MEMORANDUM

Date: February 19, 2014

To: Chairman and Members
Pima County Bond Advisory Committee

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

Re: **Review of Animal Care Services in Six Cities/Counties**

I recently forwarded to you requests from the Pima County Board of Health and Animal Care Advisory Committee requesting that the Board of Supervisors hold a bond election in 2014 to replace the existing Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) facility.

Both requests cited a report that is also attached to this memorandum, which compares and contrasts animal care services provided in six southwestern cities and counties, one of which was Pima County. The study concludes that Pima County's animal shelter staff are handling numbers of animals that are two to three times greater than the other jurisdictions, while having the lowest budget-per-animal handled. In short, Pima County's shelter is understaffed and underfunded as compared to these other communities. Many of you may be unaware that PACC handled 22,000 animals last year.

The Board has taken some short-term actions since the completion of this report to add a limited number of additional staff. Additional changes to the PACC operating budget will be considered by the Board during the upcoming budget review and approval process.

CHH/dr

Attachment

c: The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors
Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Health Department
Kim Janes, Manager, Pima Animal Care Center
Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator
Diana Durazo, Special Staff Assistant to the County Administrator

MEMORANDUM

Medical and Health Services

Date: November 18, 2013

To: C. H. Huckelberry
County Administrator

From: Jan Lesher
Deputy County Administrator

Re: Review of Animal Care Services in Six Cities/Counties

As part of a review and assessment of the operations of Pima Animal Care Center (PACC) staff from the Office of the Assistant County Administrator for Health conducted a study to compare and contrast the operations, budget, staffing and services provided by six similar jurisdictions with those offered at PACC. This report will be one of several tools used to analyze the appropriate level of support needed to operate an effective and efficient facility for the care and treatment of animals in Pima County.

As noted in the report, the most startling finding from this study is that Pima County residents have the highest demand for shelter services and the lowest budgeted dollars per animal handled of all respondents reporting their budget for shelter services. The report states, "The impact of this significant demand was particularly remarkable in its impact on shelter staff handling volumes that are two to three times greater than other respondents..."

The report looks at:

- Reporting Structures
- Service Comparability
  - Scope of Services
  - Population Density
  - Enforcement and Field Services
- Population Demand for Enforcement Services
- Enforcement Service Volume
- Shelter Services
  - Hours of Shelter Operation
  - Release Rates
  - Innovative Reunification of Adoption Strategies
- Licensing Services
- Volunteers
- Budget and Staffing Levels
  - Overall Budget

- Staffing Concentration
- Staffing of Enforcement Services
- Staffing of Shelter Services

- Fees Charged

Attached is that report, which will now be shared with the Animal Care Advisory Board, the Board of Health and other interested and impacted parties.

JL/cbc

Attachment

cc: Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Pima County Health Department
Mr. Kim Janes, Manager, Pima Animal Care Center
Pima Animal Care Advisory Board
Pima County Board of Health

PIMA COUNTY

Review of Animal Care Services in Six Cities/Counties

Prepared by: Office of the Assistant County Administrator

Staff: Sarah Davis, Special Staff Assistant
Amy Fish, Program Coordinator
Honey Pivirotto, Assistant County Administrator for Health

November 15, 2013

Review of Animal Care Services in Six Cities/Counties

Scope of the Study

Pima County leadership requested a study to analyze the operations, budget, staffing and services provided for its Pima Animal Care Center (PACC). Leadership provided a listing of cities and counties to include in the survey. Staff responsible for the survey and subsequent report worked closely with Kim Janes, the Director of Pima Animal Care Center (PACC), to refine the original draft questionnaire to assure it addressed the full scope of services PACC provides. Mr. Janes contacted each organization to alert the leadership of Pima County's commitment to this study and to request their cooperation.

Staff held an initial phone call to describe the scope of the study and answer questions about the survey. The survey was distributed to the willing participants to complete in advance of a formal interview by phone. Phone interviews ranging from one to two hours were conducted with each participant to discuss details of their responses. The study relied on verification of data by participants and utilized budgeted costs for the current year.

The original listing of suggested participants and those actively engaged in this study are in **Appendix A.** The following report details key findings from this work effort. It was clear to the County staff performing the study that subsequent, more detailed examinations of facilities and operations beyond the scope of this study could prove valuable as both strategic and operational plans are developed for PACC.

Limitations

This report was developed on the data provided by the respondents, including PACC, without independent verification of financial and statistical data sets. The financial and staffing analyses are based on budgeted not actual data as reported by animal care leadership who responded to Pima County's request for information. The focus and timeline of the study precluded review and examination with the financial personnel from each respondent of the expense categories and cost allocation plan methodology used for assigning administration and other costs. No data were provided to permit an evaluation of the variance between budget and actual data. It should be noted that this study did not examine the extent to which fees are actually charged for services rendered. Additionally, no adjustments were made for regional variations in wages, benefits or other budgeted costs.

Reporting Structure

Table 1 highlights the fact that animal care reports outside of any other operation directly to the city or county administrative team in all jurisdictions except Pima County.

Service Comparability

Scope of Services

All respondents report providing the same categories of services: enforcement/field services, shelter/adoption services, and communication/outreach and education services. However, the scope and hours of these operations differ from Pima County. These differences are described in greater detail with a comparison to Pima County operations in the following sections of this report.

The participants represent a diverse set of operations both in terms of the geography and population as well as the nature of services provided. As a first step, density of population across the geographic area served by each respondent was calculated to identify comparable service areas.

Population Density

Data on population served and square miles covered were used to identify the sites most comparable to Pima County in terms of population density (population per square mile). The respondents with the most comparable population density to Pima County were determined to be Clark County and Maricopa County. Pima County population density for its service area is 109 persons per square mile; Clark County is 108 and Maricopa County is 217. **Table 2** provides a comparison of population density.

Key Operational Findings

<u>Enforcement/Field Services</u>

The terms Enforcement and Field Services are used interchangeably. The terms include responses by Animal Care Officers (ACOs) to calls requesting assistance with an array of events that may include animal bites, stray or roaming animals, nuisance events including animal waste and noise, and animal welfare issue such as neglect and abuse. Pima County responds for all of these events. Others do not.

The first service noted in which Pima County differs from others is nuisance events. Only Clark County and the San Diego County address animal waste. In the other municipalities waste calls are handled by other departments in the city or county e.g., zoning.

The second service which varies from that provided by PACC and other respondents is animal welfare including neglect and abuse. In Maricopa County these calls are referred to law enforcement which includes the Sheriff's Department for unincorporated areas and city police departments in municipalities. Law enforcement responds to the call by going to the site of alleged neglect and abuse. Once they assess the situation and determine that further action is required, Maricopa County Animal Care Center transports the animal to the Humane Society which provides temporary housing.

The third service area that differs is wild animal calls. PACC responds to wild animal calls as does Austin, TX and San Diego. However, the other respondents do not provide this service. Maricopa County refers to Arizona Game and Fish. San Antonio refers to Texas Wildlife and Fish. Clark County indicates that for the most part they are now referring these calls to the Nevada Game and Fish.

A fourth area of differing policy was noted in Maricopa County which does not permit drop off of healthy animals for euthanasia. Owners are instead directed to their veterinarian's office for this service.

Population Demand for Enforcement Services

Table 3 compares the demand for enforcement services per 1,000 residents in the service areas across Pima County and respondents. Interestingly the demand for service in those areas most comparable to Pima County in terms of the population density, Clark County and Maricopa County, were quite variable. Pima County's demand for enforcement services is 32 per 1,000 residents whereas Clark County and Maricopa County are 44 and 19 respectively. With the exception of San Antonio and Clark County all other areas surveyed had a lower demand for enforcement services per 1,000 residents. Clearly, Pima County residents have a strong demand for these services. The top three service requests for enforcement across all respondents including PACC are: stray and loose animals, animal bites, and animal welfare. By far the majority of these calls are for dogs versus cats.

Enforcement Service Volume

Table 4 relates the volume of enforcement service demand to the ACO staffing levels and overall staffing level. PACC has the second highest response rate per ACO of the six areas included in the study exceeded only by the City of San Antonio. This indicates a highly productive team of ACOs. However, once total staffing, specifically Managers Supervisors Dispatch staff is included with ACO staffing and compared to service volumes, PACC ranks second lowest of the six respondents to the study. The variation in handling of dispatch services between the respondents may explain some of the variation and warrants further examination. Both the City of Austin and the City of San Antonio use a non-emergency hotline (311) to initially screen dispatch calls reducing the call burden on

the dispatchers in the enforcement unit. The change in ranking when comparing response rates for just ACO staff versus the response rate for all enforcement staff warrants further review of the array of functions performed by Managers, Supervisors, and Dispatchers. In comparison to the other two sites with comparable population density per square mile of service, (Clark County and Maricopa County), which has direct impact on the time it takes for ACOs to respond to enforcement calls, PACC's response rate by the total enforcement team is comparable to that of Maricopa County (813 versus 953) and substantially lower than Clark County (813 versus 1573). It should be noted, however, that Clark County has a significantly higher volume of calls that are resolved without ACO onsite response. Instead Clark County resolves a substantial volume of calls through letters or phone calls rather than a staff response to the site of the call. This skews the comparison of service volumes per staff reflecting a considerably higher response rate per staff than can be achieved when responding in person to the call. It also should be noted that Maricopa County does not perform the full range of services that PACC provides which also skews a direct comparison.

Shelter Services

All study participants provide shelter services. Clark County contracts out these services to three animal shelter groups from the community and therefore was limited in the data they could provide. All respondents other than Pima County have multiple shelter sites in the community to make the shelter service as well as adoption services more accessible to the community. San Antonio is the only respondent indicating they stop intake when full or nearing capacity in their shelters.

However, as can be seen from **Table 5**, Pima County shows the highest utilization of shelter services per 1,000 residents of any of the survey participants. The significant pressure this level of service demand creates is further illustrated in a review of the volume of shelter services handled by the shelter staff as shown on **Table 6**. With each staff person handling 1,535 shelter services units, the service volume handled by PACC staff is nearly double the second highest performing shelter in Austin, Texas as well as Maricopa County and triple that of the volume expected of shelter staff in San Diego County and the City of San Antonio, Texas.

Hours of Shelter Operation

Austin, San Antonio and Pima County provide the most hours of access to shelters by the public with access not only during traditional business hours but substantial access during nights, weekends and holidays. A strategy of interest is the one utilized by San Antonio. At the beginning of each fiscal year, they examine their staffing budget to identify which four holidays have had the most traffic from the public and then focus their staffing resources, including overtime hours, accordingly. Also of note, Austin is only closed on

Thanksgiving and Christmas operating their shelter all other days of the year. The goal of improving access to the shelters is to improve the rate of adoptions and therefore live release.

Release Rates

All participants surveyed report improvement in live release rates. Two factors were identified as contributing to improvement in live release rates: increased utilization of veterinary services and greater engagement with community partners focused on rescue and foster homes.

These initiatives evolve out of widespread acceptance of ASILOMAR Accords developed by animal welfare stakeholders including Humane Societies and animal care centers across the nation. All survey respondents have adopted the ASILOMAR Accords. These standards redefine what is considered a healthy or treatable animal. As a result increasing numbers of animals that would have previously been euthanized are now under treatment by veterinarians. The increased engagement of the rescue and foster partners has expanded the rehabilitation resources prior to the adoption of the animal.

As reported in the October 23, 2013 memo from Mr. Huckelberry to the Board of Supervisors, PACC's live release rate has increased to 72% from 49% just two years ago. In fact, there has been continual improvement as evidenced by the 64% live release rate reported by PACC for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013. Austin, San Diego and San Antonio had the highest live release rates at 93%, 84% and 77% respectively. Since adoption of the ASILOMAR Accords, San Diego reports it has not euthanized a single healthy animal, based on their evolving definition of "healthy", in five years.

San Antonio's philosophy of the last two years emphasizing treatment and rehabilitation has resulted in a dramatic increase in their live release rate from 31% to 77%. **Table 7** details the significant number of rescue and foster partners PACC and the other respondents report working with to improve their live release rate. PACC reports the lowest volume of rescue and foster partners in comparison to the other respondents. All respondents indicate they are focused on leveraging the ASILOMAR Accords to improve their live release rate and accelerating concentrated efforts at collaborative relationships with foster and rescue organizations.

Innovative Reunification or Adoption Strategies

Several respondents identified innovative strategies. When Maricopa County responds to a call regarding a loose or stray animal, they photograph the animal and load the information on the location of the animal on a website called NoLostPetsMaricopa.org which showcases a map and the location of the animals. By hovering over the animal indicator,

the person seeking to locate their lost animal can see a picture of the animal and its location. This information is also hooked to a live Twitter feed.

Maricopa County Animal Care also has a unique partnership between Metrocenter Mall and PetSmart Charities. The Metrocenter Mall location in Phoenix permits Maricopa County to operate an adoption location, rent free, in lieu of leasing space to a privately operated pet store. Maricopa County pays a predetermined modest dollar amount for utilities and provides their staff for the adoption operation in this mall site. More recently, Maricopa County formed a similar collaboration with PetSmart Charities in Old Town Scottsdale. At this site, the County utilizes PetSmart Charities sponsored space for adoption of their animals.

San Antonio Animal Care applied for a $1 million grant from Petco Corporation and Petco Foundation. The funds were used to build a facility housing adoption services, a spay and neuter clinic and a pavilion for education on animal care and adoption events. Petco also committed to paying $200,000 per year over five years towards the operating costs of the services at this site. The site is named Petco. It is operated by Petco staff, must be a "no kill" facility and take in 3,000 pets from the San Antonio Animal Care operation each year. Only San Antonio Animal Care pets can be housed at this center.

While the respondents reported a shortage of staff to apply for any grant opportunities, it is clear from reviewing the National Animal Care Association (NACA) website that there are substantial grant opportunities that could be pursued. See **Appendix B** for NACA listing of grant opportunities.

Licensing Services

Only Pima, Maricopa and San Diego require licenses. The other three respondents do not require animal licensure. In Pima County the licensing charge is $15 per year per altered dog. Last fiscal year, PACC reports 110,000 licenses were sold representing $1,650,000. PACC reports a 50% compliance rate in comparison to 42% in Maricopa and 25% in San Diego. Compliance rate is calculated based on the number of licensed dogs versus the total number of dogs estimated by the American Veterinary Medicine Association.

Volunteers

All respondents use volunteers reporting anywhere from 300 to 600 active volunteers in their programs and use of volunteers primarily in shelter and general animal care or for outreach and communication activities including adoption events. **Table 8** details the volunteer data. PACC shows the lowest volume of volunteer full time equivalents (FTEs) at 9; other respondents report between 13 and 22 FTEs of volunteer time annually and a variety of recognition strategies and awards focused on recruitment and retention of the

volunteers. Full time equivalents represent conversion of hours of work effort to a standard of 2,080 hours per year.

Only PACC and Maricopa utilize state prisoners as volunteers. Pima County utilizes an average of 20 male prisoners per day supervised by a guard from Arizona Department of Correction (ADOC) to assure no public interaction.

Maricopa limits its use of prisoners to female prisoners with a one year prison term who are enrolled in a working trustee program. Currently there are three to five female prisoners in this program. The program permitting male prisoners was cancelled one year ago due to the oversight burden. The current program is operated through a contract with the ADOC and also includes a guard posted onsite to assure no interaction between the female prisoners and the public.

Clark County is the only respondent that utilizes three to five volunteers for enforcement activities including citations. This is a different model from the other respondents which focus the use of volunteers on shelter services or community outreach and collaboration.

Budget and Staffing Levels

Overall Budget

Table 9 details the budget for the service areas of enforcement, shelter and adoption, veterinary services and communication/outreach, administrative costs and the grand total of all costs budgeted for fiscal year 2013. Administrative/other costs range from 7% to 29% of the grand total of costs. Clark County and the City of Austin reported the lowest administrative/other costs at 7% and 10% respectively with the City of San Antonio, San Diego County and PACC reporting 23%, 24%, and 26% respectively.

PACC has the second lowest annual budgeted dollars and provides the widest array of services. On a per capita basis, PACC's budget ranks third highest at $6.34 per resident after the City of Austin ($7.80) and Maricopa ($6.92). To increase the per capita expenditure for Pima County to the level of Maricopa, assuming no change in scope of service, would require an additional budget authorization to the 2013 budget level of over $575,000. To match the per capita level reported by the City of Austin would require an additional $1.5 million.

Staffing Concentration

Staffing is the major element of total operating cost. Between 70% and 83% of actual FTE positions are utilized in the service areas of enforcement and shelter services.

Staffing of Enforcement Services

The approach to evaluating staffing sufficiency was to examine the volume of service per FTE. As mentioned previously in this report and shown on **Table 4**, PACC ranked second highest of the six respondents in terms of volume of service per ACO. However, it is second lowest in terms of service volume across all enforcement staff (ACOs plus Managers, Supervisors, and Dispatch). Clark County's service volume per FTE is 93% greater than PACC; San Antonio's volume is 56% greater and Maricopa's is 17% greater than PACC. The low level of service volume across all enforcement FTES versus the ACO's performance in Pima County raises questions about the performance and number of staff in positions of Manager, Supervisor and Dispatch.

Staffing of Shelter Services

PACC's staffing per service volume is by far the lowest of the other four respondents for which shelter staffing was available. Clark County could not be evaluated as they contract shelter services to other organizations in the community and could not report FTEs for this service. The variation between PACC and the other four respondents is significant. The level of services per FTE that PACC staff must provide ranges from 72% to 239% higher than any of the other four respondents. These date make it clear that shelter services in Pima County are not adequately staffed for current volumes.

The staffing deficiency is also evident when comparing actual shelter staff to staffing standards for services published by National Animal Care Association (NACA). NACA recommends that each shelter and animal care facility be staffed daily with the appropriate number of kennel personnel to assure appropriate care and a safe working environment. NACA has created a formula for projecting kennel staffing to insure Animal Care providers can adhere to the minimal animal care standards. This formula is based on the number of individuals living in the service area. The formula is noted on **Table 10** which details the projected kennel staffing for each of the six survey participants, including PACC.

Using NACA standards all survey participants are substantially understaffed in the shelter service raising questions about the validity of the standard. PACC, however, would require the largest percentage increase of all six respondents with a projected need to hire 276% more staff or 47 staff at a cost slightly greater than $2 million per year in wages and benefits. **Table 10** displays the comparison of NACA projected staffing level at the shelter to the actual staffing levels for all six respondents.

Fees Charged

Appendix C provides a comparison of fees charged for the various services across the six survey participants. Of note is that PACC has the most comprehensive fee schedule and offers a 10% discount for seniors on adoption services. PACC has the highest boarding day rate and the highest impound rate. Fee opportunities identified for PACC include: rabies quarantine fee, fees for third and subsequent impounds, livestock impound fee, hoarding fees for instances requiring pickup of large numbers of animals. Also of note is the fact that the $15 owner requested euthanasia fee was established a rate far below what a community veterinarian would charge, in an effort to recognize the need for low cost options, Pima County may want to examine the feasibility of a sliding fee scale for this service. Assuming PACC is actually charging all the fees where appropriate, additional fees should generate a new revenue stream. It should be noted that this study did not examine the extent to which fees are actually charged for services rendered but this work effort is one the County Finance Department could consider undertaking to assume maximization of revenue.

Summary and Conclusions

The most startling finding from this study was that Pima County residents have the highest demand for shelter services and the lowest budgeted dollars per animal handled of all respondents reporting their budget for shelter services. The impact of this significant demand was particularly remarkable in its impact on shelter staff handling volumes that are two to three times greater than other respondents as shown on Table 6 (1,535 compared to a range of 453 to 894).

PACC reports the second lowest total annual budgeted dollars, provides the widest array of services and experiences the most extreme demand for shelter services for its resources of all six respondents. On a per capita basis, PACC's budget ranks third highest at $6.34 per resident after the City of Austin ($7.80) and Maricopa ($6.92). To increase the per capita expenditure for Pima County to the level of Maricopa, assuming no change in scope of service, would require an additional budget authorization to the 2013 budget level of over $575,000. To match the per capita level reported by the City of Austin would require an additional $1.5 million. It is logical to conclude essentially all increases in funding should be directed to shelter services.

The survey also highlights opportunities and areas requiring further investigation or action. There are four areas detailed in which Pima County can consider eliminating or modifying its services ultimately reducing the burden on its enforcement resources and at the same time reducing the pressure on shelter services. For example, PACC could consider following Maricopa's policy of utilizing the Arizona Department of Game and Fish for wild animal calls which is comparable to the other respondents. Additionally, Pima County

could consider utilizing the GIS tracking initiative Maricopa County has implemented along with its Twitter strategy to reduce the burden on PACC of responding to inquiries about lost animals. To further accelerate the improvement in the live release rate, Pima County could expand its efforts to partner with the community on storefront models perhaps examining more closely strategies used by the City of San Antonio and Maricopa County.

Further review of the scope of work performed by the Manager, Supervisor and Dispatch staff in Enforcement is recommended as the service level per FTE decreases to the second lowest of the six study participants in comparison to the service level per just Animal Control Officers in which Pima County ranks second highest of the participants. .

Revenue opportunities also exist. With the availability of competent grant writing staff in the Pima County Health Department, consideration can now be given to aggressive pursuit of grant opportunities beginning with the listing published by NACA and outreach to PetSmart and Petco which have engaged in innovative strategies in Maricopa and San Antonio. These funds can be leveraged to support PACC's capital and operating needs thereby reducing the burden on the County taxpayers.

Review of Animal Care in Six Cities / Counties

Listing of Data Tables:

Table 1: Reporting Structure among Animal Care Center Respondents

Table 2: Population Density for Service Area

Table 3: Comparison of Enforcement Service Demand per 1,000 Residents Served

Table 4: Enforcement Service Volume Response Rate per Animal Care Officer (ACO) and per Overall Staffing (ACOs + Managers, Supervisors and Dispatchers)

Table 5: Shelter Volume by Service Type and Demand for Shelter Services per 1,000 Residents Served

Table 6: Shelter and Adoption Volume by FTE

Table 7: Re-homing Strategy

Table 8: Volunteer and Prisoner Utilization

Table 9: Grand Total Budget for all Costs Including Administrative for Animal Care Operations

Table 10: Projected Staffing Levels Using the NACA Staffing Formula

Prepared by: Office of the Assistant County Administrator for Health

November 15, 2013

Table 1: Reporting Structure Among Animal Care Center Respondents

Respondent	Reporting	Additional Notes
Pima County, AZ	Reports directly to the Director of the Health Department	N/A
City of Austin, TX	Reports directly to the City Manager of the City of Austin	Formerly part of the Health Department; Health Department still provides HR and Budget/Finance Support Services
Clark County, NV	Leadership reports to Administrative services which is the oversight support for the commissioners as well as some enforcement agencies, who reports to County manager, who reports to the Board of County Commissioners	N/A
Maricopa County, AZ	Leadership reports operations to Dr. Rodrigo Silva who performs a dual role as the Director and Assistant County Manager	N/A
City of San Antonio, TX	Leadership reports operations to the City Manager of the City of San Antonio	N/A
San Diego County, CA	Leadership reports the County Administrative Officer, who reports the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer; Contract Cities report to City Managers	N/A

Table 1.

Table 2: Population Density for Service Area

Respondent	Square Miles	Population	Density (Population / Square Miles Served)
Pima County, AZ	9,200	1 Million	109*
City of Austin, TX	1,022	1.1 Million	1,076
Clark County, NV	7,910	858,000	108*
Maricopa County, AZ	9,224	2 Million	217*
City of San Antonio, TX	460	1.4 Million	3,182
San Diego County, CA	4,199	3 Million	714

* Most comparable in terms of population density of areas served by Animal Care Services

Table 2.

Table 3: Comparison of Enforcement Service Demand per 1,000 Residents Served

Respondent	Population	Per 1000 Residents	Total Number of Enforcement Responses Completed	Enforcement Service Volume Per 1000 Residents	% Variation from PACC
Pima County, AZ	1,000,000	1,000	31,708	32	
City of Austin, TX	1,100,000	1,100	22,307	20	-36%
Clark County, NV	858,000	858	37,741	44	39%
Maricopa County, AZ	2,000,000	2,000	37,396	19	-41%
City of San Antonio, TX	1,400,000	1,400	60,743	43	37%
San Diego County, CA	3,000,000	3,000	30,861	10	-68%

Table 3.

Table 4: Enforcement Service Volume Response Rate per Animal Care Officer (ACO) and per Overall Staffing (ACOs + Managers, Supervisors and Dispatchers)

Respondent	FTEs Animal Control Officers (ACOs)	Total Service Volume for ACO: (Response for Stray/Loose, Animal Welfare, Rabies, Bites, Nuisance, Wild Animals, NOT other)	Response Rate by ACO FTES ONLY	% Variation from PACC	Total Service Volume per Enforcement Department	All Enforcement FTEs: Division Totals (ACOs, Supvs, Mgrs, and Dispatch)	Response Rate by ALL Enforcement Division FTEs	% Variation from PACC
Pima County, AZ	25	29,079	1,163		31,708	39	813	
City of Austin, TX	19	19,074	1,004	-14%	22,307	23	991	22%
Clark County, NV	13	10,037	772	-34%	37,741	24	1,573	93%
Maricopa County, AZ	30	21,368	712	-39%	39,056	41	953	17%
City of San Antonio, TX	39	50,637	1,298	12%	60,743	48	1,265	56%
San Diego County, CA	31	16,383	528	-55%	30,861	44	701	-14%

Table 4.

Table 5: Shelter Volume by Service Type and Demand for Shelter Services per 1,000 Residents Served

Respondent	# of Shelters Operated	Dog Impounds (Total from Enforcement and Civilian Drop-off)	Cat Impounds (Total from Enforcement and Civilian Drop-off)	Owner Requested Euthanasia - data include both healthy and unhealthy animals	Animals Handled in Shelter (Number Dogs/Cats Impounded + Owner Requested Euthanasia)	Budget for Shelter Services	Budget per Animal Handled	Utilization of Shelter Services per 1,000 Population Served
Pima County, AZ	1	15,000	8,000	3,100	26,100	$ 1,300,745	$ 50	26
City of Austin, TX	2	10,856	7,811	106	18,773	$ 3,087,961	$ 164	17
Clark County, NV	3 (Contracted)	10,215	8,436	1,082	19,733	$ 1,800,000	$ 91	23
Maricopa County, AZ	2	34,000	4,000	Maricopa did not provide any figures for euthanasia. Maricopa's policy is that an owner wishing to euthanize a health animal must go to a private vet and pay the required fee to that vet.	38,000	NO BUDGET DETAIL AT THIS TIME	NO BUDGET DETAIL AT THIS TIME	NO BUDGET DETAIL AT THIS TIME
City of San Antonio, TX	2	21,500	7,500	400	29,400	$ 3,000,000	$ 102	21
San Diego County, CA	3	13,343	8,450	2,689	24,482	$ 2,300,000	$ 94	8

Table 6: Shelter and Adoption Volume by FTE

Respondent	Shelter FTEs (All Shelter)	Animals Handled in Shelter (Number Dogs/Cats Impounded + Owner Requested Euthanasia)	Service Volume per Shelter FTE	% Variation from PACC
Pima County, AZ	17	26,100	1,535	
City of Austin, TX	21	18,773	894	-42%
Clark County, NV	Contracts with 3 Shelters	19,733	NOT AVAILABLE	NOT AVAILABLE
Maricopa County, AZ	48	38,000	792	-48%
City of San Antonio, TX	50	29,400	588	-62%
San Diego County, CA	54	24,482	453	-70%

Table 6.

Table 7: Re-homing Strategy

Respondent	Rescue / Foster Partners
Pima County, AZ	50-75 Rescue and Foster Partners
City of Austin, TX	110 Rescue Partners, 622 Foster Partners
Clark County, NV	CONTRACTED SERVICE; NO DETAILS AVAILABLE
Maricopa County, AZ	97 Rescue Partners, 115 Foster Partners
City of San Antonio, TX	70 Rescue Organizations, 9-12 Rescue Partners
San Diego County, CA	200 Rescue Organizations, Fosters done through Rescue, 25 Additional Fosters

Table 8: Volunteer and Prisoner Utilization

Respondent	Volunteers Exclusive of State Prisoners	Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) = 2080 hours per year equivalents	State Prisoners
Pima County, AZ	300 active	9.0	20 males
City of Austin, TX	622 active	22.0	NOT UTILIZED
Clark County, NV	2-5 active	MINIMAL	NOT UTILIZED
Maricopa County, AZ	600	16.5	3 to 5 females
City of San Antonio, TX	500 in database, 300-350 active	13.0	NOT UTILIZED
San Diego County, CA	500+ active	Does not reduce staff costs because services are limited to walking pets and occasional outreach events	NOT UTILIZED

Table 9: Grand Total Budget for all Costs for Animal Care Operations

Respondent	Total Direct Services Budget for Animal Care Exclusive of Administrative Costs	Administrative AND Other Costs not Reported as Direct Service Costs	Grand Total Budget Including Administrative	Administrative and Other Costs as a % of Grand Total Costs	Population Served	Grand Total Budget Including Administrative Costs - per Resident	% Variation from Pima County
Pima County, AZ	$ 4,670,575	$ 1,670,626	$ 6,341,201	26%	1,000,000	$ 6.34	
City of Austin, TX	$ 7,709,351	$ 875,637	$ 8,584,988	10%	1,100,000	$ 7.80	23%
Clark County, NV	$ 3,686,316	$ 277,731	$ 3,963,047	7%	858,000	$ 4.62	-27%
Maricopa County, AZ	DETAIL NOT AVAILABLE	DETAIL NOT AVAILABLE	$ 13,833,309	DETAIL NOT AVAILABLE	2,000,000	$ 6.92	9%
City of San Antonio, TX	$ 8,715,136	$ 2,545,673	$ 11,260,809	23%	1,400,000	$ 8.04	27%
San Diego County, CA	$ 12,023,746	$ 3,798,651	$ 15,822,397	24%	3,000,000	$ 5.27	-17%

Table 10: Projected Staffing Levels Using National Animal Care Association Shelter Staffing Formula

Respondent	Human Population or Residents in Each Service Area	Incoming Animal Population Per Year (Population X 0.07)	Incoming Animals Per Day (Projected Incoming Animal Population divided by 365)	Animals in Shelter Per Day (Incoming Animals per Day X 4)	Number of Minutes Needed (Animals in Shelter per Day x15)	Number of Hours Needed (Number of Minutes Needed divided by 60)	Staff Needed per Day (Projected Hours divided by 3)	Current Staffing Level for Shelter Services (FTEs)	Additional Staffing Required to Meeting NACA Proposed Level	% Variance from Current Staffing Level (FTEs)
Pima County, AZ	1,000,000	70,000	192	767	11,507	192	64	17	47	276%
City of Austin, TX	1,100,000	77,000	211	844	12,658	211	70	53	17	33%
Clark County, NV	858,000	60,060	165	658	9,873	165	55	Contracts with 3 Shelters	Contracts with 3 Shelters	Contracts with 3 Shelters
Maricopa County, AZ	2,000,000	140,000	384	1,534	23,014	384	128	69	59	85%
City of San Antonio, TX	1,400,000	98,000	268	1,074	16,110	268	89	50	39	79%
San Diego County, CA	3,000,000	210,000	575	2,301	34,521	575	192	54	138	255%

Table 10.

Appendix A:

Original Listing of Counties or Cities to Contact for Participation in the Survey

APPENDIX A

Original Listing of Counties or Cities to Contact for Participation in the Survey

Albuquerque, New Mexico	DID NOT CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE
Washoe County, Nevada	DID NOT CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE
City of San Antonio, Texas	PARTICIPATED
San Diego County, California	PARTICIPATED
City of Austin, Texas	PARTICIPATED
City of Jacksonville, Florida	DID NOT CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE
Maricopa County, Arizona	PARTICIPATED
Salt Lake City, Utah	DID NOT CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE
City of Las Vegas, Nevada	DID NOT CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE
Clark County, Nevada	PARTICIPATED
City of El Paso, Texas	DID NOT CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE

Appendix B:

National Animal Care Association (NACA) Identified Grant Opportunities

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

Animal Assistance Foundation - Colorado

Applicants must be 501(c)(3) organizations located in Colorado or directly benefiting Colorado pet owners. Grants for long-term funding, endowment funds, or retirement of debt will not be considered. AAF is interested in making grants that demonstrate new approaches to animal care and the understanding of the importance of animals.

www.aaf-fd.org/

Animal Welfare Trust

The Animal Welfare Trust's grant program seeks to assist organizations whose work can help alleviate animal suffering and/or raise public consciousness toward giving animals the respect they so need and deserve. Although general organizational funding will be considered, preference will be given to well-defined projects with clear goals and objectives. Capital projects will not be considered. foundationcenter.org/grantmaker/

Arcus Foundation

The Arcus Foundation lends special emphasis to programs and organizations which recognize that members of the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender (GLBT) community deserve to be welcomed and celebrated. Located in Kalamazoo, Michigan, the Arcus Foundation devotes many of its philanthropic resources to improving the quality of life in Southwestern Michigan.

www.arcusfoundation.org/pages/

Arthur L. and Elaine V. Johnson Foundation

The Foundation can award grants to organizations which provide for the care, benefit, support and preservation of seeing eye dogs or other animals trained to assist the sight impaired or otherwise handicapped individuals (or that facilitate the use of such animals by sight-impaired or otherwise handicapped individuals). We do not fund the therapeutic use of animals.

www.aljfoundation.org/

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

Banfield Charitable Trust

The Banfield Charitable Trust funds programs that help pets and their families stay together. Our Pet Advocacy Grants are awarded twice a year with application package deadlines on June 30 and November 30. Guidelines and application can be downloaded from our website.

www.banfieldcharitabletrust.org

Bernice Barbour Foundation

The Bernice Barbour Foundation is a private charity established by the late Bernice Wall Barbour. It is a trust to be used for preservation and care of animals, and prevention of cruelty to animals in the United States. The Foundation primarily supports programs of IRS 501(c)(3) organizations whose purpose is to benefit animals. Organizations must have completed one year of actual hands-on animal care.

www.bernicebarbour.org

Brigitte Bardot Foundation - International

The Brigitte Bardot Foundation fight against all forms of animal suffering in France and abroad. She participates in projects of reintroduction to the wild and the creation of sanctuaries and rehabilitation centers for wildlife as well as in the development of laws protecting animals and implements awareness campaigns among the general public.

www.fondationbrigittebardot.fr/

Charles A. and Anne Morrow Lindbergh Foundation

The Charles A. and Anne Morrow Lindbergh Foundation presents Lindbergh Grants to individuals whose proposed research or education projects will make important contributions toward improving the quality of life by balancing technological advancements and the preservation of our environment. Awarded in amounts up to $10,580 each (a symbolic figure representing the cost of the "Spirit of St. Louis" in 1927.

www.lindberghfoundation.org

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

DJ & T Foundation

A Non–Profit Foundation Devoted to The Support of Low Cost Spay/Neuter Clinics and Voucher Programs Throughout the 50 United States and the District of Columbia.

www.djtfoundation.org/

Donate Your Car For Animals

Your vehicle donation will make a much needed difference in the life of those that cannot speak. By donating your car you will be supporting the ongoing effort to reduce animal suffering and cruelty as well as to create meaningful social change for animals.

www.carshelpingpets.org/

Doris Duke Charitable Foundation

The mission of the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation is to improve the quality of people's lives through grants supporting the performing arts, wildlife conservation, medical research and the prevention of child maltreatment, and through preservation of the cultural and environmental legacy of Doris Duke.www.ddcf.org

Farm's Sabina Fund

The Sabina Fund provides grants of $500–1,000 to small grassroots projects, primarily in developing countries, promoting a vegan diet and publicizing the devastating impacts of animal agriculture. The Fund honors the memory of FARM President Alex Hershaft's mother, Sabina, who passed away on February 14, 1996.

www.sabinafund.org

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

FishAmerica Foundation

The FishAmerica Foundation, the American Sportfishing Association's conservation and research arm, provides funding to nonprofit organizations such as sporting clubs, civic associations, conservation groups, and state agencies in the United States and Canada for projects designed to enhance fish populations, restore fish habitat, improve water quality, and advance fisheries research, thereby increasing the opportunity for sport-fishing success.

www.fishamerica.org/grants/index

Foundation for Protection of Animals

The Mission of the Foundation for Protection of Animals is to promote responsible human interaction with animals for their protection and welfare.

www.protectionofanimals.org/

Foundation for the Protection of Animals - CO, AZ, NM

The mission of the Foundation for the Protection of Animals is to promote responsible human interaction with animals for their protection and welfare. The Foundation strongly believes that encouraging proactive, responsible pet ownership is the key to ending the suffering of homeless animals. Currently the Foundation is working to further its mission through the funding of spay/neuter programs and participation in animal rescue operations.

www.protectionofanimals.org/

Frank Stanley Beveridge Foundation - Massachusetts

The Frank Stanley Beveridge Foundation, Inc. welcomes the opportunity to consider grant proposals from the following Institutional/Program Activity Areas: Animal Related, Arts, Culture, and Humanities, Civil Rights, Social Action, Advocacy, Education, Employment/Jobs, Environmental Quality, Protection & Beautification, Food, Nutrition, Agriculture, Health – General & Rehabilitative Services.

www.beveridge.org

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

Fund for Animals - National Focus

The Fund for Animals was founded in 1967 by prominent author and animal advocate Cleveland Amory, and has spearheaded some of the most historic and significant events in the history of the animal protection movement. With regional offices working around the country on hard-hitting animal advocacy campaigns, and animal care centers.

www.fundforanimals.org/

Fund for Wild Nature

The Fund for Wild Nature (Fund) provides money for campaigns to save and restore native species and wild ecosystems, including actions to defend wilderness and biological diversity. If your project is not clearly and directly connected to these priorities, please clearly explain the link.

www.fundwildnature.org

Gabriel Foundation

The Gabriel Foundation is pleased to support responsible and ethical breeders who implement the very best standards of care for the needs of the psittacine and parrot-like birds raised and housed in their aviaries. They are dedicated to the environmental and psychological nurturance and enrichment of these birds lives, pursuing continuing education in the fields of aviculture, husbandry, behavior and veterinary care.

www.thegabrielfoundation.org

Glaser Progress Foundation

The Glaser Progress Foundation focuses on four program areas: Measuring Progress, Animal Advocacy, Independent Media, Global HIV/AIDS. The Foundation does not accept grant proposals or solicitations for the Global HIV/AIDS program area. Though frequently asked, the Foundation does not fund companion animal shelters or animal sanctuaries.

www.glaserfoundation.org

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

Glaser Progress Foundation

The Glaser Progress Foundation focuses on four program areas: Measuring Progress, Animal Advocacy, Independent Media, Global HIV/AIDS. Note: The Foundation does not accept grant proposals or solicitations for the Global HIV/AIDS program area. As a general rule, the Foundation awards grants to established organizations with a national focus, strong history of success and recognized leadership within its field.

glaserfoundation.org

Grants Fundraising.com

Grants Fundraising.com's purpose is to help spread the word about grants programs initiatives and fundraising opportunities from foundations, 501c3 non-profits organizations and private sector sources by posting those initiatives on our site.

www.grantsfundraising.com

Greg Biffle Foundation

The Greg Biffle Foundation was founded in 2005 by Greg and Nicole Biffle to create awareness and serve as an advocate to improve the well-being of animals by engaging the power and passion of the motor sports industry. The Foundation offers animal welfare groups nationwide the opportunity to apply for grant funding from us on an annual basis.

www.gregbifflefoundation.com

Greygates Foundation

The Greygates Foundation was created in 2001 by J. Ronald Gibbs to provide grants to organizations that serve the needs of children, the elderly, the disabled, or the disadvantaged, and to organizations that promote animal welfare or wildlife preservation. The Foundation makes grants to organizations that are recognized as registered charities by the Canada Revenue Agency, to support projects worldwide. The grant award limit is $3,000.

www.adminitrustlic.com/foundations/

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

Gus Hawthorne Foundation for Animals

The Gus Hawthorne Foundation GHF was established to financially assist non-profit organizations with the mission of providing care for abused, abandoned, feral, at-risk domestic or exotic animals or care and release of injured or orphaned wildlife within the USA. The applicant must have their IRS 501-c-3 status prior to applying.

www.gushawthornefoundation.org

Handsel Foundation

The Handsel Foundation gives grants to organizations in California, Oregon, and Washington State working to end companion animal cruelty and neglect. Priority is given to organizations with targeted spay/neuter programs, effective adoption programs, and education programs that address animal cruelty and neglect. The foundation focuses on giving grants to organizations that do not receive wide public support.

www.handselfdn.org/

Laura J. Niles Foundation

The Laura J. Niles Foundation encourages and supports efforts that offer learning and economic growth opportunities for the motivated poor, initiatives that foster life enrichment through canine and other types of animal companionship and programs that alleviate unhealthy dependencies. The foundation has a particular interest in education, economic self-sufficiency and programs that alleviate unhealthy dependencies. www.ljniles.org

Lennon Family Foundation

The Lennon Family Foundation is a collection of donor-advised funds in operation since 2000 that can provide support to IRS-recognized 501(c)3 nonprofit organizations. In keeping with the spirit of the Lennon Family interests, there are currently four focus areas for the Foundation. They are: Conservation (habitat and species), Education (outdoor, arts, sciences), Health (medical and scientific research),and Humanitarian.

www.lennonfamilyfund.org

Lindbergh Foundation

Grants are made in numerous areas of special interest to Charles and Anne Lindbergh, including aviation/aerospace, agriculture, arts and humanities, biomedical research and adaptive technology, conservation of natural resources, education, exploration, health and population sciences, intercultural communication, oceanography, waste disposal management, water resource management, and wildlife preservation.

www.lindberghfoundation.org

Maddie's Fund

Maddie's Fund will support animal welfare groups and veterinary medical associations that operate within the United States and are classified by the Internal Revenue Service as tax-exempt organizations.

www.maddies.org/

Miccio Foundation - Iowa

The Miccio Foundation's focus is to support organizations and individuals involved in animal welfare. Examples include, but are not limited to, private and governmental animal shelters, humane societies, rescue groups, volunteer foster organizations, local animal control agencies, and veterinarians. We will not support activities inconsistent with federal, state or local laws and ordinances, and we reserve the right to a phone interview or a request for interview.

www.miccio.org

Morris Animal Foundation

Morris Animal Foundation (MAF) answers a critical and unique need in promoting and protecting animal health and welfare and advancing veterinary medicine.

www.morrisanimalfoundation.org

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation conserves healthy populations of fish, wildlife and plants, on land and in the sea, through creative and respectful partnerships, sustainable solutions, and better education.

www.nfwf.org

NAVS Sanctuary Fund - National Focus

The Sanctuary Fund has been created to serve animals who are in emergency situations, where immediate intervention is necessary; enabling groups to receive the money they need to act quickly and ensure safe and loving lifetime care for all the animals involved. The Sanctuary Fund is national in scope, and although NAVS's primary focus is on laboratory animals, the Fund considers emergency requests for all animals, not just those used in research.

www.navs.org/

Nevada Community Foundation

The Nevada Community Foundation has some areas of interest to which specific pools of our competitive granting dollars are allocated. Following is a guide to these areas: Capacity Building, Education, Animals, Wildlife & Conservation.

www.nevadacf.org

Nina Mason Pulliam Charitable Trust - Vermont

The Trust awards grants for program projects and capital needs, and provides application opportunities three times during the calendar year. We prefer to disperse funds as a one-year grant, but will consider projects of up to three years. Areas of funding interest: Helping people in need; Protecting animals & nature and Enriching community life.

www.nmpct.org

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

Onaway Trust

The Onaway Trust was established in 1974 with the overall objective to relieve poverty and suffering. This is expressed in many areas and includes the protection of the environment, the support of children and adults with learning difficulties, the assistance of smaller charities whose aim is to safeguard sick, injured, threatened or abandoned animals and emergency relief for victims of disaster. www.onaway.org/animal.htm

Oxbow Cares Rescue Rewards Program

Oxbow can support your rescue organization with substantial product discounts and educational resources to help meet the needs of your rescue program. The Oxbow Cares Rescue Rewards Program enhances Oxbow's ability to provide genuine care for non-traditional animals and their caregivers by partnering with animal shelters and rescue organizations.
www.oxbowhay.com/link.sp?page=oxbow...

Pegasus Foundation

The Pegasus Foundation improves animal welfare through effective grant making and education in the United States, the Caribbean, Native American lands and Kenya. The Foundation focuses its support of companion animal programs on spay-neuter services and humane education in several regions, including Cape Cod, Massachusetts; Southeast Florida; Native American lands in the southwestern United States; and the islands of the Caribbean.
www.pegasusfoundation.org

Pet Care trust

The Pet Care Trust in a nonprofit, charitable, public foundation. Incorporated in 1990, its purpose is to help promote public understanding regarding the value of and right to enjoy companion animals, to enhance knowledge about companion animals through research and education, to promote professionalism among members of the companion animal community, and to provide educational materials to teachers and schools, the media and the pet industry on responsible animal care.
www.petcaretrust.org

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

Petco Foundation

The Petco Foundation's mission is to support community organizations and efforts that enhance the lives of companion animals while strengthening the bond between people and pets. The foundation was established in 1999 as a result of Petco's continued hands-on involvement with animal welfare agencies across the country. The foundation has raised and distributed more than $34 million through fund-raisers and donations. www.petco.com/Content

Petfinder.com Foundation

The Petfinder.com Foundation was created in 2003 to further assist adoption partners through problem solving, fundraising and providing relief in times of stress or disaster. Our mission is to ensure that no pet is euthanized for lack of a home.

www.petfinder.com/foundation

PetSmart Charities

Our effort, time and donations go toward one of the thousands of exciting and innovative programs we support. Currently, we're working with more than 3,400 animal welfare organizations to help pets throughout the United States and Canada. Whether it's pet overpopulation, adoption, spay/neuter, retention, emergency relief or any other unique program, you can bet we're working toward a solution.

www.petsmart.com/charities/

Planet Dog Foundation

The mission of the Planet Dog Foundation is to promote and celebrate programs in which dogs serve and support their best friends.

www.planetdogphilanthropy.org

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

Planet Dog Philanthropy - National Focus

The Planet Dog Foundation (PDF) strives to support worthy organizations through a grant-making program designed to financially support 501(c)(3) not-for-profit partners across the U.S. The goal of our grant program is to fund initiatives that bring people and pets together for mutual benefit and support. Funding is allocated nationwide to promote and financially support service-oriented canine programs such as assistance dogs and therapy dogs.

www.planetdogfoundation.org/

Regina B. Frankenberg Foundation

Regina Frankenberg directed that the remainder of her estate be used to establish a foundation to support organizations and programs that promote the care, conservation, treatment, well-being and prevention of cruelty to animals.

foundationcenter.org/grantmaker/

SeaWorld & Busch Gardens Conservation Fund

The SeaWorld & Busch Gardens Conservation Fund works with hundreds of organizations, both big and small, around the world. All of these groups share a common goal – protecting animals, people and places. Aiming to achieve long-term conservation success, we support projects that are: 1. Science-based, 2.Solution-driven, 3. Community-oriented.

www.swbg-conservationfund.org/grant

Second Chance Fund - Animal Welfare

The Second Chance Fund is one way American Humane works to support member organizations in their vital work. By providing financial assistance, in select cases, to animal welfare organizations responsible for the temporary care of animals as they are prepared for adoption into permanent, loving homes, the program provides animal victims of abuse or neglect with a second chance at life.

www.americanhumane.org

Appendix B: NACA Identified Grant Opportunities

Summerlee Foundation

Grants for alleviation of fear, pain, and suffering among animals through support of shelters, wildlife sanctuaries, and animal rescue. Priority given to shelters in low-income areas. Organizations must have 501(c)3 status.

www.summerlee.org

Toby Wells Foundation

The Toby Wells Foundation welcomes funding requests from recognized 501 (c)(3) non-profit organizations operating programs within San Diego County for initiatives that support our work in enhancing the lives of youth, people with disabilities and animals.

www.tobywells.org

Appendix C:

Fee Schedule Comparison

ADOPTION

Appendix C: Table 1: Adoption Fees

Respondent Fee Schedule	PIMA COUNTY, AZ		AUSTIN CITY, TX		CLARK COUNTY, NV		MARICOPA COUNTY, AZ		SAN ANTONIO CITY, TX		SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA	
	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description
Line Item:												
Pet Adoption - Dogs and Cats	$85	Dog/ Cat	$15	Large Dogs	Contracts, Does not Charge Fee for Adoption		$75	Dogs	$81	Dog	$69	Dog
			$20	Medium Dog			$50	Cats	$29	Cat	$58	Cat
			$15	Cat								
Pet Adoption Small Animals	$100	Puppy / Kitten	$26	Small Dogs			$100	Dogs			$35	Puppy/Kitten
Animal Cruelty Restitution, Animals			N/A	Based on Court's Judgment			$50	Cats				
Special Needs Animal	$45	Health or Behavior Compromised					$20	Senior Dogs			$35	cats 7+
							$10	Senior Cats				
Exotic Birds	$75											
All other animals	$10								$10	Bird, fowl, ferrets, reptiles, guinea pigs		
									$80	Rabbits (for sterilization)		
									50-2000	Livestock/ Specialty Animals		
Discounts	-10%	Senior Citizen Discount										

IMPOUND / SHELTER

Appendix C: Table 2: Impound /Shelter Fees

Respondent Fee Schedule	PIMA COUNTY, AZ		AUSTIN CITY, TX		CLARK COUNTY, NV		MARICOPA COUNTY, AZ		SAN ANTONIO CITY, TX		SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA	
Line Item	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description
Rabies Quarantine Fee		Included in Boarding	$30									
First Impound	$125	Unaltered	$40	For Sterilized Animals					$50	Dogs & Cats	$26	Dog cat or other Small animal
											$8	
	$75	Altered	$100	For Intact Animals							$30	Sheep, Goat, other medium sized animal
Second Impound	$200	Unaltered	$80	For Sterilized Animals	Collected on behalf of Clark County - sending a		Follow-up meeting with Maricopa week of 10/28		$100	Dogs & Cats	$45	Dog Found at large second time
	$125	Altered										
Third Impound			$80	For Sterilized Animals					$150	Dogs & Cats	$65	Dog Found at large third or subsequent time
Subsequent Impounds		Same Fee as Second Impound							$200	Dogs & Cats	$120	Intact Dog Found at large a second or subsequent time
Livestock Impound Fees									$100	Horse / Cattle		
									$75	Goats/Pigs		
									$20	Poultry/Rabbits		
Boarding (daily Rate)	$15	LAU altered dogs Puppies under 3 mo Altered Cats Kittens under 3 mo Permitted altered canine-wild hybrids Permitted unaltered canine-wild hybrids			$10	Per Day (Dogs / Cats)			$10	Per Day (Dogs / Cats)		
	$35	Unlicensed altered dogs required to be licensed Unaltered Cats 3 mo or older							$35	Horse / Cattle		
	$40	Unlicensed Altered dogs requiring licensure, Non-permitted altered canine wild animal hybrids, Non-permitted unaltered canine-wild animal hybrids requiring permit, not after							$15	Goats/Pigs		
	$80	Unlicensed unaltered dogs required to be licensed, non-permitted unaltered canine-wild animal hybrids required to be permitted and altered							$10	Poultry/Rabbits		
Sterilization Deposit			$50									
Animal Identification			$15									
Redemption of Unlicensed, Unaltered Pet recovery Fee	$250											

Appendix C: Table 3: Veterinary / Clinic Service Fees

VERTERINARY/ CLINIC SERVICES

Respondent Fee Schedule	PIMA COUNTY, AZ		AUSTIN CITY, TX		CLARK COUNTY, NV		MARICOPA COUNTY, AZ		SAN ANTONIO CITY, TX		SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA	
	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description
Line Item	[redacted]	[redacted]		[redacted]	Services Contracted Out			[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
											Note: The director may determine fees to recover the Department's cost for any vaccinations, medications, and other medical supplies, and for any medical services provided by a private veterinary facility or laboratory. The fee for a rabies vaccination shall not exceed the current California Department of Health Services approved 'Actual Cost' vaccination fee as published in the California Compendium of Rabies Control and Prevention	
Veterinary Care Fee	Detailed Fee Schedule Below										$40	Per hour for the examination and/or treatment of a sheltered animal
Minor Vet Treatment	Detailed Fee Schedule Below		$30				$10	Sliding Fee Spay/Neuter Cat			$10	Feline Leukemia Blood Test
							$25	Sliding Fee Spay/Neuter Dog				
Intermediate Vet Treatment	Detailed Fee Schedule Below		$60									
Major Vet Treatment	Detailed Fee Schedule Below		$115									
Surgery	Detailed Fee Schedule Below		$35									
Euthanasia Fee	$15			Not Identified				Refers to Private Vet	$25		$10	Resides within department's service area
											$30	Owner requested small dog or cat and impounded in the field
											$35	Subject to rabies quarantine and brought to County Shelter
											$45	Subject to rabies quarantine and impounded in the field
Vaccinations	$15	Per Vaccination										
Rabies												
Bordetella							$34		$12			
DHLPP									$8			
FVRCP									$8			
									$8			

Appendix C: Table 3: Veterinary and Clinic Service Fees Continued

	Respondent Fee Schedule	PIMA COUNTY, AZ		AUSTIN CITY, TX		CLARK COUNTY, NV		MARICOPA COUNTY, AZ		SAN ANTONIO CITY, TX		SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA	
		Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description
	Line Item					Services Contracted Out							
VERTERINARY/ CLINIC SERVICES	Rabies Observation Fees												
	1st Occurrence									$75			
	2nd Occurrence									$100			
	3rd Occurrence									$200			
	Boarding for Rabies Quarantine									$20	Per Day	$20	
	Idexx 3DX test	$30											
	Idexx Parvo test	$30											
	Idexx Giardia test	$25											
	Idexx FLV/FIV test	$30											
	Fecal test	$25											
	Brief Blood Work	$43											
	Complete Blood Work	$55											
	Dental	$58											
	Skin Scrape	$15											
	Umbilical Hernia Repair	$30											
	Inguinal Hernia Repair	$115											
	Cherry Eye Repair	$160											
	Eye Enucleation	$175											
	Flea/Tick	$15											
	Ear Treatment	$20											
	Rescue Alter	$45											
	Redemption Alter	$100											
	Dangerous dog Alter	$120											
	Dangerous Dog Tattoos	$55											
	Microchip	$13						$25				$10	
	Pick up, 1st Animal	$70											
	Pick up, each additional animal	$5											
	Privately owned Female Cat Alters	$55											
	Privately owned Male Cat Alters	$30											
	Privately owned Pet Dog Alters	$75											
	Bath (no grooming)	$25	Small Dogs										
		$42	Medium Dogs										
		$47	Large Dogs										

Appendix C: Table 4: Permit and Licensing Fees

	Respondent Fee Schedule	PIMA COUNTY, AZ		AUSTIN CITY, TX		CLARK COUNTY, NV		MARICOPA COUNTY, AZ		SAN ANTONIO CITY, TX		SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA	
	Line Item	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description
FEES				Does not require licensure						Does not require licensure			
PERMITS	Sellers Permit									$250	Per Year		
	Litter Permit									$50	Per 1 Litter, Per Year		
	Cat Colony Permit									$10	Per Year		
	Livestock Permit									$150	Per Animal, Per Year		
	Other Livestock Permit									$75	Per Year		
	Pet Shop Permit									$150	Per Year		
	Commercial Boarding Kennel Permit									$150	Per Year		
	Pet Grooming Permit									$75			
	Animal Exhibit Permit									$100	Per Event		
	Petting Zoo/ Recreational Animal Ride Permit									$50	Per Year		
	Exceed # Animal Limit Permit									$25			
	Inspection and Subsequent Re-Inspection									$25	Per Year		
LICENSURE	Altered Dog	$15						$17				$14	Up to 12 Months
												$28	Up to 24 Months
												$38	Up to 36 Months
	Altered Dog - Low-Income	$5											
	Altered Dog (Sr/ Disabled)	$10											
	Unaltered Dog	$60						$42				$30	Up to 12 Months
												$52	Up to 24 Months
												$72	Up to 36 Months
	Unaltered Low Income	$27											
	Unaltered Sr./ Disabled	$17						$6	Seniors 65 years and older; limit two dogs per household				
	Older Dog (10+)	$15											
	Duplicate License	$10											
	Canine- Wild Animal Permit	$15											
	Canine- wild animal duplicate license	$10											
	Transferred License	$10											
	Vicious/Dangerous Animal	$100		$50		$100							
LICENSING LATE FEES	Less than One year late	$10						$2	Per Month Sterile Dog License Penalty				

Appendix C: Table 4: Permit and Licensing Fees Continued

Respondent Fee Schedule	PIMA COUNTY, AZ		AUSTIN CITY, TX		CLARK COUNTY, NV		MARICOPA COUNTY, AZ		SAN ANTONIO CITY, TX		SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA	
	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description	Fee	Description
Line Item			Does not require licensure						Does not require licensure			
							$4	Per Month Unaltered Dog License Penalty				
1-2 years late	$22											
2+ years late	$36											
Multi-Dog Kennel Licenses	$400											
Less than 1 year late	$100											
1-2 Years Late	$200											
2+ years late	$400											