

Animal Care & Control



AD HOC TASK FORCE

BUDGET & FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE

December 10, 2014 from 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm

The Chair opened the meeting by asking members to comment on any surprises or take-away items from the budget presentation from the November 24th meeting. The following comments were noted:

- Realizing there was an expenditure limit.
- The average cost shown per animal.
- Shortage of staffing.
- Lack of surgical tables.
- Seeing that the Director's Wish List is similar to the topics discussed within the Task Force meetings.

A member noted that one of the strategic goals is to increase dog licensing to 45%. The member suggested the group discuss how best to support.

A member noted that in a previous presentation there was a comment made about continuously streamlining processes. The member suggested that specific examples are shared with the group.

Another comment was to seek ways to update or change the laws as it relates to the department as well as the budget or expenditure limit.

There was discussion on the sustainability of performing 10,000 spay & neuter procedures – How will this be accomplished? Has additional funding been requested from the Board of Supervisors? What has the historic pattern of requests?

A member stated that animal welfare in Maricopa County should be looked at as a whole. It is important for members be aware of what is happening outside of just MCACC. A member offered that the Alliance for Companion Animals may have stats for member to review. The Chair will see what may be easily available.

ACTION ITEM: The Chair is to discuss the general state of animal welfare in the County. A benchmarking report has been posted for members. The Chair will lead the discussion on the report and determine if there are other communities to which MCACC should be compared at the next meeting.

The question of wages was raised and a member asked, "What has been done in terms of wage increases at the County?"

ACTION ITEM: Information will be requested from the Office of Management & Budget related to wage increases over the past few years.

A member shared that in the past, public pleas have been released asking for food and there was an overwhelming outpouring. The member suggested that more be done to get public support, "...animals die here. Why doesn't the County own that?"

With respect to raising funds, there was discussion there may be limits.

ACTION ITEM: Define the expenditure limitation as it relates to MCACC by statute. Does this include fundraising? The request for additional information will be forwarded to the Office of Management & Budget.

Dr. Silva presented an overview of the fee structure as previously requested by members. Some additional discussion items were noted during the presentation:

- There is no marketing budget.
- Kennel permits are for breeders and fanciers – it is really about multi-dog licensing.
- The fees were last revised in 2010.
- An increase in fees sometime results in decreased compliance.
- MCACC pays \$8.50 per microchip by contract.
- A member suggested utilizing a passive chip that actually performs robo-calls and texts that cost \$4.95 each. Dr. Silva related that microchips are not 100% fail-proof. Studies have shown there is about a 25% failure rate.
- 96-97% of the animals that enter the shelter have no source of identification.
- 96-97% of the animals that enter the shelter are unaltered.
- The owner relinquish fee is \$51 and is not waived.
- The clinic is the critical component and is the bottleneck. Increasing the capacity in the clinic is the key.
- There are clinic fees for the New Hope partners.

ACTION ITEM: Valerie Beckett to have the presentation posted on the CitizensForPets.org website.

Dr. Silva then moved into a presentation on the relationship between the department and HALO. Some of the additional discussion items noted:

- HALO has 31 staff members at West; whereas, the County has 20. The 20 could not fulfill the adoption needs.
- Dr. Silva explained a formal Request for Proposal is not required for a partnership when the County is not paying for services. To be sure the process was open, a request was released and only two vendors responded.
- Dr. Silva stated this partnership is about saving lives and HALO was the only partner able to put 31 boots on the ground. As a result, the customer experience is much better.
- HALO remits payments for each animal.
- HALO has 8 adoption centers across the valley.
- HALO has a partnership with the AZ Humane Society for cats.
- Dr. Silva believes this relationship is working tremendously. HALO has the capacity and for any growing pains, increasing live releases is worth it.

ACTION ITEM: Valerie Beckett to have the presentation posted on the CitizensForPets.org website.

A member suggested the Task Force should discuss how to revisit the contract – build in checks and balances, and how to better separate intake and adoptions. It was stated that there shouldn't be two adoption centers at the same location. There are very distinct differences in how both adoption services are handled.

The Chair posed the question that if the group were to recommend the same level of service and access to bedding, what would that look like in terms of cost?

Due to the time, the meeting was concluded.

Next / Remaining Follow-up Items:

From 11/12/2014 meeting –

- Data on Population, Intake, Live Release and Comparison to other communities – Benchmarking discussion

From 12/10/2014 meeting –

- Request information on wage increase history (past 5 years).
- Request for specific impact the expenditure limit has on the department? Does it include fundraising?