilizes the "calls for service" model in determining the appropriate number of personnel."

Santa Barbara County provides field services to approximately 306,000 citizens. Santa Barbara County is 2,745 square miles. There are 7 beat areas in Santa Barbara County's field services coverage area. A beat area is defined as the geographical district assigned to an officer for coverage during his/her shift. Based on the way Animal Services provides field services regionally through the three shelters, beat areas are associated with the officer's base shelter. The Santa Barbara shelter has two beat areas, the Lompoc shelter uses two beat areas and the Santa Maria Shelter has three beat areas. Utilizing the NACA method of calculation, the County should deploy between 11 and 12 Animal Control Officers. The County currently has 9 budgeted field officer positions.

² National Animal Control Association Web Site: <http://www.nacenet.org/staffing.html>

Exhibit I-20 Five Year History
Santa Barbara County Animal Control Officer Main Field Activities

| <u>SANTA BARBARA</u> | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | <u>2000-01</u> | <u>2001-02</u> | <u>2002-03</u> | <u>2003-04</u> | <u>2004-05</u> |
| Activities: | | | | | |
| Service Calls | 4323 | 4889 | 4934 | 5004 | 5299 |
| License Checks | 11 | 30 | 468 | 379 | 123 |
| Citations Issued | 74 | 115 | 53 | 103 | 146 |
| Cruelty Investigations | 126 | 164 | 182 | 217 | 319 |
| <u>LOMPOC</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>2000-01</u> | <u>2001-02</u> | <u>2002-03</u> | <u>2003-04</u> | <u>2004-05</u> |
| Service Calls | 3818 | 3766 | 3607 | 3611 | 4202 |
| License Checks | 33 | 195 | 148 | 174 | 116 |
| Citations Issued | 179 | 198 | 198 | 272 | 361 |
| Cruelty Investigations | 173 | 203 | 221 | 226 | 473 |
| <u>SANTA MARIA</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>2000-01</u> | <u>2001-02</u> | <u>2002-03</u> | <u>2003-04</u> | <u>2004-05</u> |
| Service Calls | 5364 | 6569 | 6776 | 6024 | 6131 |
| License Checks | 43 | 148 | 251 | 256 | 175 |
| Citations Issued | 269 | 341 | 364 | 398 | 348 |
| Cruelty Investigations | 378 | 763 | 766 | 434 | 487 |
| <u>TOTAL for all SHELTERS</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>2000-01</u> | <u>2001-02</u> | <u>2002-03</u> | <u>2003-04</u> | <u>2004-05</u> |
| Service Calls | 13505 | 15224 | 15317 | 14639 | 15632 |
| License Checks | 87 | 373 | 867 | 809 | 414 |
| Citations Issued | 522 | 654 | 615 | 773 | 855 |
| Cruelty Investigations | 677 | 1130 | 1169 | 877 | 1279 |

A review of Santa Barbara County operations provides information on productive time and the best use of staff. Shelter operations often depend on field staff, with animal control officers frequently required to work within the shelter to provide animal care and/or customer service. We will use the term "functional vacancy" to define the times when an employee is at work, but not filling the normal function of their job classification. The examples given above create functional vacancies in field operations. Additionally, time spent at training or in court would similarly result in functional vacancies. While this has not been closely quantified, it is estimated that up to 15% to 20% of officer time consists of "functional vacancy" time.

Based on the field service analysis a reasonable request would be to recommend additional field officers. At this time, there will be no recommendation. It is the desire of the department to increase the Kennel Attendant positions to adequate levels (4 FTEs) and then, after time, determine if the officer "functional vacancy" rate has diminished because officers will now spend less time in the shelter.

Quantifying Lost Time

There are three areas of staffing analysis this report desires to communicate: 1.) 7 day per week, 365 day operations. 2.) Capacity, and. 3.) Lost Time. So far, one and two have been discussed.

The division has a difficult time meeting the service demands in the shelter and field operations due to a high level of absenteeism. This absenteeism is the result of vacations, holidays, FMLA, sick leave, worker's compensation leave, training and alternate assignments. This high level of absenteeism has a trickle down effect that dilutes the work force.

The following chart, Exhibit 1-21, shows the productive time and the lost time for combined shelter and animal care staff at the three shelters for a one year period (November, 2004 through October, 2005). Overall productive time, or hours worked, was 80% for the entire district. It should be noted, that based on how Animal Services uses its staff, lost time has a domino effect. Critical absences in one area are covered by moving staff out of another area. An example of this would be if the Animal Shelter Attendant at one shelter was absent, it might be covered by bringing in an Animal Shelter Attendant or an Animal Control Officer, from the same region or another shelter. This would then cause a shortage at the shelter where the staff came from in either the kennel or the field. Frequently absences are concurrent, creating more of a staffing hardship. Animal care staff and field officers are scheduled 7 days a week, to provide these services ongoing. Based on the 7 day a week coverage needs, staffing requirements are higher than a business that would be operated based on a 5 day work week.

**Exhibit 1-21 Productive Time vs. Time Away
Animal Care Staff and Field Officers**

| | SB | % | Lompoc | % | SM | % | All | % |
|---------------|-------|------|--------|------|-------|-----|--------|-----|
| Hours worked | 8734 | 86% | 5293 | 86% | 8978 | 72% | 23,005 | 80% |
| Vacation | 422 | 4% | 308 | 5% | 791 | 6% | 1521 | 5% |
| Sick/WC | 455 | 4.5% | 277 | 4.5% | 2219 | 18% | 2951 | 10% |
| Holiday | 520 | 5% | 220 | 3.5% | 405 | 3% | 1145 | 4% |
| Leave | 60 | 0.5% | 28 | 0% | 111 | 1% | 199 | 1% |
| Total away | 1457 | 14% | 833 | 13% | 3526 | 28% | 5816 | 20% |
| Total Hours | 10191 | | 6126 | | 12504 | | 28821 | |
| # Staff | 5 | | 3 | | 8 | | 16 | |
| Hours wk/year | 1,747 | | 1,764 | | 1,122 | | 1,438 | |

Earlier in this report, the productive hours per staff was calculated at 1,800. This 12 month review of actual time worked for Animal Control Officers and Animal Care staff shows 1,438 hours per year; 362 hours less than the productive hours needed. To look at it another way, this 362 hour average per person multiplied by 16 staff is 5,792 hours or 3.2 FTEs.

This review of lost time and vacancies demonstrates that current staffing levels do not provide adequate coverage for the 24 hours per day coverage by field staff and the 7 days per week requirement for animal care at the three shelters.

E. Discussion of Staffing for Shelter and Field Operations

The Animal Services cost center 5-year staffing shows that positions have been reduced in order to maintain low costs and to keep partnering city contracts reasonable. This report has demonstrated that these decisions have had a negative affect on staff and services.

Exhibit I-22 Animal Services FTEs

| ANIMAL SERVICES FTE COUNT | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| FISCAL YEAR | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 05-06 |
| Total | 27 | 28 | 27 | 26.75 | 26.75 |
| Animal Control Officer | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 |
| Supervising ACO | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Kennel Attendant | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Office Assistant | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Accounting Asst II | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Accounting Asst Sr | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Volunteer Coordinator | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Reg Veterinary Tech | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Program Analyst | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Director | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

F. Recommendations to Improve Shelter and Field Operations

The following are the recommendations as identified in the document above:

Recommendation 9- Continue the business hours at the three shelters as currently scheduled six days per week. City contracts contain these hours and the community is accepting of the hours as currently defined. The current business hours meet the state mandate regarding holding periods for animals.

Recommendation 10- Perform the analysis to evaluate whether use of additional dedicated part time extra help staff to perform the annual license canvass program would be financially viable.

Recommendation 11 – Reinstate the Kennel Attendant (1FTE) at the Lompoc shelter to 2002 level and add 1FTE or .5 FTE.

Recommendation 12 – Add a minimum of 2.0 Kennel Attendants at the Santa Maria Animal Center for FY 06-07.

V. Community/Public Relations

A. Overview of Findings

Santa Barbara County Animal Services has very active community participation in its organization. Citizens throughout the County share a compassion and concern for animals and have put this into action through volunteerism and generous donations to the program. Much of the progress over the past decade has been facilitated by the helping hands of the volunteers. Clearly, the program would not be what it is today without these valuable resources.

B. Volunteers and Donations

Volunteers participate in daily operations at all three shelters. As mentioned earlier, there are non-profit 501 (c) 3 organizations that were formed with mission statements to assist the thousands of homeless and abandoned animals in the County's shelters. The groups are dedicated and well organized.

At the Santa Barbara Shelter, three organizations are dedicated to helping each of the three main companion animal types received, cats, rabbits and dogs.



ASAP, the Animal Shelter Assistance Program, is the cat volunteer organization in Santa Barbara. ASAP provides all of the care for the cats received at the shelter and performs lost and found services and adoption counseling. The group authorizes and pays for veterinary care for treatable cats and has a network of foster homes to care for cats in need. Volunteers commit to one or more shifts each week to provide seven day a week coverage. ASAP has been very successful in its fundraising efforts and completed a total renovation of the cat shelter in 2002. This capital project resulted in additional holding and display areas, an isolation ward, mothers and kitten area, medical procedures room, expanded storage area and outside runs for the cats. The shelter is bright and cheerful and designed for ease of cleaning and enhanced showcasing of adoptable cats. ASAP has a variety of events to promote the feline cause. The very popular Catty Corner is a holiday boutique fundraiser that has been very successful for many years.



BUNNS, Bunnies Urgently Needing Shelter, is the house rabbit rescue group that originated at the Santa Barbara Shelter. This organization provides all of the care for the rabbits in the shelter and ensures they are all spayed and neutered. They have developed the rabbit shelter to include individual hutches and a number of exercise runs. Each

rabbit receives individualized care daily and a few hours in an exercise run with a compatible rabbit. They are fed pellets, hay and fresh greens to ensure proper diet. BUNS handles all of the adoption counseling and veterinary care and also provides training in the form of their excellent workshop entitled Basic Bunny. They offer the service of rabbit nail trims and “bunny dating” to assist in finding a suitable companion for your pet rabbit. Did you know rabbits can be litter box trained and can learn to run agility courses? Each fall, the group hosts the Bunny Festival, a family event featuring games, a silent auction, informational booths, veterinarian advice, demonstrations and even bunny bowling. Santa Barbara County most certainly has the premier rabbit shelter in the country!



K-9 PALS. K-9 Placement and Adoption League, is the dog volunteer group in Santa Barbara. This group is responsible for adoption counseling and training of the sheltered dogs. They perform behavior evaluations and assist the veterinarian. The group also provides medical procedures for treatable dogs. They have written a number of successful grants for such items as agility equipment, training courses for all adopted dogs and support for medical care. Volunteers are at the shelter 7 days a week and ensure the dogs are exercised and walked as appropriate. They assist in training of new volunteers and have been a tremendous resource for improving the dog adoption program.



The Lompoc Shelter has benefited for many years from the services of the CAPA (Companion Animal Placement and Assistance) volunteer organization. This group encompasses all species of animals in the shelter and assists with the veterinary examinations and the adoption program. In 2001, CAPA managed a project to add an additional 12 adoption kennels and to renovate the existing dog kennel area. Two visiting areas were added along with signage and artwork. There is a strong corps of dedicated volunteers with CAPA who have generously provided services and medical support for many years at the Lompoc Shelter.



BUNS Lompoc Chapter was formed in 2004 when the shelter became inundated with a large impoundment of domestic rabbits, originating from one investigation. The group has continued to support enhanced care for the rabbits at the Lompoc shelter and provides daily care and fresh greens, oversight of health care and exercise. BUNS Lompoc has

also provided educational programs in the area and adoption counseling for all of the rabbits at the Lompoc Shelter.

The Santa Maria Shelter has a core group of dedicated volunteers that have been working with Animal Services for many years. The volunteers have promoted adoption of shelter animals at the local PETsMART very successfully for over five years. They assist with adoptions and daily care for the animals and have provided foster homes for hundreds of animals. With the opening of the new facility, the program is growing and expanding. Enhanced volunteer opportunities at the new Animal Center include assisting in the spay and neuter clinic, training classes to teach "Manners for Shelter Dogs", cat care and adoption counseling, a newly formed rabbit volunteer chapter, grooming classes to help shelter pets adaptability, behavioral assessment of dogs and community outreach through shelter tours and educational presentations. There are currently approximately 85 volunteers on the active roster, whereas previously only a small group of very dedicated individuals volunteered at the shelter.

Volunteer Donation Hours for past year

An estimate of the number of volunteer hours for the last year (2005) shows the incredible dedication of these individuals:

Santa Maria Animal Center (since grand opening in June): 4300 hours shelter = 4480 hours fostering animals

Santa Maria Shelter prior to new shelter opening: 1325 hours

Lompoc Shelter: CAPA 3470 hours shelter, 2240 hours foster + BUNS North 1184 hours shelter and 1000 hours foster

Santa Barbara Shelter:

BUNS south: 5300 hours shelter and 3000 hours foster

ASAP: 15,600 hours shelter and 15,600 hours foster, special events, PR, board meetings, photos/website, etc.

K-9 PALS: 10,400 hours shelter and 5200 hours foster, special events, PR, board meetings, photos/website, etc.

SB County Animal Care Foundation: 3000 hours

Total Estimated Hours: 76,099



C. Animal Care Foundation

In 2002, a new group, the Santa Barbara County Animal Care Foundation, Inc., was formed to support all of the animals in the County's shelters and to serve as the philanthropic arm to Animal Services. It is a non-profit organization dedicated to directly benefit the homeless, abandoned and neglected animals in the community. This group's mission statement is to "promote animal welfare and to better the quality of life for animals in Santa Barbara County through education, outreach, collaboration and promotion of the humane ethic and responsible treatment of all animals". The

Foundation vision statement reads, "It is our vision that someday no adoptable homeless or rehabilitatable animal will be euthanized within Santa Barbara County".

The Foundation's first project was to help close the funding gap for the new Santa Maria Animal Center. While the project was committed to by the Public Health Department, the budget was greater than expected and a shortfall was holding up progress. The group held fundraisers, solicited individual donors and wrote grants to secure the funds to help make the dream a reality. Capital grants were received from the Santa Barbara Foundation and the Wendy McCaw Foundation that accomplished the goal of ensuring funding for the new Facility.

The Animal Care Foundation has submitted two successful grants to the Santa Barbara Foundation to provide for a part time Volunteer Coordinator position dedicated to the new Santa Maria Animal Center. The first grant covered 2005 and accommodated the hiring of a coordinator to be on board when the facility opened. A renewal of the grant was funded to continue the position for 2006. The goal is to follow the highly successful model in Santa Barbara to continue to encourage a strong volunteer program and community involvement in the program. To date, the program is very successful, volunteerism is increasing and adoptions are up. The establishment of the Foundation has been a very positive partnership for Animal Services.



The Foundation sponsors two main events each year. The Santa Barbara Fur Ball is a festive night of dinner, silent and live auctions, dancing, and an opportunity to show one's love and support of local animals. This formal, fun and furry affair is held at Fess Parker's DoubleTree Resort in Santa Barbara. Its purpose is to raise funds, promote community awareness, and share a magical evening of smiles and stories with fellow animal lovers.



A Cause 4 Paws is a local pet walk-a-thon held in Santa Maria to benefit the innocent abandoned and injured animals in our County's shelters. Its purpose is to raise funds, advocate responsible pet stewardship, promote community education and networking, and encourage a special day of fun for the whole family. The Pet Walk is a fun run/walk locally in Santa Maria and features services including training, grooming, products and

non-profit organization information. A rabies shot clinic, microchip clinic, licensing, and pet adoptions booths are available for participants. Highlights of the day include contests such as the Golden Biscuit Award presented to the most spirited Pet Walk team, and a Pet/ Owner Look Alike contest, Biggest Lap Dog and Best Costume. In addition, participants are able to experience an agility course and food booths.

The Foundation established the Sebastian Medical Fund in 2003 to assist with medical care for animals received in the County's shelters. Through the Fund, many treatable animals have been helped and then were able to be placed in new, loving homes. A current project of the Foundation is its media campaign that is working to extend outreach into the community about adoption opportunities, volunteerism, pet overpopulation and the Sebastian Fund.

D. Education Programs

Animal Services participates in educational presentations upon invitation and as staffing resources permit. The County previously had a position of Humane Educator as a staff position, however it was eliminated in the mid 1990's as a budget measure and has not been replaced. As a part of their daily work, all of Animal Services employees are involved in educating the public. Staff continually offer advice and suggestions in the areas of animal care, peaceful co-existence with wildlife, behavior issues, the importance of spay and neuter and vaccinating companion animals and a variety of other animal related issues.

Many of the non-profit internal partnering groups participate in community events with booths and represent the cause in the media or other public forums. Through the good work of these groups, the County has a much broader and more effective presence than would ever be possible with the small number of paid staff in the subdivision.

E. Recommendations to Improve Community/Public Relations

Recommendation 2 – Continue the community partnerships with volunteer groups whose missions are to assist Santa Barbara County's abandoned and homeless animals in the animal shelters.

VI. Veterinary Clinic Operations

A. Overview of Findings

Animal Services has historically outsourced all of its veterinary services, including the use of contract vets for shelter medicine, outside hospitals for treatment of sick and injured stray animals and for all spay and neuter surgeries. A spay/neuter program is the most important component of a successful animal control program, since it is a certainty that if the birth rate of dogs and cats is not controlled, the pet overpopulation problem in Santa Barbara County will worsen.

The new Santa Maria Animal Center includes a clinic that is designed to serve the spay and neuter surgery needs for all three County shelters. The County is currently transitioning to in house provision of spay and neuter services. A full time veterinarian and full time veterinary technician are key to an effective transition. The Registered Veterinary Technician position was cut to .75% as a budget measure in FY 2004-05. The position needs to be reinstated to full time. A veterinarian on payroll would ensure consistent provision of veterinary services in the spay and neuter clinic and for the regular rabies clinics. A full time veterinarian would ensure consistency in the medical treatment program and provide for enhancement of staff training in the area of veterinary care and disease recognition.

A proactive animal services program includes a Spay/Neuter program focused on providing low cost spay/neuter services to all of the citizens of the County. Rabies vaccination and a current dog license should be required to support the rabies control mandate. A spay/neuter program is instrumental in helping reduce the number of unwanted animals in the community. An excellent model is collaboration with non-profits on a variety of spay/neuter promotional efforts. Availability of low cost spay/neuter services in a community has proven to be an essential preventative program that reduces the amount of space needed to house unwanted animals.

B. Spay and Neuter Clinic – Case Study Contra Costa County and Kern County Models from Citygate Associates Report, July 2005

Contra Costa County's animal control program is selected for study in that Citygate is very familiar with its history and operational components, and that certain parallels can be identified between Contra Costa County's history and Kern County's present circumstances.

Contra Costa County has experienced the growth that Kern will experience over the next 20 years. The total County population increased from 651,600 in 1980 to 930,025 in the year 2000, a 42 percent increase.

Contra Costa County has integrated its animal control programs. The County has service contracts with all but one of the County's 19 cities. The Contra Costa County Animal Services:


Department has operated a low cost spay/neuter clinic since 1977 and a public education program since 1981.

From 1974 to 2004, the number of animals impounded decreased from 41,749 to 13,758 and the number of animals euthanized decreased from 31,904 to 5,330 while the human population increased from 545,750 to 907,850. The human population increased 66 percent but the number of animals impounded decreased by 67 percent and animals euthanized decreased by 83 percent. These changes are depicted below.




Comparable animal data for the years 1974 and 1979 were not available for Kern County. Therefore, a comparison between Contra Costa County and Kern County for the years 1984, 1989, 1994, 1999 and 2004 are shown below. Kern County began housing animals from the city of Bakersfield in 2004. Animal impounded and animals euthanized for 2004 were adjusted to exclude Bakersfield animals in order to present a meaningful comparison with prior years.


KERN COUNTY POPULATION VS ANIMALS IMPOUNDED




CONTRA COSTA COUNTY POPULATION VS ANIMALS IMPOUNDED



KERN COUNTY POPULATION VS ANIMALS EUTHANIZED



CONTRA COSTA COUNTY POPULATION VS ANIMALS EUTHANIZED



In 1975, concerned citizens approached the Board of Supervisors relative to building and staffing a spay/neuter clinic. These initial efforts were not successful. These citizens formed a non-profit organization named S.P.A.Y. (Stop Pets Annual Yield) to raise money for a spay/neuter clinic. By 1977, they had raised enough money to purchase and equip a "doublewide" mobile home as a clinic. They proposed giving the clinic and equipment to the County if the County would administer the program. The Board of Supervisors accepted this offer and the Clinic began operations in 1977

The Contra Costa County Spay/Neuter Program is focused on providing low-cost spay/neuter and vaccination services to all of the citizens of Contra Costa County. There are no income requirements. The Clinic provides spay/neuter surgery service Monday through Friday. Vaccinations are provided Monday through Saturday. All revenue generated at the clinic is credited to the Clinic. Rabies vaccination and a current dog license are required. Non-profit groups are accommodated relative to scheduling but no discounts are provided.

Contra Costa County's spay/neuter program has been instrumental in helping reduce the number of unwanted animals in the community. Non-profits have collaborated with the County on various spay/neuter promotional efforts. The Contra Costa County Humane Society, which was an outgrowth of the original S.P.A.Y. organization, has offered discount coupons at various times and has assisted with paying for clinic renovations and equipment upgrades. Tony LaRussa's Animal Rescue Foundation has collaborated with the County to utilize other community resources relative to kitten spay/neuter.

Initially a controversial program, the spay/neuter clinic is now accepted as an essential factor in reducing the number of companion animals euthanized in the County. The clinic is also recognized as an essential preventive program that reduces the amount of space required to house unwanted animals

While we have used Contra Costa County in the above Case Study, other agencies have achieved similar results.

"Hundreds of jurisdictions offer subsidized spay/neuter programs, which work by creating a financial incentive for pet owners to have their pets sterilized.

"Two states, New Hampshire and New Jersey, have accumulated data on spay/neuter programs over a period of years

"New Hampshire launched a statewide spay/neuter assistance program in 1994.

"In the [first] six years after the programs inception the state's eight largest shelters admitted 30,985 fewer animals. (New Hampshire's eight largest shelters account for 95% of the animals admitted statewide.)

"Cities and counties that have run their own subsidized sterilization programs for years also consistently report that the number of animals handled by local shelters have stabilized or declined, even in the face of growing citizen populations"³

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) has chronicled the successes of agencies throughout the nation in adopting successful spay/neuter programs.⁴

³ Animal Control Management, International City/County Management Association, 2001, p 35-39

⁴ <http://hsus.org/pets>

Madäie's Fund is also a resource relative to successful spay/neuter programs.⁵

The crucial point is that successful spay/neuter programs have been started and sustained throughout the United States. Kern County can do it to.¹⁶

This study is quoted to demonstrate the progress that can be made with a progressive spay and neuter program. Prior to the building of the new shelter, Santa Barbara County did not have the facilities for in house spay and neuter. Excellent progress has been made due to the partnerships developed with the volunteer organizations. With the availability of on site surgical facilities and the continuing partnerships with community groups, Santa Barbara County is now positioned to accomplish 100% adoption of adoptable and treatable animals in the not too distant future and to meet its stated goal of accomplishing this by the year 2010.

Recommendation 13 – Implement an in house spay/neuter program utilizing a full time veterinarian and full time veterinary technician.

C. Shelter Medicine Program

Shelter medicine is currently performed by visiting veterinarians at each of the shelters, once or twice a week. The program involves performing a physical examination on each animal and administration of vaccines and de-worming if needed. Other minor procedures may also be performed at the shelter. The exam may also result in the determination that the animal needs a further work-up, including blood work or other laboratory tests.

For an in house shelter medicine program to be most effective, a coordinated medical program should be developed to include the following protocols:

- Training program for animal care staff in the recognition of illness and medical abnormalities
- Intake vaccination protocol and record keeping system
- Standardized triage protocols for common medical problems
- Established disinfection protocols to deal with serious disease outbreaks, such as Parvo, Panleukopenia, and Calici virus
- Diagnostic capability to recognize infectious disease outbreaks

Protocols for the above type program are under the supervision of the veterinarian. A key element to the success is staff training and participation in the program. Many of the procedures, such as routine physical exams, vaccinations and de-worming can be done by trained animal care staff. The veterinarian participates when staff identifies anomalies that need a more expert opinion. This type of program design has the benefit of cost savings in veterinarian fees and education and empowerment of the staff in furthering their job skills.

D. Treatable Animals

Treatable animals, as defined by the state of California, fall into the three tiers of animals received in animal shelters as follows:

⁵ <http://www.madiesfund.org/>

Definitions:

Tier 1: Adoptable animals are by definition friendly, healthy dogs and cats that are 8 weeks of age and older and do not require medical treatment, foster care or behavioral modification.

Tier 2: Treatable animals are defined as animals that require medical treatment for illness or injuries, underage animals needing maternal and/or foster care, or animals with modifiable behavioral problems requiring socialization and training.

Tier 3: Unadoptable or unrehabilitatable animals are animals that are irremediably suffering or vicious and should be humanely euthanized.

The staff and volunteers of Santa Barbara County Animal Services have established a primary goal to end euthanasia of *adoptable* animals received at the County's three animal shelters. A secondary goal to end euthanasia of *treatable* animals follows accomplishment of the primary goal. The County's roles in public safety and rabies control are not affected by a no kill goal for adoptable animals, as these animals are unadoptable by definition.

With the new isolation and clinical facilities in the new Santa Maria Animal Center, and a contract veterinarian on site, Animal Services has additional opportunities to treat animals in need of medical intervention. The volunteers and community partners work closely with Animal Services to meet needs for fostering animals and behavioral modification and socialization of treatable animals.

E. Recommendations to Improve Veterinary Operations

Recommendation 13 – Implement an in house spay/neuter program utilizing a full time veterinarian and full time veterinary technician.

VII. Summary of Recommendations

The Project Team has presented thirteen major recommendations. Although all of the recommendations are vitally important to the future of the Animal Services subdivision, the recommendations are further recognized in the following three categories:

1. Recommendations Maintaining Current Status Quo

- Recommendation 1- Continue to operate three shelters in Santa Barbara County. This model allows for regional services to cities and the unincorporated areas and strong local identification promotes community involvement.
- Recommendation 2- Continue the community partnerships with volunteer groups whose missions are to assist Santa Barbara County's abandoned and homeless animals in the animal shelters.
- Recommendation 3- Maintain Animal Services as a program within the Public Health Department. If other forms of governance are considered, solicit the contract cities for their input and evaluate the viability.
- Recommendation 4- The functions of field and sheltering services are interdependent in Santa Barbara County. Maintain both functions within the program and continue to contract for full services.
- Recommendation 7- Continue to prioritize training and consistency at all three sites through the Animal Services Academy and other training opportunities. While there is an aggressive program for training, vacant positions continue to impact training goals.
- Recommendation 9- Continue the business hours at the three shelters as currently scheduled six days per week. City contracts contain these hours and the community is accepting of the hours as currently defined. The current business hours meet the state mandate regarding holding periods for animals.

2. Recommendations in Critical Need

- Recommendation 8- Move the Animal Services program to the General Fund beginning in FY 2006-07.
- Recommendation 11- Reinstate the Kennel Attendant (1 FTE) at the Lompoc shelter to 2002 level and add 1 FTE or .5 FTE.
- Recommendation 12- Add a minimum of 2.0 Kennel Attendants at the Santa Maria Animal Center for FY 06-07.
- Recommendation 13- Implement an in house spay/neuter program utilizing a full time veterinarian and full time veterinary technician.

3. Recommendations That Need Further Study

- Recommendation 5- Evaluate the reasons for high turnover, recruitment and retention problems in supervisory positions.
- Recommendation 6- Perform a comprehensive classification and salary survey to determine whether Santa Barbara County Animal Services salaries are competitive and equitable.
- Recommendation 10- Perform the analysis to evaluate whether use of additional dedicated part time extra help staff to perform the animal license canvass program would be financially viable.

Santa Barbara County Animal Services has been successful in moving its program forward in the past decade. Through a combination of a comprehensive staff training program, collaboration and cooperation with volunteers and strong professional leadership, many long term goals are being met.

The Project Team recommends the County continues to operate three regional animal shelters and continues the collaboration and cooperative relationships with local volunteer groups. It is recommended to continue to house Animal Services in the Public Health Department and fund it through the General Fund. Contracts with cities are recommended to continue to be for full services, as sheltering and field services are interdependent in Santa Barbara County.

Further study is recommended to evaluate salaries and retention issues and to evaluate the viability of utilizing dedicated staff for license canvassing. Prioritization of training through the Animal Services Academy to continue improving consistency throughout the subdivision should continue.

Addition of four (4) animal care staff positions is recommended.

A recommendation to implement an in house spay and neuter program with a full time veterinarian and full time technician is also included.

AS Project Team, 2008
Appendix A – Mandates Expectations

| Function | Minimum Mandate | Department Service Level Goal | Community Expectations | Reference |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| Holding period | 5 days stray | Adoptable animals held as long as cage space available | indefinite for adoptable dog, cat, rabbit | SB 1785, local ordinances |
| Treatment | Stray sick and injured must be treated | Animals treated when funding is available | Treatable animals will be rehabilitated/adopted | SB 1785, local ordinances |
| Population control | Spray and neuter of adopted dogs/cats | All adopted are sprayed and neutered, currently by outside veterinarians | 5/6 adoptable dogs, cats, rabbits, public program | F & A 30503, 31760-31766 |
| Standard of care for shelter animals | Food, water, shelter | Food, water, shelter, enrichment, exercise, training | Comfort, tranquility, exercise, behavior assessment | Civ Code 1834, H & S 121690 |
| Customer Service | PRE standard | Visible, reliable and friendly resource for all animal issues | Above and beyond, counseling, advice, referrals | NA |
| City contractual agreements | Provisions of contracts, full services | Adequate staff to provide high tier service level to contracts and unincorporated County | High standard of service | City contracts, County standards |
| County unincorporated services | Stray animal impoundment | Prompt response to service requests, patrol for strays | Prompt response | |
| Rabies control program, clinics | Health Officer, 16 clinics, public clinics | Rabies clinics, prompt bite investigations | Clinics and vaccinations available through shelters | H&S 120130-121619 |
| Animal Shelter systems | A way impounded stray dogs | 3 regional shelters | 3 regional shelters, 5 days/week, business hours | |
| License program | Dog licenses req'd over 4 months | Effective license canvassing, promote cat licensing | License canvass program | H & S 121690 et al |
| Special Events | NA | Outreach events to educate and positively promote program | Open houses, fairs, recognition, fund raising | |
| Volunteer Program | NA | Opportunity for community involvement of multiple levels, all ages | Active program at each site and office | |
| Partnerships | SB 1785 with 501 c. 3 org's | Partnerships to enhance animals welfare and save lives | Work with other agencies to prevent euthanasia | SB 1785, F & A 31108, 31753-31754 |
| Cruelty Investigations | Animal Control responsibility | Consistent, fair investigations of cruelty and neglect; prosecution when appropriate | | Penal Code 597 |
| Cruelty Investigation | not specified | Trained, professional staff with investigation abilities | Investigators covering all areas of County | Penal Code 597 |
| Public Education | Lost and found suggestions | Presentations, literature, resources for public | Workshops, tours, handouts, public presentations | SB 1785 |
| Seizure of animals | Required under certain cases | Adequate resources when this is necessary | Variable, seizure expected when necessary for the animal's welfare | Penal Code 597, 597.1 |
| Dangerous Dogs | State and local laws | Prompt impound and control of dangerous dogs; no adoption of animals posing a public safety risk | | SB Co Ord Chapt 7 |
| Wild Animals | NA for animal control agencies | Advice and intervention as needed | Advice, assistance, response non-lethal | Fish & Game laws |
| Stray patrols | Provide taking up and impound of loose dogs | Prompt response to requests, patrol for strays | Prompt response to requests, patrol for strays | F & A Code 31105, local ordinance |
| Hoach patrols | same as stray patrols | High visibility and presence- 24/7 | high response activity, extensive patrols of beaches | F & A Code 31105, local ordinance |
| Euthanasia shelter animals | Must provide, certified staff | Prompt euthanasia for unadoptable animals by skilled staff | Prompt euthanasia for inadoptable animals by skilled staff | F & A Code 31105 |
| Euthanasia owned animals | not mandated service | service provided | service provided at low cost | |
| Business permits | board/authorized by AS | Annual inspections, new businesses inspected, permits issued | Set high standard, enforce standards | County ordinance, 7-1, 7-7, 7-8, 7-9 |

AS Project Team, 2006
Appendix A - Mandates Expectations

| Function | Minimum Mandate | Department Service Level Goal | Community Expectations | Reference |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Animal Noise | City and county ordinances | Resolution of complaint through effective procedures | high standard, 24 hour response | County ordinance, 7.37 et. al |
| Animal Fighting | Penal code | Investigate and prosecute when appropriate | Monitoring and prosecuting violations | Penal code 597.5, 599 a |
| Antiques/Exhibitions | Penal Code | Inspections and monitoring | High standard, moral issues | Penal code 596.7 |
| Dead animals | Contractual agreements - cities | Pick - up within 24 hours | prompt disposal of domestic and wild dead animals | City Contracts |
| Zoonotic diseases | Health Officer - some | Educate the public, work in concert with Communicable Disease Staff | Monitoring, education, control | |
| Disease Surveillance | Health Officer | Advise Health Officer on community trends, IPSAs to public | Monitoring, education, control | |
| Microchips | NA | Microchip all adopted dogs, offer service to public | Adopted animals, offer service | |
| Ordinance revision/advocacy | NA | County ordinance update, assist contract cities as requested | cities, citizens | local ordinances |
| Animal research | County ordinance -no release | No release of live animals or carcasses | against, moral issue, information | Chapter 7 County Ordinance |
| Search & seizure | Penal Code | Ability to draft warrants as needed | Seize when abuse/neglect occurs | PC 1523, PC 1524, PC 599a |
| Donations | NA | Program enhancement | Contribute to help animals | |
| Vaccinations | Low fee rabies clinics | Vaccine clinics to promote responsible stewardship | Vaccination program at shelters, strays and owned | H & S 121660 f |
| Feral cats | Shelter evaluation, release to non-profits | Humane housing and feral cat advice available at all three shelters | program to prevent euthanasia and control population | H & S 31752 |
| Health Officer - Cities | Quarantine orders and regulation, PH codes | Contracted service provided to cities | Prompt bite investigation and action | H & S 101375 |
| Health Officer - County | Quarantine orders and regulation, PH codes | prompt investigation of bites and possible rabies exposures | Prompt bite investigation and action | H & S 120130-121615 |
| Pet Dealers - lemon laws | Civil | Assist with advice and legal filings | Enforcement, assistance | H & S 122045, Polanco-Lockyer Pet Breeder War |

| APPENDIX B | SANTA BARBARA | | | | | LOMPDOC | | | | | SANTA MARIA | | | | | TOTALS | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 |
| | Fiscal Year | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Animal Statistics | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Owner Surrender | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs | 200 | 173 | 115 | 113 | 02 | 285 | 283 | 254 | 210 | 276 | 328 | 324 | 320 | 278 | 340 | 791 | 780 | 689 | 610 | 709 |
| Cats | 164 | 210 | 182 | 170 | 135 | 132 | 152 | 89 | 115 | 113 | 168 | 211 | 162 | 152 | 200 | 454 | 582 | 433 | 437 | 408 |
| Rabbits | 75 | 107 | 55 | 70 | 47 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 38 | 42 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 23 | 11 | 87 | 134 | 76 | 131 | 100 |
| Other | 118 | 42 | 35 | 31 | 44 | 423 | 9 | 15 | 27 | 513 | 12 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 653 | 88 | 58 | 59 | 565 |
| Total | 567 | 541 | 387 | 384 | 318 | 823 | 455 | 364 | 384 | 944 | 519 | 668 | 505 | 450 | 659 | 1895 | 1564 | 1266 | 1237 | 1821 |
| Stray | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs | 1464 | 1246 | 1234 | 1122 | 1166 | 953 | 933 | 856 | 676 | 738 | 1733 | 1700 | 1578 | 1556 | 1569 | 4150 | 3959 | 3658 | 3154 | 3473 |
| Cats | 992 | 1050 | 925 | 846 | 814 | 642 | 620 | 488 | 447 | 455 | 1599 | 1346 | 1247 | 1271 | 1291 | 3233 | 3016 | 2800 | 2564 | 2560 |
| Rabbits | 111 | 95 | 134 | 124 | 136 | 18 | 34 | 26 | 94 | 89 | 52 | 36 | 27 | 50 | 28 | 179 | 145 | 187 | 768 | 251 |
| Other | 678 | 711 | 651 | 669 | 622 | 230 | 262 | 235 | 192 | 255 | 304 | 304 | 280 | 369 | 234 | 1162 | 1277 | 1106 | 1235 | 1111 |
| Total | 3195 | 3102 | 2944 | 2761 | 2738 | 1841 | 1829 | 1695 | 1411 | 1537 | 3688 | 3476 | 3132 | 3246 | 3122 | 8724 | 8407 | 7681 | 7421 | 7397 |
| Total Animal Intake | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs | 1664 | 1410 | 1349 | 1235 | 1258 | 1218 | 1216 | 1110 | 895 | 1014 | 2059 | 2114 | 1898 | 1834 | 1905 | 4941 | 4749 | 4357 | 3954 | 4181 |
| Cats | 1156 | 1269 | 1107 | 1015 | 949 | 774 | 722 | 577 | 562 | 588 | 1767 | 1557 | 1406 | 1423 | 1491 | 3697 | 3598 | 3001 | 3001 | 3098 |
| Rabbits | 186 | 207 | 189 | 184 | 183 | 19 | 25 | 32 | 132 | 131 | 61 | 52 | 42 | 73 | 39 | 266 | 279 | 263 | 399 | 353 |
| Other | 746 | 753 | 686 | 700 | 666 | 653 | 271 | 260 | 219 | 268 | 316 | 321 | 288 | 375 | 242 | 1715 | 1345 | 1224 | 1294 | 1670 |
| Total | 3752 | 3643 | 3331 | 3145 | 3056 | 2664 | 2284 | 1969 | 1808 | 2481 | 4203 | 4044 | 3637 | 3706 | 3681 | 10619 | 9971 | 8937 | 8650 | 9218 |
| Adopted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs | 822 | 514 | 500 | 295 | 288 | 351 | 306 | 356 | 368 | 384 | 886 | 892 | 720 | 687 | 652 | 1662 | 1502 | 1477 | 1351 | 1362 |
| Cats | 805 | 861 | 768 | 784 | 710 | 386 | 324 | 293 | 303 | 342 | 422 | 525 | 576 | 870 | 622 | 1703 | 1718 | 1605 | 1737 | 1674 |
| Rabbits | 148 | 171 | 155 | 140 | 149 | 28 | 17 | 20 | 57 | 113 | 28 | 30 | 24 | 32 | 47 | 205 | 218 | 199 | 229 | 303 |
| Other | 116 | 110 | 173 | 160 | 240 | 45 | 19 | 25 | 160 | 525 | 45 | 31 | 14 | 14 | 30 | 208 | 166 | 212 | 354 | 705 |
| Total | 1703 | 1662 | 1514 | 1360 | 1385 | 813 | 746 | 696 | 808 | 1384 | 1482 | 1278 | 1343 | 1403 | 1355 | 3778 | 3686 | 3553 | 3651 | 4124 |
| Redeemed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs | 888 | 839 | 812 | 831 | 880 | 399 | 325 | 368 | 516 | 387 | 509 | 518 | 438 | 489 | 552 | 1816 | 1730 | 1644 | 1646 | 1619 |
| Cats | 29 | 136 | 100 | 92 | 105 | 24 | 23 | 17 | 25 | 18 | 90 | 37 | 31 | 37 | 30 | 193 | 188 | 148 | 149 | 157 |
| Rabbits | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 182 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 14 |
| Other | 21 | 18 | 22 | 21 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 26 | 23 | 30 | 40 | 19 |
| Total | 1013 | 998 | 939 | 949 | 1010 | 427 | 404 | 416 | 546 | 414 | 777 | 564 | 473 | 547 | 585 | 2217 | 1956 | 1828 | 1842 | 2009 |
| Euthanized | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs Euth (not request) | 69 | 61 | 125 | 82 | 108 | 364 | 298 | 221 | 138 | 111 | 660 | 661 | 480 | 457 | 440 | 1042 | 1028 | 838 | 875 | 659 |
| Dogs Euth by Owner Request | 27 | 20 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 119 | 128 | 112 | 67 | 94 | 68 | 105 | 129 | 104 | 150 | 214 | 252 | 255 | 182 | 292 |
| Total Dogs Euthanized | 96 | 81 | 139 | 93 | 118 | 423 | 426 | 333 | 203 | 205 | 728 | 766 | 609 | 561 | 598 | 1256 | 1273 | 1093 | 1057 | 921 |
| Cats Euth (not request) | 161 | 91 | 64 | 71 | 59 | 183 | 217 | 149 | 116 | 133 | 846 | 687 | 603 | 578 | 646 | 1139 | 1005 | 846 | 766 | 836 |
| Cats Euth by Owner Request | 15 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 58 | 50 | 35 | 34 | 36 | 83 | 44 | 46 | 70 | 71 | 106 | 106 | 89 | 109 | 119 |
| Total Cats Euthanized | 110 | 103 | 69 | 76 | 62 | 241 | 267 | 184 | 150 | 169 | 879 | 741 | 652 | 649 | 717 | 1236 | 1111 | 935 | 875 | 948 |
| Rabbits Euth (not request) | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 14 | 5 |
| Rabbits Euth by Owner Request | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 8 |
| Total Rabbits Euthanized | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 11 | 6 | 16 | 7 | 16 | 23 | 17 | 24 | 17 |
| Total Dogs, Cats & Rabbits Euth | 212 | 187 | 240 | 173 | 183 | 668 | 702 | 526 | 358 | 381 | 1628 | 1518 | 1277 | 1226 | 1322 | 2508 | 2407 | 2045 | 1756 | 1861 |
| Other Animals Euthanized | 212 | 98 | 281 | 46 | 79 | 65 | 47 | 52 | 50 | 49 | 48 | 62 | 50 | 61 | 73 | 325 | 102 | 385 | 188 | 109 |
| Total Animals Euthanized | 424 | 285 | 521 | 220 | 262 | 733 | 749 | 580 | 417 | 430 | 1676 | 1570 | 1329 | 1317 | 1393 | 2833 | 2604 | 2430 | 1954 | 2065 |

Appendix B, Animal Statistics

| APPENDIX B Fiscal Year Animal Statistics | SANTA BARBARA | | | | | LUMPOC | | | | | SANTA MARIA | | | | | TOTALS | | | | |
|--|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 |
| Relocated | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 40 | 4 |
| Cats | 26 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 36 | 14 | 12 | 40 | 0 |
| Rabbits | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 32 | 5 |
| Other | 252 | 313 | 147 | 132 | 110 | 60 | 90 | 149 | 59 | 78 | 135 | 150 | 149 | 197 | 107 | 427 | 553 | 445 | 1290 | 295 |
| Total Relocated | 285 | 323 | 151 | 148 | 113 | 64 | 90 | 162 | 59 | 82 | 130 | 177 | 170 | 216 | 109 | 479 | 590 | 483 | 1411 | 304 |
| Died in Kennel | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs | 9 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 56 | 11 | 32 | 12 | 0 | 75 | 30 | 51 | 18 | 17 |
| Cats | 31 | 53 | 60 | 13 | 17 | 28 | 26 | 15 | 19 | 22 | 254 | 91 | 108 | 46 | 23 | 313 | 170 | 183 | 73 | 62 |
| Rabbits | 18 | 15 | 21 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 22 | 21 | 34 | 21 | 20 |
| Other | 23 | 18 | 22 | 23 | 27 | 13 | 19 | 13 | 2 | 8 | 38 | 5 | 21 | 11 | 10 | 74 | 43 | 56 | 30 | 45 |
| Total Died | 82 | 91 | 110 | 49 | 51 | 53 | 60 | 52 | 21 | 48 | 349 | 113 | 162 | 78 | 45 | 484 | 264 | 324 | 148 | 144 |
| Missing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs | 8 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 15 | 14 | 16 | 11 | 4 |
| Cats | 7 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 25 | 21 | 20 | 25 | 31 | 37 | 24 | 39 | 31 |
| Rabbits | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 7 |
| Total Missing | 18 | 16 | 2 | 15 | 7 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 20 | 32 | 38 | 41 | 30 | 55 | 54 | 43 | 62 | 42 |
| Total Animals Outcomed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dogs | 1645 | 1445 | 1349 | 1228 | 1288 | 1191 | 1264 | 1104 | 892 | 1004 | 1950 | 2003 | 1836 | 1773 | 1925 | 4835 | 4652 | 4289 | 3923 | 4117 |
| Cats | 1154 | 1169 | 1056 | 952 | 900 | 892 | 842 | 517 | 490 | 555 | 1666 | 1429 | 1364 | 1431 | 1417 | 3512 | 3240 | 2967 | 2913 | 2672 |
| Rabbits | 177 | 196 | 187 | 163 | 170 | 37 | 28 | 49 | 65 | 158 | 226 | 51 | 38 | 60 | 51 | 434 | 277 | 274 | 313 | 359 |
| Other | 829 | 565 | 645 | 398 | 470 | 187 | 181 | 239 | 284 | 666 | 249 | 239 | 247 | 335 | 224 | 1085 | 985 | 1131 | 1915 | 1360 |
| | 3605 | 3375 | 3237 | 2741 | 2826 | 2107 | 2055 | 1909 | 1737 | 2363 | 4134 | 3724 | 3515 | 3602 | 3517 | 9846 | 9154 | 8661 | 8068 | 8708 |
| Total | 3605 | 3375 | 3237 | 2741 | 2826 | 2107 | 2055 | 1909 | 1737 | 2363 | 4134 | 3724 | 3515 | 3602 | 3517 | 9846 | 9154 | 8661 | 8068 | 8708 |

AS PROJECT TEAM SURVEY, 2005 Appendix C

FINANCIAL COMPARISON

| Entity | Services | Population Served | Total Budget | Fiscal Year | General Fund | Percent Of | Consumer Fees | City Fees | Donations* | Other | Ratio Budget/pop | Number of Cases Served | How Fees are Calc'd | Per Capita Fee | Frequency Update Fees |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Berkeley, City | Shelter & Field | 100,000 | \$1,356,058 | 04-05 | \$1,352,906 | 92.5% | \$52,150 | \$34,000 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$12.66 | 3, 2 shelter only | Fee for Service | | Two Years |
| Contra Costa, County | Shelter & Field | 994,900 | \$8,500,000 | 04-05 | \$4,500,000 | 52.9% | Unavailable | Unavailable | Unavailable | \$0 | \$8.55 | 18 of 19 | Per Capita | \$2.46 | Annually |
| Monterey, County | Shelter & Field | 415,800 | \$1,972,288 | 04-05 | \$1,325,607 | 67.2% | \$442,920 | \$139,770 | \$20,000 | \$43,997 | \$4.75 | 3 | Fee for Service | | Annually |
| San Diego, County | Shelter & Field | 2,961,600 | 10,672,770 | 04-05 | \$1,838,625 | 17.0% | \$2,226,900 | \$7,069,120 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3.28 | 7 of 18 | Population & Officer Activity | ~\$4.50 | Every 2 years |
| San Francisco, City & County | Shelter & Field | 791,600 | \$3,060,000 | 04-05 | \$2,860,000 | 93.3% | \$200,000 | City/County | \$40,500,000 | \$0 | \$3.79 | 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| San Luis Obispo, County | Shelter & Field | 256,300 | \$1,935,500 | 04-05 | \$903,518 | 46.7% | \$606,172 | \$425,810 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7.56 | 7 | Fee for Service | | 3 Yr Cycle |
| Santa Barbara, County | Shelter & Field | 410,300 | \$2,956,179 | 05-06 | \$1,022,565 | 34.6% | \$672,532 | \$944,377 | \$10,780 | \$305,025 | \$7.21 | 8, 2 shelter only | Per Capita | \$5.56 | Annually |
| Santa Cruz, JFA | Shelter & Field | 259,800 | \$2,469,531 | 04-05 | \$0 | 0.0% | \$348,005 | \$2,107,067 | \$0 | \$13,859 | \$9.51 | 3 | Per Capita | \$9.01 | Annually |
| SEAACA, JFA | Shelter & Field | 740,000 | \$3,087,700 | 04-05 | \$1,344,300 | 43.5% | \$549,000 | \$1,103,700 | \$45,000 | \$45,700 | \$4.18 | 12 | Per Capita | \$3.75 | Annually |
| Solano, County | Full for County | 412,000 | \$1,863,487 | 04-05 | \$907,339 | 48.7% | \$256,230 | \$109,231 | \$0 | \$112,613 | \$4.53 | 6 of 7 | Fee for Service | | Contract |
| Sonoma, County | Shelter & Field | 472,700 | \$2,853,237 | 04-05 | \$866,669 | 30.4% | \$594,600 | \$1,246,900 | \$0 | \$106,000 | \$6.04 | 3 of 9 | Population & Officer Activity | | Annually |
| Stanislaus, County | Shelter & Field | 481,600 | \$2,998,299 | 06-06 | \$1,354,152 | 45.1% | \$532,932 | \$864,914 | \$0 | \$16,300 | \$5.39 | 7 of 91 S only | Fee for Service | | 5 yr contract |
| Ventura, County | Shelter & Field | 791,000 | \$4,341,983 | 04-05 | \$1,525,000 | 35.1% | \$1,275,000 | \$1,541,183 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5.49 | 8 | Fee for Service | | Annually |

*NOTE: None of the organizations surveyed do fundraising. Several have volunteer groups with 501(c)3 status that fundraise.

| County | Pass Along | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | Changed AB? | Incl Indirect Costs? | Recover 172 Funds | Copy of Expenditures | Copy of Revenue | Copy of Budget |
| Berkeley | No | N/A | No | Requested | Requested | Yes |
| Contra Costa | Yes | No | No | Requested | Requested | Requested |
| Monterey | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| San Diego | Yes | Yes | No | Requested | Requested | Requested |
| San Francisco | No | N/A | No | Not Avail | Not Avail | Not Avail |
| San Luis Obispo | Yes | Yes | No | Requested | Requested | Requested |
| Santa Barbara | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Pass Along

| <u>County</u> | <u>Charged ABZ</u> | <u>Incl Indirect Costs?</u> | <u>Receive 177 Funds</u> | <u>Copy of Expenditures</u> | <u>Copy of Revenue</u> | <u>Copy of Budget</u> |
|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Santa Cruz | No | N/A | No | Requested | Requested | Requested |
| SEAMCA | No | N/A | No | Yes | Yes* | No |
| Solano | Yes | Yes | No | Requested | Requested | *Requested |
| Sonoma | No | Yes | No | Requested | Requested | On-Line |
| Stanislaus | No | No | No | No | No | |
| Ventura | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes |

AS PROJECT TEAM SURVEY, 2005 Appendix D

OPERATIONS COMPARISON FY 03-04, page 1

| Entity | Population | Square Mileage | Agency Affiliation | Number of Shelters | Build or Expand Yes/No | Days/Weeks - Open | Adoption Hours | Admin Hours | Provide an Org Chart Yes/No | Number of Staff | Canvass Program Yes/No | Dedicated Canvass Staff? | How does it function? |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 1 Berkeley (City) | 100,000 | | indep/GF dept | 1 | No | 7 | M-Tu 10:00-4:00, W 10:00-7:00, Sun 11:00-3:00 | MTTF 8:00-5:00 W 8:00-4:00 | No | 10 | No | N/A | No, license does from city |
| 2 Contra Costa | 994,900 | 796 | indep/GF dept | 2 | Yes | 5 | T-F 10:00-5:00 W 10:00-7:00 | | No | 92 | No | N/A | N/A |
| 3 Monterey | 415,800 | 3,324 | PHD | 1 | Yes | 6 | M-S 12:00-5:30 | M-F 8:00-5:00 | Yes | 24 | No | N/A | N/A |
| 4 San Joaquin | 613,500 | 1,436 | Ag Dept | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 San Diego | 2,961,600 | 4,281 | indep/GF dept | 3 | yes | 5 | T-S 9:30-5:30 | M-F 8:00-5:00 | No | 111 | No | N/A | N/A |
| 6 San Francisco | 791,800 | 91 | Administrative | 1 | yes | 7 | M, T, Th, F, S, S 12:00-6:00 W 12:00-7:00 | 6:00-8:30pm with one staff member | No | 39 | No | N/A | Tax collector does all licensing, not AS |
| 7 San Luis Obispo | 256,300 | 3,325 | Sheriff | 1 | Yes | 6 | MTTF 8:00-5:00 W 8:00-7:00 S 10:00-4:00 | MTTF 8:00-6:00 W 8:00-7:15 | No | 21 | No | N/A | |
| 8 Santa Barbara | 410,300 | 2,745 | PHD | 3 | Yes | 6 | Adopt M-F 10-4:40, Sat 10:00-3:30 | M-F 8:00-5:00 S 8:30-4:30 | Yes | 29 | Yes | No | 2 officers, door to door |
| 9 Santa Cruz | 259,800 | 440 | JPA | 2 | No | 6 | M-Sun 12:00-5:30 | M-F 9:00-5:30 | Yes | 9 | No | N/A | N/A |
| 10 SEAACA (Cities) | 740,000 | 130 | JPA | 1 | Yes | 5 | T-F 11:00-6:00 S 8:00-5:00 | T-F 8:00-6:00 S 8:00-5:00 | Yes | 45 | Yes | Yes | Door to door, dedicated licensing group |
| 11 Solano | 412,000 | 872 | General Services | 1 | Yes | 6 | M-F 10:00-6:00 (closed 12:00-1:00) S 10:00-2:00 | 2 shifts, 6:30-6:30 | No | 15 | No | No | N/A |
| 12 Sonoma | 472,700 | 1,598 | Ag Dept | 1 | No | 4 | T-F 8:00-7:00 | M-S 8:00-5:00 | No | 26 | No | N/A | N/A |
| 13 Stanislaus | 481,800 | 1,521 | Sheriff | 1 | Yes | 7 | MT, Th, F 9:00-5:00 W 9:00-7:00 S, S 10:00-5:00 | M-F 8:00-5:00 | No | 37 | Yes | 5 | Door-to-door |
| 14 Tulare | 386,200 | 4,844 | Fire Dept | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 Ventura | 791,300 | 1,864 | municipal dept | 2 | Yes | 6 | M 10:00-7:00 T-F 1:00-7:00 Sat 9:00-4:00 | M-F 8:00-5:00 | Yes | 50 | No, can't keep staff | Yes, Extra Help | Was done, door-to-door, no follow-up. On hold now |

AS PROJECT TEAM SURVEY, 2005 Appendix D

OPERATIONS COMPARISON FY 03-04, page 2

| Entity | Annual Report | 2 Yr Statistics | Vet | % Time at Shelter | RVT | Inhouse \$/H | Adoption Cost Dog Cat | Vaccines to Public | Pet Supplies | Fund Raisers | Partner 501c3 | Corp Sponsor | Volunteer Program? Hours/Vol Coordinator? |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------|---|---------------|----------------------|---|
| 1 Berkeley (City) | Yes | 1 Year | No | 0% | No | No | \$100 \$75 | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes, 300, 250 hrs/week, Coord Yes |
| 2 Contra Costa | No | Requested | Yes, 5 | 100% | Yes, 6 | Yes | \$65-\$100 \$65-\$100 | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes, 100, Coord yes |
| 3 Monterey | No | No | Yes | 50% | Yes | Yes | ? ? | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes, est 35-40, 2105 hrs. Coordinator Yes |
| 4 San Joaquin | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 San Diego | No | Requested | Yes, 2 | 100% | Yes, 6 FT, 3 PT | Limited | \$60 \$58 | Rabies Clinics | No | No | No | No | Yes, Coordinator Yes |
| 6 San Francisco | No | Requested | Yes | 100% | Yes | SPCA next | \$105 \$105 | No | Enrich, image | Annual Costs Show funds 2 ACD positions | Yes | Yes, self ad plaques | Yes, 225 hr/mo, Vol Coord yes |
| 7 San Luis Obispo | No | Requested | No | 0% | No | No | | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes, 40-50, 100 hrs/week, requesting Coordinator |
| 8 Santa Barbara | Yes | Yes | contract | 80% | Yes, 75% | No | \$65 \$60 | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes, est 200 (?), Hours N/A, Coordinator Yes |
| 9 Santa Cruz | Yes | No | Yes | 80% | Yes | Yes | | No | | No | No | No | Yes, unknown #/hours, Coord Yes |
| 10 SEAACA (Cities) | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100% | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Limited | Imp 501c3 | Yes | No | Yes, est 30, very limited, No Coordinator |
| 11 Solano | No | Requested | No | 0% | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes, 60, Coord Yes |
| 12 Sonoma | No | Requested | Yes | 60% | Yes, 3 | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes, 180-190, 12,000-13,000 hours, Coordinator, Yes |
| 13 Stanislaus | Yes | N/A | Yes | 100 | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes, 259, Coord yes |
| 14 Tulare | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 Ventura | Yes | Yes | Yes | 100% | Yes, 2 | Contract Vet/114 | Contract Vet/Trailer | No | No | No | No | No | Yes, est 170, No Coordinator |