



Animal Services Sharing Assessment

Monterey County Board of Supervisors

Salinas City Council

June 28, 2016

Management
Partners



Project Purpose

- Review animal services functions currently provided independently by Monterey County and the City of Salinas
- Identify options for sharing animal services to improve efficiency, effectiveness and/or customer service
- Confirm estimated savings for a preferred option

Service Sharing

- Many terms – one goal
 - Service Integration
 - Merger
 - Consolidation
 - Service Swapping



Why Consider Service Sharing?

- Reduce government cost for service
- Improve service quality and customer service
- Reduce “peak loads” and redundancy
- Improve overall efficiency and/or productivity
- Leverage purchasing power

Service Sharing Makes Sense

- When neighboring jurisdictions
 - Provide the same services
 - Use the same service delivery methodologies, facilities and equipment
 - Operate with similar administrative arrangements
- When shared services will improve economies of scale, operational efficiency and/or customer service for both agencies

Service Sharing Is Not Useful

- When scale is not a factor in service delivery economics or all returns to scale are exhausted
- When sharing conflicts with other jurisdiction goals
- Where geography or travel time issues negate other gains

Project Approach

- Conducted 30 individual and group interviews
- Reviewed documents
- Analyzed organizational and operational data
- Identified potential opportunities for sharing animal services based on best practices and their applicability to Monterey County and Salinas

Animal Services Similarities

- Both agencies provide basic animal services
 - Animal control field services
 - Animal sheltering
 - Licensing
- Both provide contracted services to other jurisdictions
- Both agencies have experienced staffing reductions and management vacancies that make service delivery challenging

Animal Services Similarities

- Neither the County nor City have the staff capacity to perform proactive enforcement or canvassing activities
- Shelter staffing is barely sufficient to meet minimum Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) standards for care
 - Salinas staffing insufficient on Sundays and Mondays
 - Monterey County staffing insufficient on Sundays

Animal Services Differences

- The County is responsible for a larger geographic area than Salinas, but a smaller population

Jurisdiction	Population ¹	Service Area (square miles)
Monterey County ²	107,754	3,215
Salinas ³	175,592	32

¹California Department of Finance 2015 Population estimates

²Includes unincorporated areas, cities of Sand City and Carmel-by-the-Sea

³Includes City of Marina

Animal Services Differences

- The County shelter facility is newer and in much better condition than the City shelter
- The City offers online pet licensing and more effectively utilizes its animal management system (Chameleon)
- The County has physical capacity to handle more spays and neuters, but lacks veterinary capacity

Animal Services Differences

- The City utilizes volunteers to help provide services, but lacks staff to coordinate them effectively
- The County does not currently utilize volunteers, in part due to lack of staff capacity to coordinate them

Service Sharing Options

- A. Share an animal services administrator to oversee both operations
- B. Share an administrator and consolidate field services
- C. Share an administrator and consolidate field services, administrative support and licensing functions
- D. Fully consolidate animal services functions

Analysis of Preferred Option C

- Test the feasibility of sharing certain animal services through a pilot program implemented in two phases
 - Phase I – shared administrator, shared animal licensing and contractual services from Chameleon, shared contract veterinary services, shared cooler and collection services
 - Phase II – shared field services
- During the pilot program, employees would remain with their respective employer

Shared Administrator

- Animal services administrator would be hired by the City
- Cost sharing arrangement and other terms and conditions would be negotiated and documented in a memorandum of understanding between the two agencies

Shared Veterinarian

- Increase veterinarian hours at County shelter to
 - Provide spay/neuter services to City shelter animals
 - Provide more frequent spay/neuter services for County shelter animals
- Assumes County charges same or lower price than City currently pays for spay/neuter services
- Allows County to reduce its high per animal spay/neuter cost and improve facility utilization

Shared Licensing

- County would expand Chameleon services to include online licensing issuance renewals and database management, including rabies certificate tracking
- City and County databases would be merged to provide one point of contact for City and County customers

Shared Koefran Refrigeration

- Share the storage containers to eliminate duplication for maintenance and animal pick up
- Potential savings may not be worth the staff impacts of transporting animals

Potential New Revenue

- Anticipated 25% increase in County licensing revenues with implementation of Chameleon online services, based on City's experience
- Potential to generate additional revenue through better utilization of veterinary facilities by other veterinarians, animal non-profit organizations

Intangible Benefits

- Improved customer service by providing a “one stop shop” for pet licensing and lost pet inquiries
- Improved administrative capacity to perform administrative functions that have fallen behind or are not being done, such as performance measurement
- Smaller operational efficiencies by leveraging close proximity of the two operations

Financial Analysis

- Option C does not generate significant savings due to insufficient economies of scale
 - Potential savings of approximately \$52,000 the first year and \$72,000 ongoing
 - Estimate assumes the availability of funding from County vacant positions that have since been eliminated
 - Level of savings probably not worth the effort and initial start-up costs that would be required

Recommendation

- Pursue full consolidation of animal services through a joint powers authority, instead of Option C
 - Provides greater opportunity to generate economies of scale and reduce costs, particularly if other municipalities participate
 - Further enhances customer service and operational efficiency benefits of Option C

Recommendation

- In the short term, lay the groundwork for full consolidation through:
 - Shared veterinary services
 - Shared Koefran refrigeration
 - Consolidated animal management databases
 - Alignment of fees for service and animal services codes



Questions?

Cathy Standiford, Partner

cstandiford@managementpartners.com

Management
Partners

