

February 3, 2006

The Honorable Jack Kelly
Member, City Council
City of Philadelphia
City Hall, Room 594
Philadelphia, PA 19107-3290

Re: Philadelphia Animal Care & Control Association

Dear Council Member Kelly,

For the first time in history, more animals were saved than killed in Philadelphia's animal control shelter. Since the City Council's historic public hearings in 2004 on conditions within the agency, we have moved decisively to improve animal care and control delivery by seeking professional outside review, hiring new leadership, replacing underperforming staff, rationalizing operations, creating a culture of accountability, and refocusing the agency's mission. As a result of these efforts, the Philadelphia Animal Care and Control Association ("PACCA") has reduced the death rate by more than 30% over the past eight months—a level of achievement that takes most communities five years to accomplish. We could not have done it without your support and leadership.

With your continued support, and further commitments on the part of the City, I am confident that we can look optimistically to the future—a future that promises the homeless animals of Philadelphia a new beginning, instead of the end of the line. But, as you well know, the work is far from finished, there is a long way to go, and many homeless animals remain "at risk." In fact, despite the dramatic reduction in the death rate, 20,000 animals will still be killed at PACCA this year.

Moreover, PACCA's ability to sustain our achievements is in jeopardy due to insufficient resources. PACCA's current funding levels are significantly lower than other major city animal care and control agencies nationally. This was made clear in the auditor's May 2005 assessment. According to No Kill Solutions, the national consulting agency who reviewed PACCA operations:

In December of 2000, the Board of Directors for the Pennsylvania SPCA voted to discontinue its contract for animal control services with the Department of Public Health. At the time, the city was paying the SPCA only \$790,092 annually, about 54 cents per capita, and the lowest of the fourteen largest cities in the United States. Philadelphia was the only city paying less than one dollar per capita on animal control, with cities less than half its size paying more per capita and more overall. The cities in the survey paid between \$1.01 per capita to \$6.16. In other words, Philadelphia was paying about half what the next lowest city was paying and eleven times less than the leader.

Because the city was unable to find an alternative provider, it created the Philadelphia Animal Care & Control Association as a separate IRS Code Section 501(c)(3)... A list of seventeen duties were then outlined in order to meet the mission of the agency. None of them speak to services such as adoption, spay/neuter, education, increasing awareness of the role animals play in people's lives or helping responsible pet owners retain their pets... In short, PACCA was designed primarily to impound and kill animals. Adopting animals was considered a limited need

(although a perfunctory sentence “preferring” adoption is mentioned in the contract), and not identified in the expected comparison of services to be provided by PACCA... PACCA would provide primarily “catch and kill” services at the lowest possible cost. Giving the agency sufficient resources to do high quality work, or to save lives was not reflected in its mission. The emphasis was on reducing costs and staff to a bare minimum. The poor quality of the shelter, the poor location of the shelter, the poor quality of the staff and the lack of effective programs are testament to that emphasis.

The 2003 budget for PACCA was identified as \$2,307,328 which comes from a contract with the Department of Public Health. According to PACCA, there are approximately 1.5 million Philadelphia residents. PACCA is currently spending approximately \$1.50 per capita on animal control. This does not include approximately \$275,000 in revenues. Several national agencies and [International City County Management Association] ICMA recommend a budget of between \$4.00 and \$7.00 be spent per capita. At the low end, that would put PACCA at a recommended budget of approximately \$6,000,000. In other words, the City is underfunding PACCA by nearly 4 million dollars annually. Expecting the City to fund PACCA at this level is unrealistic in the current economic climate, but the City should reevaluate whether it is putting sufficient resources toward its newly developed animal control goals, in light of the fact that funding is below comparable jurisdictions, recommendations of expert bodies, and prevailing national norms.

According to the auditor, “the City is underfunding PACCA by nearly 4 million dollars annually.” Indeed, that is the assessment on the low end of national recommendations. On the high end, the figure is in excess of 8 million dollars per year. For example, when the Pennsylvania SPCA (“PSPCA”) performed animal control services for the City, they had 27 drivers picking up lost and unwanted Philadelphia animals. PACCA has 13, less than half the number the PSPCA felt was necessary to meet its animal care and control responsibilities to residents of this City. In addition, the PSPCA had ten people answering telephones and assisting the public. PACCA, by contrast, has 4.5 FTE on staff. In addition, the Department of Public Property Call Center answers telephone calls on behalf of PACCA. In 2004, PACCA calls amounted to approximately 7% of their total, or 0.6 FTE positions, for a total of roughly 5.1 FTE—at or around half the number of operators the PSPCA felt was necessary when it was performing animal care and control services under contract with the City.

Looking at comparable jurisdictions by population,

- San Francisco (population 800,000), which is expecting to save 85% of all animals the municipal animal control shelter takes in spends \$4.38 per capita, not including low-cost spay/neuter surgeries;
- San Diego, CA (population 2.5 million) spends \$4.05 per capita and has recently announced it is close to saving every healthy dog and cat. In 2005, it began construction of a \$12,000,000 shelter in the south part of the county after also completing a separate \$6.6 million shelter in the north end of the county. In 2003, it spent \$2 million on a third facility.
- Phoenix, AZ (population 1.3 million) is spending \$6.16 per capita;
- Los Angeles, CA (population 3.5 million) spends \$5.34 per capita on animal control and in FY 2000 approved \$154,000,000 in general obligation bonds to renovate and/or build new animal shelters;
- Hillsborough, FL (population 1 million) is spending \$6.05;
- Palm Beach County, FL (population 1.2 million) is spending \$6.37.

There are others, of course, which spend less. Unfortunately, their rates of lifesaving and community satisfaction reflect it. The bottom line is painfully obvious—without sufficient funding, animals in Philadelphia who might otherwise live long lives, bringing joy to people, will die. And it is clear that this something the public simply will not continue to accept.

Moreover, there are facility challenges which must also be addressed for the City to improve the effectiveness of operations relative to its goals for the Department. Since the deficiencies of the current facility will thwart some of the agency's policy decisions, a capital improvement plan is vital to sustaining and improving the success of the agency, particularly in the busy summer months when the agency takes in up to 250 dogs and cats per day.

As the auditor noted,

A community's animal shelter is the heart of an animal care and protection program and facilities and grounds should be maintained so that they are attractive and welcoming to the public. The physical building itself can be—or can appear to be—reflective of how strong and caring the internal programs are and the commitment to animal care is.

Modern shelters in communities with demonstrative commitments to lifesaving are spacious places, clean and well lighted, and provide and welcome ample opportunity for public and animal interaction. They are public meeting places, they reduce costs of care for illness, keep animals healthy and stimulated, increase adoptions by decreasing length of stay and increasing public traffic, and improve overall community satisfaction with the job the shelter is doing.

PACCA's shelter, by contrast, was placed outside of public retail and commercial areas, and designed for warehousing animals only. It was not designed to serve as an animal care center, adoption center, and area of public gathering. As indicated in the auditor's report:

The shelter appears to have been so hastily and poorly design—and horribly located—that PACCA will always be hindered in its lifesaving success by its physical facilities.

The agency's website states that PACCA "operates a state-of-the-art facility to provide temporary shelter and care for animals." (www.pacca.us, last visited April 25, 2005.) Unfortunately, there is simply no basis for this claim. A former administrator for two of the largest shelters in the country wrote of PACCA following his visit in December 2004:

The building...is inadequate, to put it mildly. It was not designed to do adoptions in a pleasant, friendly atmosphere. It was easy to see that it was designed to warehouse animals only. Because of the nonexistent proper air flow, the dog area had an overwhelming stench that made it difficult, if not unhealthy, to breathe. The area that was modified to handle the public wishing to adopt was inadequate, and there was definitely no proper draining system available for cleaning and sanitizing. The building, though safe in structure, was never meant to properly house animals. We are now, in modern times of animal facilities.... The city put together an outdated environment to help animals.

It quickly became apparent that many people in the City have no idea of the shelter's physical location, and many potential adopters, in the prime retail areas of Center City and/or outlying suburbs, cannot and/or will not travel to this area of the City. The shelter is far removed from the City's commercial, shopping/retail, and neighborhood districts. While there is a residential center near PACCA, the neighborhood appears to be economically distressed.

As a result, the auditor recommended that PACCA create a satellite adoption facility in the heart of the City's retail and commerce area, Center City. He also recommended a series of structural improvements including revamping the facility's HVAC system, among others.

It is important to keep in mind that today's animal services program is as complex and critical an operation as any municipal department. For example, a modern municipal animal care and control program interested in reducing killing to the maximum extent practicable must meet certain mandatory minimums. These are:

1. Providing nourishment, medical care and social enrichment/behavioral rehabilitation for all domestic animals in its care;
2. Providing basic health screening for all animals;
3. Providing a preventative disease control program;
4. Vaccinating animals in its care;
5. Remaining open seven days per week to adopt out animals;
6. Humanely killing by barbiturate injection those animals who are not adoptable;
7. Providing shelter care for animals in protective custody and under observation or quarantine;
8. Providing a formalized and structured volunteer and foster care program through which members of the community can get actively involved in helping the animals;
9. Providing lost and found services;
10. Providing information and access to subsidized spay/neuter services;
11. Maintaining accurate and thorough records on all animal-related activities; and,
12. Providing community education.

In the context of its public safety obligations, it is also responsible for:

1. Enforcing local ordinances;
2. Dog licensure;
3. Dog bite investigations;
4. Investigation of animal cruelty cases for animals in its care;
5. Rabies compliance and abatement;
6. Stray animal sheltering; and,
7. Quarantine and/or destruction of dangerous and irremediably diseased animals.

It is impossible to do all of these functions and/or do them competently without sufficient funding. At this time, therefore, we are asking the City to increase our budget by \$2.5 million dollars for the next fiscal year for operational support, and \$3 million for short-term one-time capital improvements. We are also asking the City to consider this request as part of a commitment to gradually increase operational support by a total of \$4 million dollars per year over current levels during the next three year to five years, with the bulk of the increase occurring in FY 2007. This will bring the City closer to national recommendations.

With the one time capital appropriation, PACCA will partner with private donors to create the Pet Adoption Center and to begin to make improvements at its central facility. An architect-consultant experienced in animal shelter design will also be retained to assess the facility and make recommendations for modifications necessary to allow PACCA to achieve its long term goals. As a result, PACCA will further ask the City Council to enact a long term capital improvement plan in FY 2008.

These appropriations will allow PACCA to implement necessary infrastructure improvements, as well as the recommended programs and services identified by the auditor and ongoing managerial assessment of PACCA operations. And they will allow PACCA to sustain and improve upon the reduction of the death rate and to increase public health and safety by allowing us to effectively deliver animal care and control services to the citizens of this City.

I am confident that we can create an agency that not only enjoys great community esteem, but is a national model for others to follow. If I can answer any questions or provide further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (215) 685-9043.

Very truly yours,

Tara Derby-Perrin
Executive Director

Enclosures

Attachment I: Budget Summary Worksheet for FY2007

Attachment II: Funding Needs

SHORT-TERM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

- Pet Adoption Center.
- Telecommunications system.
- Surgery suite.
- Exterior, effective signage, including back-lit sign.
- Commercial washer and dryer.
- Renovation of space review. Hire an architect experienced in animal sheltering design to review the facility and make recommendations for a long term capital improvement plan.
- New Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system.
- Improve and add drainage, electrical upgrades, and plumbing.
- Parking lot redesign. Not enough room for people wanting to adopt, large pot holes.
- Exterior exercise yards for dogs, concrete-based for cleaning efficiency, securely fenced, tent roof for shade from hot sun.
- Need a larger adoption area, not enough room to hold people who wish to adopt.
- Increase the number of cat cages to accommodate demand without the need to kill daily.
- Front lobby needs to be redesigned—poses risk to public and animals.
- Surveillance system.
- Keyless entry system for rear garage door.

ONE-TIME COSTS

- PACCA needs two additional computers, complete with towers and monitors, and an additional printer in receiving in order to expedite data entry, and begin a daily census of lost/found animals.
- Enrichment items for animals.
- Feral Cat Handling System, including cage and boxes.
- Safety equipment for all ACOs and Drivers.
- Isolation Room—Protective clothing for all staff.
- Personal protective equipment for all staff (e-room, kennels, vet techs, etc.).
- Surgical instruments.

OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE

- City doesn't have dumpster trucks. PACCA needs at least 2 large capacity dumpsters that are emptied every day through a private contractor.
- Landfill dumping has proven to be a problem with the city for disposal of dead animals. PACCA should have adequate resources to contract out with a private vendor for disposal of dead animals.

- There is no budget for outside resources, materials, etc. All training must be obtained pro bono which limits our ability to garner continuous, high-quality training for staff throughout all areas of shelter operations.
- Disaster plan review and initiation.
- Formal facility maintenance plan to keep building operating efficiently.
- Staff for data entry. Inputting data into the computer system in a timely manner is currently thwarted given the amount of animals PACCA receives (60-250 daily) as a function of available staff.
- In an effort to ensure safe, quality adoptions, and increase lifesaving for animals by making better matches with adoptive families.
- Staff additions to handle and care for animals. Increasing hold time for stray cats is impossible given PACCA's current space and budget restrictions. This means that people looking for lost cats have little to no chance of reclaiming their pet at PACCA.
- As an agency that employs individuals who are responsible for driving vehicles, and handling controlled substances, PACCA should have a mandatory random drug testing policy.
- Industrial steam cleaning.
- Increased staff to handle volume of animals.
- Rabies prophylaxis for all staff.
- Training and development of City-ACO certification program.
- Public spay/neuter budget.
- Medical treatments sufficient for 27,000 animals.
- Veterinary/Medical personnel.
- Post Adoption callback program.
- Public relations/advertising budget.

Attachment II: Funding Needs with Justification

SHORT-TERM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

- Pet Adoption Center. (See Section 3.1 of auditor's report at pages 8-9, 21-22, and section G at pages 124-125.)
- Telecommunications system. (See Section 4.6 of auditor's report at page 34, Section 7.6 at page 92, and ongoing management assessment.)
- Surgery suite. (Recommendations of University of Pennsylvania Veterinary College review of facilities.)
- Exterior, effective signage, including back-lit sign. (See Section 3.1 of auditor's report at pages 8-10.)
- Commercial washer and dryer. (See Section 3.1 of auditor's report, especially at page 20.)
- Renovation of space review. Hire an architect experienced in animal sheltering design to review the facility and make recommendations for a long term capital improvement plan. (See auditor's report, throughout, especially Section 3.1.)
- New Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system. (See auditor's report, Section 3.1, especially at pages 21-22.)
- Improve and add drainage, electrical upgrades, and plumbing. (See auditor's report, Section 3.1, especially at pages 21-22.)
- Parking lot redesign. Not enough room for people wanting to adopt, large pot holes. (See auditor's report, Section 3.1, page 10.)
- Exterior exercise yards for dogs, concrete-based for cleaning efficiency, securely fenced, tent roof for shade from hot sun. (See auditor's report, Section 3.1, page 11, and ongoing management assessment.)
- Need a larger adoption area, not enough room to hold people who wish to adopt. (Ongoing management assessment.)
- Increase the number of cat cages to accommodate demand without the need to kill daily. (Ongoing management assessment.)
- Front lobby needs to be redesigned—poses risk to public and animals. (Ongoing management assessment)
- Surveillance system. (See auditor's report, Section 3.3 at page 23.)
- Keyless entry system for rear garage door. (See auditor's report, Section 3.3 at page 23.)

ONE-TIME COSTS

- PACCA needs two additional computers, complete with towers and monitors, and an additional printer in receiving in order to expedite data entry, and begin a daily census of lost/found animals. (Ongoing management assessment.)
- Enrichment items for animals. (See auditor's report, Section 5.1 at page 41, and ongoing management assessment.)
- Feral Cat Handling System, including cages and boxes. (See auditor's report, Section 5.3 at pages 51-53.)
- Safety equipment for all ACOs and Drivers. (See auditor's report, Section 9.1 at pages 104-105.)

- Isolation Room—Protective clothing for all staff. (Recommendations of University of Pennsylvania Veterinary College review of facilities.)
- Personal protective equipment for all staff (e-room, kennels, vet techs, etc.). (Ongoing management assessment.)
- Surgical instruments. (Recommendations of University of Pennsylvania Veterinary College review of facilities.)

OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE

- City doesn't have dumpster trucks. PACCA needs at least 2 large capacity dumpsters that are emptied every day through a private contractor. (Ongoing management assessment.)
- Landfill dumping has proven to be a problem with the city for disposal of dead animals. PACCA should have adequate resources to contract out with a private vendor for disposal of dead animals. (Ongoing management assessment.)
- There is no budget for outside resources, materials, etc. All training must be obtained pro bono which limits our ability to garner continuous, high-quality training for staff throughout all areas of shelter operations. (See auditor's report, Section 3.5 at page 25, and ongoing management assessment.)
- Disaster plan review and initiation. (See auditor's report, Section 3.5 at pages 25-26, and ongoing management assessment in light of lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina.)
- Formal facility maintenance plan to keep building operating efficiently. (See auditor's report, Section 3.6 at page 26, and ongoing management assessment.)
- Staff for data entry. Inputting data into the computer system in a timely manner is currently thwarted given the amount of animals PACCA receives (60-250 daily) as a function of available staff. (See auditor's report, Section 4.3 at page 29, and ongoing management assessment.)
- Behavior assessment, training staff. In an effort to ensure safe, quality adoptions, and increase lifesaving for animals by making better matches with adoptive families. (See auditor's report, Section 6.3 at pages 74-76, and ongoing management assessment.)
- Staff additions to handle and care for animals. Increasing hold time for stray cats is impossible given PACCA's current space and budget restrictions. This means that people looking for lost cats have little to no chance of reclaiming their pet at PACCA. (Ongoing management assessment.)
- As an agency that employs individuals who are responsible for driving vehicles, and handling controlled substances, PACCA should have a mandatory random drug testing policy. (See auditor's report, Section 4.7 at page 39, Section 8.1 at page 101, and Section 9.1 at page 104.)
- Industrial steam cleaning. (Ongoing management assessment.)
- Increased staff to handle volume of animals. (Ongoing management assessment.)
- Rabies prophylaxis for all staff. (See auditor's report, Section 5.9 at page 65.)
- Training and development of City-ACO certification program. (See auditor's report, Section 9.1 at pages 102-105, and ongoing management assessment.)

- Public spay/neuter budget. (See auditor's report, Section 5.7 at pages 61-63 and Section D at pages 118-120.)
- Medical treatments sufficient for 27,000 animals. (Ongoing management assessment.)
- Veterinary/Medical personnel. (See auditor's report, Section 5.4 at pages 53-56, recommendations of University of Pennsylvania Veterinary College review of facilities, and ongoing management assessment.)
- Post Adoption callback program. (See auditor's report, Section 6.4 at pages 76-77, and ongoing management assessment.)
- Public relations/advertising budget. (See auditor's report, Section 7.1 at pages 84-85, Section J at pages 129-131, and ongoing management assessment.)

Attachment IV: Selected Provisions of Auditor's Assessment

No Kill Solutions Evaluation and Program Plan for Philadelphia May 2005

Physical Shelter Pages 8-22

The shelter appears to have been so hastily and poorly design—and horribly located—that PACCA will always be hindered in its lifesaving success by its physical facilities.

The agency's website states that PACCA "operates a state-of-the-art facility to provide temporary shelter and care for animals." (www.pacca.us, last visited April 25, 2005.) Unfortunately, there is simply no basis for this claim. A former administrator for two of the largest shelters in the country wrote of PACCA following his visit in December 2004:

The building...is inadequate, to put it mildly. It was not designed to do adoptions in a pleasant, friendly atmosphere. It was easy to see that it was designed to warehouse animals only. Because of the nonexistent proper air flow, the dog area had an overwhelming stench that made it difficult, if not unhealthy, to breathe. The area that was modified to handle the public wishing to adopt was inadequate, and there was definitely no proper draining system available for cleaning and sanitizing. The building, though safe in structure, was never meant to properly house animals. We are now, in modern times of animal facilities.... The city put together an outdated environment to help animals.

It quickly became apparent that many people in the City have no idea of the shelter's physical location, and many potential adopters, in the prime retail areas of Center City and/or outlying suburbs, cannot and/or will not travel to this area of the City. The shelter is far removed from the City's commercial, shopping/retail, and neighborhood districts. While there is a residential center near PACCA, the neighborhood appears to be economically distressed.

Even if someone was intentionally going to PACCA, there is limited parking, and no available street parking (if one did not "have" to be there, such as adopters, it is conceivable that they would just leave out of frustration.) And while a sign reading "Animal Receiving" fronts the parking lot, there is no indication of adoptions in the building. In addition to being too small, the parking lot had a couple of potholes, one significant in size, further evidencing a lack of repair or priority for animal care functions in Philadelphia.

Invest in the modification of the shelter's heating, ventilation and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems to comport to modern requirements. HVAC systems in animal shelters should allow for a minimum of 10-12 100% outside air exchanges per hour, intake at the ceiling or a high point and exhaust near the floor to prevent smells from circulating to human nose level. If this is something that PACCA is willing to invest in, a good point of contact is ARQ Architects who specialize in shelter design, including HVAC. Go to www.arqarchitects.com.

Improve drainage at the shelter, especially at the dog runs, in receiving (no drain currently exists) and all rooms in which animals are housed.

Place sinks (with a foot pedal design to prevent the spread of disease associated with hand-handled sinks) in receiving, the cat room, the puppy room, post-op, in the dog kennel area, and in the isolation room.

The floors of the main dog area have cracks, which are difficult to effectively clean. Many of the fixtures and fittings on the kennels are not ideal for infection control because they have permeable, rough or rusty surfaces that cannot be effectively cleaned. These should be replaced.

Relocate PACCA (ideally) to a more centrally located area of the city that is convenient and in close proximity to retail areas of the City; or relocate Vector Control (less ideal) so that PACCA not only has more space, but a bigger parking lot for adopters, volunteers and events.

Develop a multi-year capital improvement strategy, including a voter-approved Bond measure, to build a new animal care and control center in a location closer to residential, retail and commercial centers, which will be better suited to meeting PACCA No Kill goals.

Building Security

Pages 23-24

Although the shelter does have a camera/video surveillance system, all but the outside cameras are not functional.

General Safety Issues

Page 25, 51-53

There does not appear to be a safety training program for staff which includes training on proper cleaning and sanitation techniques, first aid, and proper handling of animals, particularly those of aggressive or unknown disposition... Safety is the classic example where an “ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.” Staff training benefits everyone: the staff themselves, the animals and the public.

An animal handler’s most important tool cannot be found in any catalog. By far, the greatest asset to animal handling staff is knowledge. Personnel trained in animal behavior and humane handling can ensure that they are handling animals—and employing equipment—in the safest, most humane manner possible.

Disaster Preparedness

Pages 25-26

According to PACCA management, the agency is expected to “provide supplemental assistance for animal rescue.” There are no procedures or plan for how this would be accomplished. In addition, PACCA staff indicated that they do not see themselves able to provide any rescue or coordination in the event of a disaster other than normal duties...

Facility Maintenance

Page 26

Routine inspection and a preventative maintenance program is more cost effective and will decrease the number of costly repairs that have to be initiated because of overlooked problems.

Spay/Neuter Pages 61-63

According to recent census data, two-thirds of Philadelphians have incomes below \$20,000. The city has lost most manufacturing industries, infrastructure appears to be crumbling and segments of the community (particularly some areas within North Philadelphia) have little commercial or retail activity. At the same time, studies consistently show that wealthy communities spay/neuter their animals at four times the rate of economically distressed areas, and this figure holds true even within particular communities. In short, the single biggest variable for spay/neuter is cost, not “irresponsibility.”

Spay/neuter is the cornerstone of a successful lifesaving effort—the single most effective place to direct shelter resources. High volume spay/neuter will quickly lead to fewer animals entering the shelter system, allowing more resources to be allocated toward saving lives.

In the 1970s, the City of Los Angeles was the first to provide municipally funded spaying and neutering for low-income pet owners in the United States. A city study found that for every dollar it was investing in the program, Los Angeles taxpayers were saving \$10 in animal control costs due to reductions in animal intakes and fewer field calls. Indeed, Los Angeles shelters were taking in half the number of animals after just the first decade of the program and killing rates in the city dropped to the lowest third per capita in the United States. This result is consistent with experiences in San Francisco, San Diego and elsewhere.

One of the primary limitations to success in PACCA’s future is the lack of the City’s commitment to funding low-cost spaying and neutering. Research shows that investment in such programs not only provide immediate public health and public relations benefits but also long-term financial savings to a jurisdiction. According to the International City County Management Association (“ICMA”),

An effective animal control program not only saves cities and counties on present costs—by protecting citizens from dangerous dogs, for example—but also helps reduce the costs of animal control in the future. A city that impounds and euthanizes 4,000 animals in 2001... but does not promote spaying and neutering will probably still euthanize at least 4,000 animals a year in 2010. A city that... [institutes a subsidized spay/neuter program] will likely euthanize significantly fewer animals in 2010 and save on a host of other animal-related costs as well.

Zoonoses (Staff Safety) Page 65

PACCA relies on its staff to save lives and protect public safety. In return, PACCA has an obligation to reasonably protect its staff. Although bites and incidents will occur, a good program to protect the health of staff starts with training, and affords medical protection against zoonotic diseases, particularly rabies.

Customer Service Page 92

According to the Department of Public Property Call Center, about 52,000 PACCA related telephone calls come in annually (approximately 140 calls per day), 11% of which go unanswered and are “abandoned.”

Field Services

Pages 102-105

Drivers described being required by police to be the first to enter homes under police search warrants if dogs are suspected in the house, without police immediately entering with them for protection, and without defensive weapons or adequate safety equipment...

Drivers, like agents, should be given the following equipment at the start of each shift (logged as returned after each shift):

1. Bullet proof vests
2. Steel toed boots
3. Mace/Pepper spray
4. Bite stick
5. Cat/Wildlife gloves
6. Flash lights

In exchange for this equipment, which poses liability issues, all drivers and agents should be required to meet minimum education requirements (a high school diploma), have no criminal record, must receive certification, and be subject to random drug testing. All existing staff should be required to meet these qualifications and should not be "grand-fathered" in due to liability and safety issues...

All driver vehicles should be equipped with the following:

1. Strobe lights
2. Police search lights
3. Ladder

Governance

Pages 108-112

In December of 2000, the Board of Directors for the Pennsylvania SPCA voted to discontinue its contract for animal control services with the Department of Public Health. At the time, the city was paying the SPCA only \$790,092 annually, about 54 cents per capita, and the lowest of the fourteen largest cities in the United States. Philadelphia was the only city paying less than one dollar per capita on animal control, with cities less than half its size paying more per capita and more overall. The cities in the survey paid between \$1.01 per capita to \$6.16. In other words, Philadelphia was paying about half what the next lowest city was paying and eleven times less than the leader.

Because the city was unable to find an alternative provider, it created the Philadelphia Animal Care & Control Association as a separate IRS Code Section 501(c)(3)... A list of seventeen duties were then outlined in order to meet the mission of the agency. None of them speak to services such as adoption, spay/neuter, education, increasing awareness of the role animals play in people's lives or helping responsible pet owners retain their pets. These were all seen as SPCA functions. In short, PACCA was designed primarily to impound and kill animals. Adopting animals was considered a limited need (although a perfunctory sentence "preferring" adoption is mentioned in the contract), and not identified in the expected comparison of services to be provided by PACCA, as compared with the SPCA. PACCA would provide primarily "catch and kill" services at the lowest possible cost. Giving the agency sufficient resources to do high quality work, or to save lives was not reflected in its mission. The emphasis was on reducing costs and staff to a bare minimum. The poor quality of the shelter,

the poor location of the shelter, the poor quality of the staff and the lack of effective programs are testament to that emphasis.

Attachment V: Auditor's Full Assessment

No Kill Solutions

Evaluation and Program Plan for Philadelphia
May 2005