



City of Portland  
and Multnomah County

## Animal Services Taskforce

# RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ANIMAL SERVICES

FINAL REPORT – Appendix C

November 2008

## APPENDIX C

# Plans and Proposals that Illuminate Taskforce Recommendations

### 1. Spay and Neuter Service and Cost Analysis

Submitted by Taskforce Member Joyce Briggs

### 2. “PAWS” Proposal: A concept example for a rebranded animal services program

Submitted by Taskforce member Robert Simon


**ASAP (Animal Shelter Alliance of Portland) Area Spay Neuter Status and Needs  
Based on 2006 Estimated Human Population**

**APPENDIX A2**

<b>CATS</b>	<b>Clackamas</b>	<b>Clark, WA</b>	<b>Multnomah</b>	<b>Washington</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>% of OR (2)</b>	<b>OREGON</b>	<b>Portland(3)</b>
Est. Number of Owned Cats (4)	85,074	84,415	299,975	112,256	462,310	52%	885,059	148,472
Estimate Number of Feral Cats (5)	18,716	18,571	65,995	24,696	101,708	52%	194,713	32,664
Estimate total Cats	103,791	102,987	365,970	136,952	564,018	52%	1,079,771	181,136
Existing Owned Cats Sterilized (86%) (A)	73,164	72,597	257,979	96,540	397,586	52%	761,150	127,686
Existing Feral Cats Sterilized (5%)	936	929	3,300	1,235	5,085	52%	9,736	1,633
Estimate total Sterilized Cats	74,100	73,526	261,278	97,775	402,672		770,886	129,319
Existing Owned Cats Intact (14%)	11,910	11,818	41,997	15,716	64,723	52%	123,908	20,786
Existing Feral Cats intact (95%)	17,781	17,643	62,695	23,461	96,623	52%	184,977	31,031
Estimate total intact Cats	29,691	29,461	104,691	39,177	161,346	52%	308,885	51,817
Owned cats replaced annually* (15%)	12,761	12,662	44,996	16,838	69,346		132,759	22,271
Surgeries annually (to 86% sterilized)	10,975	10,890	38,697	14,481	59,638		114,173	19,153
Targeted Low income Surgeries over baseline*	1,321	1,487	2,526	1,802	7,136		13,323	2,017
Targeted Feral Cat Surgeries**	468	516	877	643	2,479		4,626	701
Total Targeted Cat Surgeries	1,789	2,003	3,402	2,445	9,614		17,949	2,718
* 72% of Euth Cat in All combined but Clark County. Apply 5 per 1000 by 72%.				3.6 per thousand people targeted surgeries.				
** 1.25 per 1000 people								
baseline includes S/N of shelter pets...								
For Numbered Footnotes see Appendix A1								
(A) Association of Pet Products Manufacturer's study 2005/6 - data from 2004								

## YEAR 1 - CATS ONLY (w/exception of Impound and RTO)

Multnomah County								
Sterilization Surgeries	Community Target (Multnomah Cty)	Community Target (Portland)	MCAS	OHS(D)	FCCO(B)	Dove Lewis (H)	Private Veterinarians (C)	TOTAL
for Adopted Pets (A) (Dog/Cats)								
Impounded and RTO pets (Dog/Cats) (I)	200	150	200	0	0	0	0	200
Below are Cats only								
Public Assistance Outreach (total)(E)	2,526	2,017	350	1,575	3	200	400	2,528
Cats	2,526	2,017	350	1,575	3	200	400	2,528
Dogs								
Working Poor (total) (G)	2,526	2,017	200	2,075	0	50	203	2,528
Cats	2,526	2,017	200	2,075	0	50	203	2,528
Dogs								
Feral Cats (total) (F)	877	701	50	0	825	0	0	875
								0
TOTAL SURGERIES PLANNED	6,129	4,885	800	3,650	828	250	603	6,131
Total Cat surgeries (I)	5,989	4,780	660	3,650	828	250	603	5,991
Total Dog Surgeries (I)	140	105	140	0	0	0	0	140
<b>Costs for Pdx/MC - incurred directly or reimbursed to NGO's &amp; veterinarians</b>								
Cost surgery @ ave. \$50 cat/\$75 dog at MCAS	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,500
Cost for \$10 co-pay for all on Public Assistance/Feral	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,750	\$ 8,280	\$ 2,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 30,030
Offset for average \$37 co-pay from Working Poor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (7,400)					\$ (7,400)
TOTAL	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,100	\$ 15,750	\$ 8,280	\$ 2,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 66,130
TOTAL Surgeries subsidized in some way			800	1,575	828	200	400	3,803

POSSIBLE MADDIES SUBSIDY MCAS ONLY (Cat ave. \$55)  
for Public Assistance surgeries

\$ 19,250

Abbreviations:

MCAS : Multnomah County Animal Services

OHS: Oregon Humane Society

FCCO: Feral Cat Coalition of Oregon

(A) Neuter before adoption program sustained. Assumed x % growth but incremental growth not included in this budget.

(B) FCCO data for 2007 entire Portland metro (ASAP - 4 county) area was 1678 . This assumes achieving target rate with subsidy. Surplus anticipated.

(C) Through existing Adoption programs or subsidized programs such as Oregon Spay/Neuter Fund. In cremental spurred by Maddies Fund dollars ?

(D) OHS capable of 10K cat community cat surgeries - assume 50% for Multnomah County.

(E) Assumes surgeries for \$0 targeted to those on federal or state assistance programs -with gov't picking up \$10 (cat) to \$20 (dog) co-pay.

(F) Assumes 1.25 feral cat surgeries per 1000 human population.

(G) Assumes we need to at last match total surgeries for the Working Poor population, as for the Medicaid at subsidized rates at the level of the Oregon Spay/Neuter Fund.

(H) Assumes able to do twice a month surgery with 12.5 surgeries a day for 10 months a year..

(I) Dog/Cat break assumes that 70% of the surgeries for impounded and RTO pets are for dogs.

**Spay Neuter Plan  
Budget  
Draft 9/16/08**

**APPENDIX B1**

## YEARS 1 - 5 Forecast

### Multnomah County Proactive Spay Neuter Plan

<b>Sterilization Surgeries</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	
<i>(above baseline including Adopted Pets)</i>							
<b>Impounded and RTO pets</b> (Dog/Cats)	\$ 13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	\$ 67,500	
<b>Public Assistance Outreach</b> (surgeries & \$20 Copays for Dog; \$10 for Cat)	\$ 39,280	\$ 64,380	\$ 64,380	\$ 64,380	\$ 64,380	\$ 296,800	
Cats	\$ 39,280	\$ 39,280	\$ 39,280	\$ 39,280	\$ 39,280	\$ 196,400	
Dogs	\$ -	25,100	25,100	25,100	25,100	\$ 100,400	
<b>Working Poor</b> (Surgeries minus offset Income)	\$ 2,600	\$ 4,100	\$ 4,100	\$ 4,100	\$ 4,100	\$ 19,000	
Cats	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 13,000	
Dogs	\$ -	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 6,000	
<b>Feral Cats</b> (subsidy @\$10)	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	
<b>Sub-total Surgery and Subsidy Costs</b>	\$ 66,130	\$ 92,730	\$ 92,730	\$ 92,730	\$ 92,730	\$ 437,050	
<b>TOTAL including 8 % inflation in Years 3-5</b>	\$ 66,130	\$ 92,730	\$ 100,148	\$ 100,148	\$ 100,148	\$ 459,305	
<i>Total Surgeries enabled</i>	3,803	4,810	4,810	4,810	4,810	23,043	
						\$ 18.97	ave. cost
<b>Transportation Vehicle</b> ( 2 in five years)	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90,000	
<i>capita</i>							
<b>Program Marketing and Administrative Exp.</b>	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 150,000	
<b>TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS</b>	\$ 141,130	\$ 122,730	\$ 175,148	\$ 130,148	\$ 130,148	\$ 699,305	\$30.21 avg
<b>Possible Offset Maddies Grant</b>	\$ 19,250	\$ 27,250	\$ 27,250	\$ 27,250	\$ 27,250	\$ 128,250	
	\$ 121,880	\$ 95,480	\$ 147,898	\$ 102,898	\$ 102,898	\$ 571,055	\$24.63 avg

***Spay Neuter Plan  
Budget  
Draft 9/16/08***

***APPENDIX B1***

/

**Spay Neuter Plan**  
**Budget**  
**Draft 9/16/08**

**APPENDIX B1**

## YEARS 1 - 5 Forecast

### Multnomah County Proactive Spay Neuter Plan

<b>Sterilization Surgeries</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	
<i>(above baseline including Adopted Pets)</i>							
<b>Impounded and RTO pets (Dog/Cats)</b>	\$ 13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	\$ 67,500	
<b>Public Assistance Outreach (surgeries &amp; \$20 Copays for Dog; \$10 for Cat)</b>	\$ 39,280	\$ 64,380	\$ 64,380	\$ 64,380	\$ 64,380	\$ 296,800	
Cats	\$ 39,280	\$ 39,280	\$ 39,280	\$ 39,280	\$ 39,280	\$ 196,400	
Dogs	\$ -	25,100	25,100	25,100	25,100	\$ 100,400	
<b>Working Poor (Surgeries minus offset Income)</b>	\$ 2,600	\$ 4,100	\$ 4,100	\$ 4,100	\$ 4,100	\$ 19,000	
Cats	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 13,000	
Dogs	\$ -	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 6,000	
<b>Feral Cats (subsidy @\$10)</b>	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	\$ 10,750	
<b>Sub-total Surgery and Subsidy Costs</b>	\$ 66,130	\$ 92,730	\$ 92,730	\$ 92,730	\$ 92,730	\$ 437,050	
<b>TOTAL including 8 % inflation in Years 3-5</b>	\$ 66,130	\$ 92,730	\$ 100,148	\$ 100,148	\$ 100,148	\$ 459,305	
<i>Total Surgeries enabled</i>	3,803	4,810	4,810	4,810	4,810	23,043	
						\$ 18.97	ave. cost
<b>Transportation Vehicle ( 2 in five years)</b>	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90,000	
<i>capita</i>							
<b>Program Marketing and Administrative Exp.</b>	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 150,000	
<b>TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS</b>	\$ 141,130	\$ 122,730	\$ 175,148	\$ 130,148	\$ 130,148	\$ 699,305	\$30.21 avg
<b>Possible Offset Maddies Grant</b>	\$ 19,250	\$ 27,250	\$ 27,250	\$ 27,250	\$ 27,250	\$ 128,250	
	\$ 121,880	\$ 95,480	\$ 147,898	\$ 102,898	\$ 102,898	\$ 571,055	\$24.63 avg



**Spay Neuter Plan**  
**Budget**  
*Draft 10/28/08*

**APPENDIX**

## YEARS 1 - 5 Forecast

**Additional Costs to Add Complimentary Rabies Vaccination and Licensing for County Residents on Public Assistance**

### Multnomah County Proactive Spay Neuter Plan

	<b>Sterilization Surgeries</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
	<i>(above baseline including Adopted Pets)</i>						
	<b>Public Assistance Outreach (# surgeries &amp; \$20 Copays for Dog; \$10 for Cat)</b>	2528	3508	3508	3508	3508	16560
	Cats	2528	2528	2528	2528	2528	12640
	Dogs	0	980	980	980	980	3920
	Cost for Rabies Vaccination included with S/N @10 100%	\$ 25,280	\$ 35,080	\$ 35,080	\$ 35,080	\$ 35,080	\$ 165,600
	Cost for License and Administration @10 and 100%	\$ 25,280	\$ 35,080	\$ 35,080	\$ 35,080	\$ 35,080	\$ 165,600
	<b>TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS</b>	<u>\$ 50,560</u>	<u>\$ 70,160</u>	<u>\$ 70,160</u>	<u>\$ 70,160</u>	<u>\$ 70,160</u>	<u>\$ 331,200</u>



• Kava •

*Boykin Spaniel, An All American Breed*

## MEMORANDUM

Robert S Simon  
Post Office Box 820035  
Sellwood Station  
Portland, Oregon 97282-1035  
503-417-8766 • 503-417-8767 (facsimile)

DATE: Thursday, February 19, 2009

RE: Provision of Animal Welfare Services (PAWS) task force issues to consider as a part of the PAWS process.

### Introduction

“Animal problems become people problems if left to their own devices” according to our most respected animal advocates. Animal problems are one of the several fundamental public Safety concerns of modern urban living, and in our metropolitan area animal welfare is as high a priority for the citizens as their own respective personal safety. It is the exercise of leadership which brought Portland and Multnomah County into these discussions of a joint governance model for this metropolitan public safety concern.

As animals and people live in closer proximity and share more urban and suburban amenities that interface becomes a place of greater conflict. Leadership in conflict resolution requires the best possible use of non-sworn enforcement officers and mediators to identify potential conflicts, defuse actual conflicts, and provide a safe environment for all citizens whether or not animal owners. These enforcement efforts are a buffer between sworn law enforcement and they can be more effective and economical if properly implemented. Therefore, the innovative use of animal services and the private not for profit animal advocate partners is another field of “livable communities” in which Portland and the County can demonstrate regional and national leadership.

The PAWS charter is an example of leadership in the field of public safety through a holistic as summarized by the facilitator demands that the task force recommend levels of service (LOS), service priorities, and sustainable funding methods for continuity of service. This is the same series of objectives provided to the 2000 Multnomah County task force convened by Chair Bev Stein. The exception is that in this particular case the City of Portland has expressed interest in handling its own animal control in the absence of a county commitment to a higher level of service. Portland’s willingness is predicated on its ability to reach a self-funding level for animal safety services through fees, licenses, and

finances. The PAWS process is designed to revisit the 2000 Task Force recommendations, update those, and determine if new ideas are timely or necessary to reach the joint goals of a higher LOS and a higher level of self funding.

The Multnomah County Commission resolution 07-190 identifies that the County provides animal services within the City under an intergovernmental agreement, and the County does not have adequate funding to meet “growing expectations and demands from the citizens of Portland.” The mission of the task force according to the resolution is to “study feasible options for providing animal services in the city that protects the health, safety, and welfare of its citizens, and promote[s] neighborhood livability.” The introduction of the commissioners (both Hon. Randy Leonard and Hon. Ted Wheeler through his deputy Mr. Poe) stressed (1) Sustainable Funding, (2) LOS which can be purchased with this level of funding, and (3) Capital Facilities improvements which the funding can support through revenue bond measures (“CapEX”). Therefore, the distilled result of the political process leads to a necessary conclusion that the task force must focus on first revenue creation and second on spending that revenue on LOS in order of priority.

There is a first fundamental principal of “building the level of service for all citizens” which both the City and the County must embrace as a point of departure for the mission of PAWS. The urban service capability must become more robust and the ability to enforce the laws must become County-wide. All citizens benefit from the service whether they care for animals or not. In order to satisfy this growth in service principal the County must agree to a “No Net Loss” of funding to the Animal Services functions as revenue increases, and the City must agree to Animal Services as a County public service using the existing bureaucracy in most instances. In sum, if the City raises funds for enhanced LOS within the City limits, then the County may not reduce the General Fund support for Animal Services. There may be no net loss of resources and City raised funds must stay within the City LOS boundary.

There is a second fundamental principal of “County provided service” which the City and County must embrace as a point of departure for a successful reshaping of animal welfare services. The County must marshal all of the animal service expertise and infrastructure at the County administrative level rather than at a Balkanized municipal level, all the while using new revenue to focus service in the urban cores.

There is a third fundamental principal of “defuse problems at the earliest point” which the City and County must embrace as a guiding philosophy for a successful “service” component of animal welfare programs. If the entire system focuses on making the interface between animals and humans a conflict free environment, then the associated costs of escalation and confrontation can be avoided. Animal Service Officers are the interface between animal problems which can rapidly become people problems requiring law enforcement response. Much like Noise control or Park Rangers at the municipal level, the Animal Service Officers divert confrontation from the criminal justice response system (which is our most resource intensive governmental response system). Laws, education and training should focus on this role of harmonizing the animal-human urban interface.

In conclusion, this Report has Recommendations and Implementation Sections. The City and the County can choose to adopt this Report, including the Implementation Section, and move forward with adoption of the new approach to animal services. Failure to adopt the Implementation Sections reflects upon the political will to lead the community to an innovative approach to the provision of animal welfare services.

### **Innovation Strategies**

► **Innovations in Urban Services:** The urban area where high population density per acre is a land use planning goal requires a complex and more intensive animal welfare service. The presence of animal safety officers at all hours in all neighborhoods is a strategic goal for the community in an effort to reduce tensions at the “people-animal” interface. The complexity of resolving animal safety issues in the urban environment requires many special skills (conflict resolution, force protection, language diversity) that are not a part of the traditional animal safety officer training and experience. The rural environment, presents its own and very different challenges, though typically ones for which officers are traditionally trained. Similarly, urban public safety officers (police, fire, EMS, Park Rangers, Code Enforcement) are not traditionally trained to address the safety needs of our animal companions. Animals are present in one half or more urban households but not one public safety officer has animal safety training. It is the very unique challenges of the urban environment which compel a multidisciplinary team approach to urban responses where animals are present, and it is the creation of such an approach which is the keystone of an effective urban service model.

Portland and Multnomah County are innovators in the multidisciplinary approach to animal safety. The Parks and Recreation Department, for the last five years, has been operating a pilot program in which a County employed, equipped and trained animal safety officer is seconded to the Public Safety Office within the Parks Department. That officer, whole equipped by the County is dispatched by the Parks Department. The officer is a 40 hour FTE and the personnel cost is paid by Parks while the support, equipment, training and benefits are provided by County. This pilot program matches the trained first responder animal safety officer to the Park Ranger and the people within the Department that need support at the people-animal interface. The structure is created by intergovernmental agreement (IGA) and the cost has been stable at \$60,000 - \$65,000 annually over the life of the IGA.

The innovation of the multidisciplinary team could be expanded to provide for animal safety officers seconded to police, fire, and Code Enforcement. The same model should be used which gives primary dispatch authority to the bureau which contracted for the service. The officers could be housed in the same downtown facility envisioned in the capital project section of this study. The funding for the officers should come from fees specifically dedicated to urban services. The goal of the program should be focused on supporting the diverse first responders who make up the urban public safety officers who are confronted with animals in the course of routine performance. That support should be (1) immediate, (2) 24/7/365, and (3) within one phone call. That support must be in the form of a fully equipped and trained animal safety officer.

**Recommendations:** Eight animal safety officers should be added to the City's urban service area through IGA with Police, Fire, Parks, and BES. The officers should be shared by the bureaus when not otherwise in use, and the officers should be combined with the existing 13 FTE officers to create 21 FTE first responders with at least one officer available through the swing shift. The funding for these positions should be "forward" funded by the bureaus, and then recouped from the urban service fees adopted in the fee schedule (discussed separately). The officers and equipment should be housed in the Central City Animal Community Center (as described in the Capital Projects section) along with transitional holding facilities for animals detained on shift. The animal safety officers should receive Public Safety Officer training at the law enforcement training facility in order to work smoothly with the urban public safety officers when confronting potentially hostile law enforcement challenges. Funding targets should include advanced training for animal safety officers assigned to the multidisciplinary teams.

► **Innovations in Participation:** The animal system is voluntary (much like the tax system) with the threat of enforcement for non-participants. The current system, in use for generations, does not couple a credible threat of enforcement in order to stimulate voluntary participation. A new approach is needed and PAWS offers some suggestions based on adding incentives to the tool box and restructuring the number and types of fees required. The system needs to be re-focused on incentives creating "privileges" for animal owners and a broader method of enforcement through a concept of "universal enforcement."

**Existing Funding:** Revenue is generated by (1) fees, (2) penalties, and (3) General Fund taxes receipts. There is a certain amount of revenue which is dedicated to particular areas or services, and that is not a significant consideration in this analysis. FY 07 had a budget of 4.1M with 29% of the program revenue generated from services and 71% from General Fund. The ultimate objective is to reach the "zero" general fund contribution level. There are approximately 700,000 residents in the County, with 172,335 dogs and 298,295 cats (based on rabies vaccine registrations) for a total of 470,630 animals known to reside in the service district. Only 62,536 were registered as of FY 2007. The remaining 408,094 animals remain non-compliant. As recently as 1999 there were County sponsored citizen workshops intended to address the funding issue for animal welfare services. It appears that the voluntary compliance model is not successful for this series of regulations.

**Fee Size:** In 1997 Ballot Measure 26-60 gave authority to the County to raise its fees. In 2002 the County raised license fees without a material change in voluntary compliance.

Effective 2002

DOGS: Fertile:	1 yr = \$30;	2 yr = \$50;	3 yr = \$65
DOGS: s/n:	1 yr = \$18	2 yr = \$26;	3 yr = \$38
CATS: Fertile:	1 yr = \$30;	2 yr = \$60;	3 yr = \$90
CATS: s/n:	1 yr = \$8	2 yr = \$14;	3 yr = \$19

Prior to 2002

DOGS: Fertile:	1 yr = \$25;	2 yr = \$45;	3 yr = \$60
DOGS: s/n:	1 yr = \$15	2 yr = \$23;	3 yr = \$35
CATS: Fertile:	1 yr = \$30;	2 yr = \$50;	3 yr = \$65
CATS: s/n:	1 yr = \$8	2 yr = \$14;	3 yr = \$19

The size of the fee per animal has not been evaluated recently for price resistance. The Riley Research Associates survey was compiled in July 2002 from 157 respondents in which the size of the fee was not the point of resistance to compliance. Convenience and the fear or lack of fear of enforcement are what accounted for the low license compliance rate.

**Annual Registration:** We need a reasonable annual registration fee. After much thought it appears that we should register all the animals (with few exceptions) and we should shift to an annual registration (dropping the three year option). Further, a registration system for all animals must be coupled with a generous incentive package which demonstrates the value to the registrant. The threat of a penalty through first collection then physical enforcement must also be credible, but it must be the most discrete part of the program. Animal Safety Service simply does not operate effectively in the roll of the heavy when so much of its success comes from the voluntary cooperation of people who love animals. Therefore, the incentives for a registrant should be the most well advertised aspect of the system, and the enforcement must be implicit through the greater public profile of officers and the greater public profile of the fee collection efforts.

The reasoning is based upon three basic premises; (1) Census, (2) Regularity, and (3) Revenue.

First, in order to prepare for the disaster we need a relatively current census of all the domesticated animals in the County. Whether they are cats or cows we need to have a general idea how many and where they are located. If we know, then we can plan for evacuations, rescues, care and kenneling of these animals with greater confidence. We can pre-position supplies and pre-designate sheltering facilities in areas based on the census. Also, vector control needs a reliable census in order to manage out breaks of disease such as avian flu or West Nile virus. A census will allow for rapid information to registrants (by e-mail or robo dial) of an outbreak or fire. Thus, a mandatory minimum registration fee should be adopted.

Second, the annual registration and renewal will allow us to establish a routine both for the owner and for the department through which we may keep the census up to date. There is less likely to be loss of registrants if they task is annual. The expansion of enforcement to a boarder array of service providers will also be enhanced since each year there will be a registration similar to an automobile and out dated licenses will not be useful nor a source of confusion for enforcement. Either the owner has a current license or they do not. Further, we should shift to a first of the year renewal cycle for ease of enforcement.

Third, the revenue source is one which would fund the operations of the department for this larger planning task so it is a user fee type charge. The switch to annual and first of the year registration will capture the revenue early and allow for yearend reductions or expansions of service based upon the collections. If all the money is due in the first quarter, then the budget is easier to manage for the year.

Registration is currently de-centralized. Livestock registration is handled in part by the Health Department and in part by Animal Services. (See Chapter 21 and Chapter 13). The code is murky and unclear. Centralized registration should be the strategic goal. The registration of all animals which includes livestock needs to be centralized either at Animal Services or at a private vender such as “Pet Point Animal Management System.” (See **Annex #**) Microchips must be included in all animal registrations. Private vendor registration provides the advantage of a server which is off-site and thereby accessible during emergencies should the County server go down. The violations of registration rules must be made uniform through model ordinances. The hearing process for violations of the registration rules should be similarly centralized for uniformity of outcomes regardless of residency or income.

Fourth, there is an institutional resistance to creating **registration incentives** through special privileges on public lands even though such a system is the least cost to the City and County. These incentives would provide the highest yield for registration.

- Special Use Permits could be an immense source of income from users who want to use natural areas for special training or events (whether canine or equestrian). However, sometime entrenched departmental policies would need to be changed in order to advance any concept which would allow one user group to have a “special” privilege in a public park. For example canines to run off leash in City Natural Area parks (outside of existing “off leash” areas, and this group of users could be “managed” if there existed a permitted process to make such use lawful. Thus, a special use permit for dog training and water dogs, even if accompanied by K-9 Good Citizenship Training and a large fee, would require a policy rethinking by Parks. (See the Parks Policy on Natural Areas, **Annex #**).

Fifth, there are many **registration incentives** which are readily within the grasp of the service if the resources were allocated to solicit them. Private-Public partnerships with animal related vendors could be a source of income off-set for the cost of the registration programs.

- Safety related incentives for registrants include special notifications of a disaster through e-mail and robo-dial, inclusion on the 911 system to alert 1<sup>st</sup> responders of the presence of an animal in the home, and free rides home for lost pets.
- Coupons or sponsorship of the minimum required registration fee (\$10) should be available if the new FTE Public Outreach Officer were to solicit such support within the community. Matching grants for free or discounted micro-chips should be a part of the program incentives. Free or discounted spay and neuter service should be a part of the incentive package available to registrants.

**Recommendations:** We need to create a Registration System rather than a license system. The Permits must each offer both an incentive and a penalty for non compliance (enforcement is addressed elsewhere in this Report). The use of a license fee is a traditional form of fee for service. However, a different approach to the license concept needs to be adopted to transform the license into a true “fee for service” device.

It is apparent from the Leash-Law debates within Portland that there is little success in a “one size fits all” approach to the services people expect from animal safety services. People will run animals without regard for the law where there is a lack of enforcement and a lack of permission. We need an incentive based system which provides fee based access to users which allow for off leash, off trail, and other individual uses of the wild areas. Through coupling the desired uses to the special use permit system we can capture large revenue generating sources and resolve the illegal activities which occur when no permit mechanism is offered.

Further, there will be a greater level of compliance if we move from a license to a “permit” system in which various permit levels allow greater or specific animal services. Each animal, whether companion or livestock, must be “registered” with the County in order to insure it gets the level of service desired. The County already requires livestock registration in Chapter 21 and there is an implication in Chapter 13.308 but it is not a “requirement” but there is no fee for livestock registration. A new series of registrations should be offered to people and a list of proposed registration levels is attached as **Annex 6** to the Report.

In sum, we need to adopt registration as opposed to licensing, and Special Use Permits instead of unenforced rules. One size does not fit all in a compact urban environment. So, an innovative system needs to channel users into regulated opportunities rather than force users into ignoring the laws in order to fulfill the desired use.

► **Innovations in Fee Collections:** The City should enter into an IGA with the County and allow for the appropriate City department to collect the registration revenues both from the a link to the on line site as well as through the penalty enforcement process. The collection of fees must be more than voluntary since the compliance numbers indicate a very low participation rate under the historical voluntary system. The existing 12% voluntary licensing approach is not a successful revenue model and not reflective of any other government licensing program (based on the number of estimated dogs and cats as compared to the number of licenses). Oregon Public Broadcasting reports a participation rate of 18% of listeners being members of the voluntary organization. The comparison reflects a significant lack of success in penetration of the licensing program over the intervening years since 1974. The degree of compliance is directly related to the likelihood of enforcement. Therefore, revenue capture is a critical component of a successful self funding model based on fees whether rebranded as “permits” or kept as “licenses.”

**Existing Methods.** The existing methods for collecting work and should be retained as part of an expanded system.

- Reconciliation of Vaccine registration to licenses: MC is doing this in FY2008 and has increased collections by 20%. The method is to issue a license to the person for whom the vaccine was delivered along with an invoice. When the invoice is not paid, then a call by an Animal Service office staff member occurs, and ultimately a



collection agency is engaged to collect the base fee due plus any additional collection charges the agency can extract.

- Approximately 60 area vets issue licenses and make \$2 per license, and \$1 per renewal.
- On line registration and payment. An animal can be registered online for free and without vaccine proof for 60 days. The transaction is held open until the information is completed. This on line system is not the easiest to navigate nor is it designed to be used by hand held devices.

**Recommendations:** All members of the enforcement community must be authorized to cite violators of the animal codes. There needs to be a more global inclusion of the community in the animal service permit process rather than the reliance on a few staff members at headquarters to encourage each person to register the companion animals in his or her care. The City imposes penalties of its own through Chapter 13.05 of the City Code for those who fail to register but such violations are not available using the Uniform Citation system. (The City got out of the dog and cat registration business in 1993 through a repeal of its ordinances). Parks has its own penalty system in Chapter 20.12 for violations of Park rules but no companion process for citation of violators of the registration process. Park Rangers are not authorized to cite violators whose animals are unregistered (whether canine or equine). Bureau of Environmental Services has its own animal related enforcement (noise) and no authority to cite for an unregistered animal. Therefore, every interaction at the people-animal interface is essentially one in which the outcome is inconsistent and unpredictable due to a lack of universal enforcement of a single animal code.

There should be a separation of the animal service providers from the collection agents in order to increase collection. In much the same way we do not have police officers collecting the ticket bail when an infraction occurs we should separate the animal service officers from the collection of the registration fees for the animal service permits. While a person should always be allowed to register with animal services, when a violation or failure to pay is being pursued it should be done by a professional collector familiar with the laws for such collections and the artful dodges used by those few who dislike surrendering money to the government.

- **Open Access to Registration:** The registration process must be more user friendly and more widely available. The web site must be modified to allow a first time registrant to input a rabies vaccine tag number and then allow the computer to cross reference that number to a doctor reported vaccination. The various physical points of sale such as pet stores and doctor's offices need a more robust incentive in order to sell more registrations. There should be a tripling of the incentive from \$2 currently to \$6. The basic fee should be increased to prevent a loss of yield from registration fees. The Public Outreach Officer could enlist the Scouts and other private partners to encourage registrations through these increased incentives. Once there is a 'ground swell' of activists trying to register animals as if it were a voter registration drive, then the "culture of compliance" will begin to take hold. The more school aged children who participate in helping people register (in particular those potential registrants who are shut in or in homes for the aged) the greater the level of community involvement and the lower the level of governmental imposition.

- Universal Enforcement: Whether it is a police officer, park ranger, health inspector, code enforcement or traffic enforcement officer, there must be the power for any member of the City and County enforcement arms to issue a citation which brings a non-compliant person into the animal control system. Every official who possesses the right to issue a citation in whatever area of governance must be deputized to issue a citation for a violation of the animal. There should be an amendment to City code Chapter 13 which finds a violation for failure to comply with the County registration ordinance. It should be a separate violation. The City should keep its noise ordinance and the enforcement apparatus for the unique challenge of urban noise creation. This is a uniquely urban issue though unregistered animals should be something noise officers cite for, and the abuse of animals is something they should be trained to recognize and report. Union participation and modifications to the Uniform Citation program will need to be addressed as part of an implementation of this program.

- Citizen Cooperation: The whole community must be encouraged to support registration. One method is an online reporting mechanism for citizens who may be troubled by an animal issue or may see an animal code violation. The reporting should go to a dedicated person and then result in a referral to enforcement or investigation. However, it should be a citizen driven process.

- Contracted Collections: The City of Portland should be contracted for collections of the animal registration fees. A percentage of the collections by Portland should be dedicated to Portland based LOS, and a fee to the Bureau for collection should be recovered by Portland. All of the same tools which the City currently uses for collecting its license fee should be applied to the animal service fees including web based complaints. Additionally, all fines and penalties assessed by animal services should be collected in the same manner. There will need to remain discretion on the part of the Director of Animal Services to decide on waivers of fees and penalties, but the structure of the system will benefit from removing the service provider from the collection efforts.

- Contracted Census: The census of animals should be contracted to a private partner with an economic benefit from the number of registrants it brings into the system.

- Rental Housing Providers: Rental housing with pet friendly facilities must insure pets are licensed before renting to the tenant. City and County housing codes can create this requirement. However, it should not be required that renewal enforcement be monitored. In the case where an animal registration expires then we should notify the Landlord (using information on the registration form) and then the Landlord could issue a Notice for Cause Eviction which would compel the tenant to renew the registration of the animal. This provider list needs to include assisted living or any congregate care facility.

- Point of Service Providers: All licensed animal service provided must limit service to registered animals. Health and safety require that only registered animals be served in licensed facilities. City and County codes should impose these requirements with exceptions for non-profit organizations and for medical emergencies should be provided (strays or abandoned animals) in any ordinance. Service providers include all licensed animal service providers including medical providers, groomers, dog washes, kennels, day care, and breeders. Pet food stores though having business licenses are not an effective point of service provider to require to participate while clinics and grooming facilities inside such store are a good point of imposition.

▪ **Revised Fee Schedule:** The fee schedule must be revised to adopt both an annual registration process and a greater series of user fees in order to capture the cost on the community from the animals in its midst. **(See Annex #).** Simply by adopting an Urban Service Fee of \$15 per animal (assuming no net loss of the existing 52,000 registrants) the new revenue would equal (at 100% compliance) \$780,000 which is enough to fund 13 FTE officers. Similarly, a Household Animal Permit (one per household) at \$35 per household (assuming that of the 52,000 registrants there are 2 per household) would yield \$875,000 new dollars for animal safety programs. However, the Task Force revenue working group prepared a detailed analysis of both the increased revenue from dedicated collection combined with a slight increase in the sources of registration fees. **(See Annex # for the Projections).**

**Innovations in Levels of Service:** There needs to be a distinction between an “Urban Service” and a “Rural Service” response system. Time and again the less urban parts of the metropolitan whole are unenthusiastic about “subsidizing” the city dwellers. Thus, a new approach based on new urban expectations for a higher service level should be initiated through a fee which dedicates revenue to these urban levels of service.

There have been numerous historical efforts to identify LOS in any given era or decade. In 1917 Portland paid the Humane Society to handle stray dogs. In each generation subsequent some complaint about was made about animal safety services and some effort to address the complaint was forged. The LOS expected and the priority for LOS has changed with each such cycle.

Levels of service must be a multi-functioned approached with both human and capital resources which are trained and tailored to the service needs. People without facilities or facilities without people, and either without revenue makes for a dysfunctional system. Therefore, we need to consider a variety of new approaches.

More and better positioned FTE are required to lift the animal safety service out of the limb along mode and into an effective policy implementing mode. A new relationship between the first level of community organization (the neighborhood association) and the animal safety service community needs to be forged.

**Recommendations:** The Human capital needs to be elevated at the same time as the facilities to allow them to implement the plans for delivery of service. Fee for service will finance this effort.

♦ **Human Capital:** The City and County need to dedicate animal safety services officers to the urban service areas. The City should be covered in a precinct like basis, and the rural areas covered on a larger service district like basis. The staffing goals must be focused on having metropolitan wide 24/7 coverage as well as 7/365 coverage of the headquarters shelter. The National Animal Control Association study suggests that a minimum staffing level for a region our size should be 30 enforcement officers. As the revenue grows there should be focus on filling these enforcement slots in conjunction with the development of supporting function staff. Officers should be crossed trained with Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) certifications and with bonus pay to all FTE who obtain Federal Communications Commission license for short wave radio transmissions (a key emergency management skill set).

- Grant Writer/ Policy Coordinator: The Human Capital must include an elevation of the grant writer to a full time position with a mandate to participate out to our private non-profit partners (in exchange for a reimbursement if successful). We should use this position to leverage the grants which are only available to non-profits. We should then make available our facilities to help implement the grants as partners. The FTE should be dedicated to maintaining the message of the service (culture of compliance) and the look and feel of the animal service policies. The “message” should be coordinated system wide through this FTE.

- Out Reach Coordinator: The Human Capital must include an outreach coordinator and educator. Out Reach is on a professional level in this position. The FTE is charged with liaison duties to all departments of government and all service users. The role is to make certain that the service is meeting the ever changing needs within the community. Further, the FTE would work with the neighborhood associations, participate in NET training process, and assist the new governance body (recommended infra.,) among other duties.

- Education Officer: The most successful model programs use a dedicated education officer(s) to create a culture of compliance from the grade school level onward. This post should be occupied by an experienced youth educator who can create and maintain a curriculum, recruit and train volunteers. This person must partner with the schools to get public service programming into the schools to teach everyone the importance of treating animals with respect and knowing the laws. Models of these programs are implemented currently at the Oregon Humane Society and other non-profit private partners.

- Reserve/Cadet/Training Officer: The focus must be on a balanced approach to enforcement officers and leveraging our resources to train our advocate partners in rescue, control, and essential techniques of animal safety service. The reserve and cadet programs which the County had in past years should be returned as a force multiplier for the regular duty force. It is seldom that a single officer can safely handle a distressed animal. A second set of hands, volunteer and trained, should be available in normal and disaster times. These reserve officers also form a citizen backbone for the service through which the message (culture of compliance) can be spread. Further, a full time training officer should be added to both handle this program coordination and to make uniform the training of all reserve and regular FTE officers, as well as cross train shelter and front office personnel for emergency response. The area of animal welfare is constantly innovating. A dedicated trainer must be added to learn the innovative techniques and teach them to the service officers.

- Dedicated Urban Service Officers: The dedication of an urban service registration fee to the payment for urban service officers is a secure method of funding these additional FTE positions. **(See prior discussion on urban service)**. At least 8 additional officers need to be added and dedicated to urban response under IGA to City agencies which most often have animal related issues.

- Elevation of Division to Department Level: The service needs to be raised to a first responder status within the County political hierarchy. The importance of the service to a more dense community, and the need to have a leadership which is dedicated to the service, argues in favor of the elevation of the service to Department level. The need to negotiate with City Bureau Chiefs on a regular basis as a part of the IGA on

urban service officers also argues in favor of elevating the division to a department. Further, the leadership role for the foreseeable future requires raising money to re-build the service and its capital project list. A Department leader would be principally occupied with this capital campaign. Therefore, the politics and the human resource needs of the service argue in favor of an elevation to Department status and the appointment of a Director who can advance the message (culture of compliance) to the community.

♦ **Community Capital:** There needs to be an effort to create a culture of compliance with the registration laws both because it is the right thing to do but also because it is the attractive thing to do.

▪ **Rebranding the Service:** The service should be re-branded to be the “Metropolitan Animal Safety Service.” The broader mandate and the focus on safety dispels the “dog catcher” image of the Service. Further, officers should have rank, badges and other indicia similar to those of police and fire first responders. Until such time as Animal Service officers have these same indicia they will continue to not gain first responder status within the community.

♦ The experience of Calgary and our own Task Force members reveals that the re-branding effort will require some professional assistance to design a public program which uses free media, and articulates the mission priorities of the service.

▪ **Re-Focusing the Message of the Service:** The service should refocus its message so that the community recognizes the benefits of the service and desires to become a part of the program. Examples of two messages were studied in the Task Force Rebranding working group, and the head of the Calgary program contributed the observation that the actual message can be best tailored through focus groups which seek to identify the message that resonates the loudest with the target audience. A similar experience was reported by the leadership of Oregon Humane and Dove Lewis (both of which underwent re-branding exercises).

♦ “Portland is the Most Pet Friendly City in America” – This message of service is an example of a message which might find resonance with the populations served. If a focus group study confirms the traction of this message, then the registration system can identify incentives to registration that are complementary to this message.

♦ “Safety, Security, Everyday” – This message of service is an example of core mission that the Task Force embraces in both the working group and the entire force level. The incentives for registration which readily follow this core mission include subsidized microchipping, spay and neuter, free ride home for lost animals, disaster response notifications, and private-public partnership retail coupons. All of these incentives (and more as identified in the Fee discussion) are intended to promote a culture of compliance through the use of incentives (matched with enforcement).

▪ **Recruiting Neighborhood Associations:** The service should be using its human resources to establish a physical presence in each of the 95 neighborhoods in Portland, and the equivalent in the County. There should be contact made to educate these community leaders about the mission of the service and then to establish a communication corridor for neighborhood specific animal safety concerns.

♦ **Capital Resources and Infrastructure:** There needs to be a Portland based facility for adoptions, lost & found, and basing of Portland response officers for 24/7 services. The Troutdale facility is the only realistic full sized shelter location within the practical matrix of decision making. There is no need for a 6<sup>th</sup> regional full service shelter.

▪ **Central City Animal Care Center:** A new Portland urban area animal care center must be part of any capital campaign. The “Central City Animal Community Center” should be designed on the Eco-Trust Building model for a multi-user facility. The center needs to be designed to flex for the needs of the LOS, and should be a resource for all of the animal advocates in the metropolitan area. The center should offer:

1. Headquarters of Central Animal Services Precinct with 24/7 Response teams and round the clock desk and phone coverage;
2. ICS for Animal Services in the event of a disaster with FEMA funded pre-positioned sheltering equipment for urban animal rescue and shelter;
3. Lost & Found 72 Hour holding for all animals in the City which are brought in by whomever;
4. Adoption Center for all animals currently using County Shelter, and for animals held by smaller (non-profit only) groups which register with the County and enter into use agreements with the animal care center;
5. Resource Center for all registered animal advocacy groups with meeting space, kennels, and surgical suites available for use through a programmed system which may be run by one of the non-profits.

The prior citizen task forces have all found a regional need for a feline transition shelter where stray animals can be held for not more than 3 days, cataloged and then transitioned if not recovered. The location, within Portland, should have modules which can be leased at reduced rates to a variety of animal service organizations. There should be shared facilities such as operating theaters, kennels, HIV quarantine, adoption rooms, and offices for programming.

▪ **Shelter Dream for East County at Troutdale:** The majority of County growth is occurring in East County for which the Troutdale location is reasonably well situated. The size of the land available, the existing infrastructure, and the conceptual designs already created for the Shelter Dream plans all are very suited to the Troutdale location. (See, **Annex \*** ) If the CCACC is built in tandem with the construction of the Shelter Dream full service facility, then both growth nexus are ensured animal service coverage. The considered opinion is that the Troutdale location has the zoning, land, and distance from the urban centers to allow for a large capacity full service program. The larger the facility the longer animals could be held and the more likely that adoption will occur instead of death.

The City and County should fully fund and implement the County’s Shelter Dream Plan, using revenue bonds which use fee/fine revenue as the leveraged source of payment. The City should participate because it will receive the CCACC, and the City is the user of 80% of the existing animal services resources. The increased enforcement will result in more animals in the shelter system so the modern and larger flex space envisioned in the Shelter Dream needs to become a reality. Spaces for livestock need to be programmed including spaces for isolation in the event of a vector control emergency (hoof & mouth, avian flu). The ability to flex to absorb disaster victims and to pre-position FEMA

emergency shelter equipment is essential to the Troutdale location. However, Troutdale is a true full service location which the urban core does not need and often does not desire.

- **Animal Cruelty Forensic Center:** The effective imposition of a law enforcement solution on animal cruelty cases comes from having the proper capital infrastructure to treat these cases as crimes. A lab, precinct, and holding facility for abused animals is an essential part of an effective program to criminalize the unethical treatment of animals. An expanded cadre of state certified officers is needed to grow the mission into a constant regional presence as opposed to the current crisis driven response.

The current organization of animal cruelty enforcement is disjointed. There is one County detective who works with animal safety services officers and performs the arrest functions which the officers may not perform. There is a state law enforcement certification requirement for arrest powers, and the certification institute in Monmouth only certifies where the law allows. The current state of the law has authorized the Oregon Humane Society to have its officers receive certification but, oddly, has deprived the county animal services officers of the same opportunities. Therefore, at least three different actors are involved in cruelty cases, and there is no centralized facility or training center which would allow for these actors to prosecute cases, maintain evidence, and segregate animal “witnesses” to particular crimes.

#### ► **Innovations in Governance:**

- ♦ **Standing Joint Committee:** A permanent joint committee should be formed with City and County stakeholders in the animal welfare fields. The model for this effort is the Portland Noise Control Board. (See, Ordinance at **Annex \***).

The Metropolitan Animal Services Committee is a concept with both City and County appointed people who are the first stop for all things animal. The committee will develop periodic strategic goals for the community through public hearings and shall act as an ombudsman for animal issues within the community. In much the same manner as the periodic review of a comprehensive land use plan, this committee will recommend a regional series of goals, then policies designed to reach those goals. The “plans” will then be submitted to City and County elected officials for adoption. The committee will be a conduit for animal issues on many levels, and the work of the committee will allow the service providers to respond to the community’s priorities in LOS without the need for a crisis to stimulate a change in priorities.

Whether the issue is feral cats or loose dogs usually the substantive solution is found in a region wide action plan. There are 95 neighborhood associations in Portland in addition to the unincorporated Multnomah County and the other municipalities within the County. Using the Committee will allow each of these stakeholders a forum to express the priorities each identifies. The process will allow the Committee to track trends, and develop holistic action plans rather than mere crisis specific responses.

The Committee should also be designed to expand its membership. As municipalities in addition to Portland adopt the model ordinances and contribute to the system, then they should each obtain a seat on the Committee. Through a voluntary system it is possible to elevate animal services policies into regional goals matched to regional success. Therefore,

a permanent committee should be one innovation in governance the City and County pioneer.

♦ **Community Based Priorities for Levels of Service:**

The Community Nexus of the animal safety service program can be better focused if the Joint Standing Committee were complemented by the liaison of members of each City and County neighborhood association.

- **Community Leadership.** If each association or group were to add an animal safety position to the board of volunteers (much like the existing land use or public safety positions which are currently recommended by the organizers) then those board members could be included in both the online community that the Joint Standing Committee forms to review policy recommendations, but also to focus animal safety officers to specific neighborhoods to address neighborhood level concerns. The partnership of the government with the individual on the neighborhood level is an innovation in service, and provides a sense of responsiveness at the first level of community organization.

- **Community Open Access.** The service can better defuse conflicts at the human – animal interface if it adopts an open access policy to the registration data. Neighbors should be able to see if an animal is registered to a particular address, and registration numbers should be searchable for those animals which are recovered. The service should also allow for complaints to be made on-line or otherwise without attribution for those who desire it. The e-mail address of the Outreach Officer should be available and a policy of same day response should be adapted to customer care issues. Web cameras in the holding and kennel areas which show which animals are in residence should also be a part of the open access policy. People can see how well the animals are treated and look for a lost animal at the same time. Tours of the facilities and “ride alongs” by field officers should also be a part of the regular schedule for which people may sign up. All of these openness innovations should be adopted and implemented with the additional officers funded through the registration fees.

- **Urban Service Specific LOS.** The LOS desired in each City neighborhood is distinct to that particular community but the often the origin of the problems being addressed are found in regional mass.

The type of work performed by animal services is too numerous to list here but some basic concepts can be readily listed for the purpose of focusing the discussion.

- Rescue and Recovery of Animals
- Animal Health Regulation and Community Welfare
- License and Registration of Animals & Service Providers
- Anti-Social Animal Behavior Interventions
- First Responder Disaster Coordinator
- Animal Shelter and Adoption Services

The order in which these general categories are prioritized is ever changing . The history of animal safety services in Portland shows that in 1960 there was a leash law adopted, and in 1970’s feral cats were the control priority. The killing of animals and the gross budget cuts of the 1980’s resulted in a shift of priority to adoption services. Thus, even when agreeing



upon the LOS there is no fixed point of reference for the order of priority of the human resources of animal services. The strategic goal should be for the next four years (2008-12), and the focus should be on the top fundable LOS priorities.

**Recommendations:** The City and County should adopt ordinances to create a joint permanent committee to address animal welfare issues for the community and to make periodic recommendations to the elected officials of policy directions and resource allocations. Further, the objective for governance should be to focus on building a regional approach to animal welfare which is inclusive of the stakeholders and flexible to the changing needs of the community.

► **Portland's Position in the Community of Cities:**

There are other communities working with the same issue of decreasing real dollar budgets and increasing urban density. (See **Annex #11**). Each in turn is using the user fee approach to supplement general fund dollars. In none is the system funded only by user fees. None offer the systematic innovations found in this Task Force report nor the intergovernmental approach to this quality of life issue.

### **Implementation Measures**

The Report recommendations need to be implemented by the adoption of ordinances and policies which in turn need to be drafted by teams skilled in this particular art. The public process is unlikely to find successful transition from Report to action without an equal emphasis on the implementation measures. The City and County should adopt resolutions creating an ad hoc committee to draft all of the necessary ordinances and policies for consideration by the City and County as well as the public. The committee will need a City and County attorney, staff from (1) Animal Services, (2) Parks & Rec, (3) Noise Control, and (4) Business Services. A public member from the task force should also be included in order to insure transparency of the process and fidelity to the Report.

## **Annex 1**

**Central City Animal Community Center  
(To be completed in the future)**

## Annex 2

### Central City Animal Community Center Facility Criteria and Concept

**Central City Animal Facility:** A new Portland urban area animal care center must be part of any capital campaign. The “Central City Animal Community Center” should be designed on the Eco-Trust Building model for a multi-user facility. The center needs to be designed to flex for the needs of the LOS, and should be a resource for all of the animal advocates in the metropolitan area. The center should offer:

- Headquarters of Central Animal Services Precinct with 24/7 Response teams and round the clock desk and phone coverage;
- ICS for Animal Services in the event of a disaster with FEMA funded pre-positioned sheltering equipment for urban animal rescue and shelter;
- Lost & Found 72 Hour holding for all animals in the City which are brought in by whomever;
- Adoption Center for all animals currently using County Shelter, and for animals held by smaller (non-profit only) groups which register with the County and enter into use agreements with the animal care center;
- Resource Center for all registered animal advocacy groups with meeting space, kennels, and surgical suites available for use through a programmed system which may be run by one of the non-profits.

The prior citizen task forces have all found a regional need for a feline transition shelter where stray animals can be held for not more than 3 days, cataloged and then transitioned if not recovered. The location, within Portland, should have modules which can be leased at reduced rates to a variety of animal service organizations. There should be shared facilities such as operating theaters, kennels, HIV quarantine, adoption rooms, and offices for programming.

The CCACC should hold special low-cost vaccination and microchip clinics. Vaccinations for rabies, canine distemper/parvovirus (DHPP), feline "distemper" (FVRCP), canine bordatella (“kennel cough”), and feline leukemia. No appointments are necessary and there is no limit as to how many animals an individual can bring to the clinic. Microchips are also available and required. Anyone with a dog or cat can make an appointment for their pet at the CCACC. The non-profits who operate out of the CCACC can make the particular arrangements.

The location needs to be on transit and in the Central City or Near East Side. An existing building can be retrofitted at minimal cost for the service level.

### **Annex 3**

#### **Pet Food Deposit and Redemption System**

A pet food container deposit. Each container or unit of pet food sold within the County is subject to a deposit in the same manner as the bottle deposit. However, the deposit is reclaimed by presenting only the UPC for the pet food container rather than the container itself. The same mechanisms which are already in place for bottles will serve for this other form of deposit. The UPC will act like a coupon and be redeemed in the same manner as a manufacturer's coupon. The annual surplus of unclaimed deposits will be provided to County as revenue. Compare this to the often discussed pet food tax has been a non-starter for 25 years. We have no other sales taxes so it would be a unique imposition. The loop holes for what is or is not "pet food" make it even harder to enforce. This is just not a practical avenue to explore.

A working group should be formed to study both the new state wide return system and to determine if such a deposit would work for pet food containers.

**Annex 4**  
**Calgary Model Enforcement**

**(Not included in report)**

## **Annex 5**

### **Permanent Joint Committee on the Provision of Animal Welfare Services.**

**Standing Joint Committee:** A permanent joint committee should be formed with City and County stakeholders in the animal welfare fields. The model is used in several municipalities. The concept is to have a Planning Commission type unit with both City and County appointed people who are the first stop for all things animal. The committee will set periodic strategic goals for the community through public hearings and shall act as an ombudsman for animal issues within the community. In much the same manner as the periodic review of a comprehensive land use plan, this committee will set a regional series of goals, then policies designed to reach those goals. The “plans” will then be submitted to Portland and County for adoption as “guidance” for the various involved agencies (including animal safety services). The committee will be a conduit for animal issues on many levels, and the work of the committee will allow the service providers to respond to the community’s priorities in LOS without the need for a crisis to stimulate a change in priorities.

The Committee should be created by Intergovernmental Agreement of City and County, using license revenue to create one FTE staff support position, and making an office and hearing room in the new CCACC when constructed. The IGA should envision three members to start, one appointed by the City, one by the County, and the third by both Mayor and County Chair. As other jurisdictions are invited to join the committee, sign the IGA, contribute some money through their own municipal license structure, then the committee will expand to add seats for these governmental appointees. In theory, the committee would expand to add all of the local governments in our region.

## Annex 6 Fee Schedule

Annual Registration Schedule City of Portland & Multnomah County, Oregon		Who is Required to Have One?	Qualifications	Benefits
Mandatory Minimum Fee	\$10.00	Required of any Multnomah County Resident* with a domestic animal of any kind other than canine or feline	Rate applies for any Senior Citizen Companion Animal  Excludes shelter animals	Coupon to Local Pet Store E-mail Notice of Importance Robo Call List Inclusion
Mandatory Canine & Feline Fee	\$30.00	Required of any Multnomah County Resident with a canine or feline per each	Proof of Rabies vaccine and Microchip Proof of Sterility	Free Animal Recovery & Return Extended Holding Period
Urban Service Fee	\$15.00	Required of any City of Portland Resident who has an animal		?
Household Animal Permit	\$35.00	Optional		Listing on 911 Response System for animal rescue purposes
Fertile Dog or Cat	\$100.00	Required for any non sterile animal after six months of age		?
Breeder Registration	\$150.00	Any person who breeds animals of any kind	Health Dept facility license	?
Newborn Registration	FREE	Any person with a new born animal under 6 months Includes any pet store, breeder, or seller		
Special Use Permit	\$750.00	Optional	Canine Good Citizenship Certificate	Use of the Portland Public Parks in designated Permit areas for off leash activities with canines: Special rules apply.
Yield Calculations (Assumption is no net loss in registrations)				
52,000 Portland Registrants x \$15 Urban Service Fee = \$780,000 new dollars / \$60,000 per FTE = 13 FTE (after capital expense for equipment & training)				
25,000 Portland Households x \$35 Household Animal Permit = \$875,000 new dollars				



## **Annex 7**

### **Pet Point Animal Management System**

The PetPoint System  
Makes Animal Management  
Easy & Affordable!!



If you've been waiting for a better shelter management system, your wait has ended! Call us today at (866) 630-PETS(7387) to arrange a tour of the on-line demonstration version of PetPoint or to simply discuss your operational needs and how PetPoint can streamline your adoption process, lower your operating costs and provide value-added services directly to your adopters.

**Annex 8**  
**Shelter Dream for East County at Troutdale**



**Annex 9**  
**Reserve and Cadet Officer Training Program Outline**  
**(To be developed in the future)**

## Annex 10

### Parks & Recreation Natural Area Policy



#### PORTLAND PARKS & RECREATION

Healthy Parks, Healthy Portland

#### POLICY

<b>Title:</b> Dogs in Natural Area Parks		
<b>Date Adopted</b>	<b>Date Revised:</b>	<b>Authorized By:</b> David McAllister

#### POLICY:

Dogs are not permitted off-leash in natural area parks. The Bureau and its partners will develop education and enforcement plans aimed at ensuring responsible use of natural areas and minimizing the impacts of pets.

Dogs are not allowed on or off leash in newly acquired natural area parks to protect sensitive habitat until site planning occurs. As master and management planning for individual natural area park sites occurs, specific recommendations will be made regarding any restrictions on use by dogs, including the option of no dogs allowed.

#### PURPOSE:

Sites designated as natural area parkland are managed to protect wildlife habitat and natural features; human use is controlled to protect natural resource values.

Portland's natural areas are part of a larger system of greenspaces that help preserve the biological diversity of the region and maintain habitat for a variety of wildlife species including threatened and rare species such as salmon, bald eagles, and red-legged frogs. Natural area parkland offers scenic backdrops throughout the city and provides the residents of Portland a chance to connect with nature. These areas are managed to protect the region's water and air quality, protecting streams and natural vegetation in each of the city's watersheds.

Many studies have documented the effects of domestic dogs on wildlife. As dogs are recognized as predators by wildlife, their presence may stress wildlife and reduce breeding success. Visiting dogs can transmit diseases to wild populations or pick up diseases carried by wildlife. Uncollected dog feces can result in fertilization which may favor invasive plant species. Dogs can also contribute to the spread of undesirable species through seeds in their fur.

Most natural area park sites contain developed trails that see extensive use by pedestrians with dogs. Dog owners take their dogs to natural area parks for mutual

#### Administration

1120 S.W. 5th Ave., Suite 1302  
Portland, OR 97204  
Tel: (503) 823-7529 Fax: (503) 823-6007

[www.PortlandParks.org](http://www.PortlandParks.org)  
Dan Saltzman, Commissioner  
Zari Santner, Director

*Sustaining a healthy park and recreation system to make Portland a great place to live, work and play.*

exercise, for appreciation of nature, and for personal security. Many natural area sites are connected by regional trails where pedestrians and leashed dogs can do longer-distance hiking, walking, and jogging.

As the portfolio of natural area parkland increases and individual site planning continues, the appropriate level of use by people and pets in each site must be considered. In the case of newly acquired natural areas without established trails or public use, an interim policy of dog exclusion will be enforced. The interim policy will be in force until site planning for the site is completed.

#### IMPLEMENTATION:

Apply an interim dog exclusion policy at the following sites. These sites have been acquired since 2000 and have no established trails or visitor services. Other properties offer trail walking opportunities to people and leashed dogs.

- Campfire Property
- Fanno Creek Natural Area
- Gentemann Property
- Johnson Lake
- Lower Powell Butte Floodplain
- Tryon Headwaters
- West Portland Park

## Annex 11 Comparative Innovated Communities

- Calgary, ALB [www.calgary.ca/cca](http://www.calgary.ca/cca) not a “no-kill” program

Calgary has a zero tolerance policy for pet licensing, with a \$250 fine for noncompliance.

- San Clemente, CA <http://ci.san-clemente.ca.us> “no-kill” program  
(select services, then select animal services)

San Clemente-Dana Point Animal Shelter is supported by The Pet Project Foundation, a private non-profit that provides all food and medical care, some improvements, some staff salaries and partial refunds for citizens for spay and neuter. [www.petprojectfoundation.org](http://www.petprojectfoundation.org).

- San Francisco, CA [www.sfspca.org](http://www.sfspca.org) “no-kill” program

SF SPCA quit providing animal control services in 1989 and dedicated the efforts of the organization strictly to promoting animal welfare. Made a pact with SF Dept. of Animal Care in 1994 to take in all animals that the City could not place. Opened a model pet adoption center in 1998. (Some information indicates that they may no longer adhere to a strict “no-kill” policy).

- Denver, CO [www.denvergov.org/AnimalControl](http://www.denvergov.org/AnimalControl) not a “no-kill” program

Denver Animal Foundation “adopted” Denver Municipal Animal Shelter, looking to improve facilities and conditions, reduce euthanasia rates, increase volunteers, provide for special medical expenses. The City of Denver provides on-line licensing and offers free licenses for senior citizens and for guide dogs. Laws require mandatory spay/neuter, unless an “intact animal permit” is secured, at a cost of \$93 each year.

- Miami/Dade Co, FLA [www.miamidade.gov/animals](http://www.miamidade.gov/animals) not a “no-kill” program

Partnered with local Humane Society for free/low-cost spay/neuter program.

- Hastings, MN [www.animalark.org](http://www.animalark.org) “no-kill” program

Nonprofit group reports that their facility is modest but has relaxing and comfortable environment for animals. The group also states that it is the largest “no-kill” shelter in the twin-cities area.

- Reno, NV [www.co.washoe.nv.us](http://www.co.washoe.nv.us) not a “no-kill” program

Animal control shares facilities with Nevada Humane Society.

- New York, NY      [www.nyacc.org](http://www.nyacc.org)      not a “no-kill” program  
                         [www.animalallianceny.org](http://www.animalallianceny.org)      “no-kill” program

NYC contracts with the nonprofit group, Animal Care and Control of New York City for all of its municipal animal shelter and animal control services. The agency is working to reduce euthanization rates through education and spay/neuter programs, but still is killing animals due to lack of adequate shelter space. Animal Care is a program of NYACC that accepts donations to aid in, “the comfort of animals,” and to reduce euthanization. The Mayor’s Alliance for NYC’s Animals, Inc was formed in 2002, as a nonprofit organization to work with over 140 shelters in the New York area to move toward a common goal of providing homes for animals and ending euthanization of pets, “of reasonable health and temperament.” This is being accomplished by collaboration between public and private animal welfare groups.

- Tompkins Co, NY [www.spcasonline.com](http://www.spcasonline.com)      “no-kill” program

The Tompkins County SPCA provides animal control and sheltering services for the county and all its townships, including Ithica, NY. The organization decided to become a “no-kill” program in 1999 and reduced euthanasia by 50% the first year. By 2001, no healthy animals were euthanized. By 2002, and over the years since then, no healthy or treatable animals have been euthanized. The results were achieved by public support, massive volunteer support and extensive spay/neuter and adoption outreach programs.

- Richmond, VA      [www.richmondspca.org](http://www.richmondspca.org)      “no-kill” program

Richmand SPCA created a 5-year plan to transition to a “no-kill” program, employing an extensive public relations program to gain community support and then using that support to increase the volunteer base and implement more extensive spay/neuter and adoption programs. An article in the archives of the Best Friends site, described below, was written by the director of the Richmond SPCA and details the process of the transition for this group.

- Best Friends      [www.bestfriends.org](http://www.bestfriends.org)      “no-kill” program

This nonprofit organization is probably well-known to all of the Task Force members. Their shelter is in Utah and they are working to make the entire state a “no-kill” jurisdiction. Their website has great information on model programs in the section titled, “No More Homeless Pets.”