

# EUGENE CITY COUNCIL

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



---

### Work Session: Animal Services

---

Meeting Date: September 27, 2010  
Department: Central Services  
[www.eugene-or.gov](http://www.eugene-or.gov)

Agenda Item Number: B  
Staff Contact: Larry Hill  
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-5722

---

#### ISSUE STATEMENT

The purpose of the work session is to provide an update on activity responding to council direction during the FY11 budget process on animal control services.

#### BACKGROUND

The City of Eugene contracts with Lane County Animal Services (LCAS) for enforcement, shelter, and adoption services. The City also directly operates the low-cost Spay/Neuter Clinic. The clinic is a successful prevention strategy to help control Eugene's pet population. In addition to operating at full capacity for spay/neuter surgeries, the clinic offers basic health vaccinations for dogs and cats.

The following are outcomes of Animal Control identified in the City's FY11 budget:

- Manage dog behavior within the city limits.
- Keep the dog and cat population under control.
- Prevent community health problems.
- Avoid human injury from animal bites.
- Minimize traffic safety hazards caused by loose pets.
- Prevent animal abuse.

In adopting the FY11 budget, council asked for the following:

- Reach agreement on FY11 contract with Lane County implementing \$100,000 budget reduction;
- Ask the Municipal Court Judge to review the City's current licensing and enforcement fee schedules to determine if it would be appropriate to increase fees, and to implement recommended fee increases;
- Engage with stakeholders in the comprehensive review of animal services during the next 12 months with the goal of identifying greater efficiencies and leveraging of community resources for the delivery of animal services; and,
- Treat any fee increases as new revenue to be in addition to current payment to Lane County Animal Services.

#### Contract with Lane County Animal Services

The base contract fee is \$585,000 for the period of July 1, 2010, to June 30, 2011. In addition, Lane County will retain 95 percent of revenues received from selling licenses to city residents, while five percent of license revenues will be remitted to the City for low-income spay/neuter vouchers.

The contract provides for the equivalent of two full-time enforcement officers and one floating officer (to be shared with the county), a reduction of one full-time equivalent in staffing. Lane County Animal Services (LCAS) will provide enforcement, animal shelter and adoption, licensing and animal regulation, cattery, and spay/neuter voucher services to the City of Eugene. Response to emergency call-outs is assigned highest priority for field officers, followed by dog-at-large complaints, routine patrols for loose dogs, community education, and educational presentations. With the staffing reduction, Eugene residents appear to have already experienced a change in response to lower priorities, such as barking dog complaints.

The contract specifies emergency call-out criteria guidelines for emergency service from Lane County Animal Services (LCAS). Field officers are instructed to respond to all emergency requests for assistance from the Lane County Sheriff's Office and the Eugene Police Department under the following criteria:

1. Public safety or health situation when animals are involved
2. Animal bite
3. Animal endangering the public
4. Injured animal
5. Cruelty to animal
6. Stock molest in progress
7. Suspect in custody, department unable to transport animal

#### Review of City's Licensing and Enforcement Fee Schedules

The City's Municipal Court Judge is currently reviewing the City's current licensing and enforcement fee schedules to determine if it would be appropriate to increase fees.

#### Animal Services Review – Phase I

The first phase is to gather a broad range of readily available information on animal services. This phase, now underway, has the goals of summarizing developments in animal services both generally and locally -- recognizing current best practices in provision of animal services and alternative models for service delivery, surveying other communities for cost and funding information, and identifying local nongovernmental organizations along with the services and capacities these organizations provide to the community. Phase I will help identify service delivery models used in other communities that appear to offer particularly innovative and progressive approaches. Other tasks are development of a work plan and timeline. This first phase is expected to be complete in October 2010.

#### Animal Services Review – Phase II

In the project's second phase, beginning in November, City staff intends to initiate a series of informal, in-depth discussions among key stakeholders to review current animal services in Eugene, compare local services to other communities, and evaluate alternative models of funding and delivering animal services. The review will include services provided by local governments, as well as local non-governmental animal welfare organizations, and will include review of several studies and reports on animal services conducted by Lane County in recent years.

Community animal services will be evaluated against best practices in animal services. Costs and outcomes of animal services as currently funded and delivered in our community will be evaluated against the City's animal service goals, as well as against costs and outcomes of animal services as delivered in other communities.

Lane County Animal Services, City of Springfield and Greenhill Humane Society are among the important stakeholders and have been asked to participate. Representatives of local animal welfare organizations and veterinary service providers will also be asked to contribute. In recognition of a broad public interest in community animal services, this second phase will include opportunities for input by the general public. Phase II will be completed by June 30, 2011.

Animal services generally, and City of Eugene Animal Control specifically, have developed and changed over the years. A summary of historic developments is given in Attachment A. Staff is surveying other cities' animal control programs, including model of delivery, expenditures and revenues associated with the programs. This survey is not yet complete but a preliminary summary of findings for Oregon cities with more than 15,000 in population can be found in Attachment B.

Cities and counties are generally facing increasing budgetary constraints. Private organizations are facing funding limitations as well. A comprehensive review of community animal services will offer ways to address funding challenges while reaching desired outcomes for animal services in the community.

#### **RELATED CITY POLICIES**

This item related to several parts of the City Council's adopted Vision and Values Statement.

- **SAFE COMMUNITY**  
A community where all people are safe, valued and welcome.
- **EFFECTIVE, ACCOUNTABLE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT**  
A government that works openly, collaboratively, and fairly with the community to achieve measurable and positive outcomes and provide effective, efficient services.
- **FAIR, STABLE AND ADEQUATE FINANCIAL RESOURCES**  
A government whose ongoing financial resources are based on a fair and equitable system of revenues and are adequate to maintain and deliver municipal services.

#### **COUNCIL OPTIONS**

This item is to inform council only.

#### **CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION**

No recommendation is provided at this time.

#### **SUGGESTED MOTION**

No City Council action is required.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Summary of Developments in Animal Services Affecting the City of Eugene
- B. Survey of City Animal Services of Oregon Cities with 15,000 or Greater Population

**FOR MORE INFORMATION**

Staff Contact: Larry Hill, Senior Financial Analyst

Telephone: 682-5722

Staff E-Mail: [larry.k.hill@ci.eugene.or.us](mailto:larry.k.hill@ci.eugene.or.us)

## Attachment A

# Summary of Developments in Animal Services Affecting the City of Eugene

The following narrative provides an overview of developments in animal services provided within the City of Eugene specifically and of historic developments in animal services more generally. Source documents for this summary are noted at the end.

## Development of Animal Services within the City of Eugene

Animal control was first mentioned in the City Charter of Eugene in 1876. A 1929 article in the Eugene Register-Guard shows that by that time the City of Eugene required dog licenses, funded a city dogcatcher and operated a rudimentary city pound. By 1947 the old pound was recognized as totally insecure and inadequate, and the city dog control officer was housing dogs in pens at the back of his home. In that year a new pound consisting of wired-in pen boxes was constructed and it was used until 1949. No veterinary care or humane amenities were funded. The city dog control officer at the time called for the formation of a local humane society to help improve conditions for animals' welfare in the community.

In 1949 the Oregon Legislature passed laws requiring all counties to provide for impoundment of dogs. Lane County contracted with the Lane County Humane Society, newly formed in 1949. The Humane Society immediately obtained a site and began construction of a new shelter.

From 1949 to 1975, all animal control within Lane County was coordinated by the Lane County Humane Society under contract with Lane County. The Society managed shelter facilities and directed code compliance, which was enforced by city police within cities and by the sheriff's office in the county. This system was in place many years, but by 1975 both the Humane Society and the community came to view the shelter facility as inadequate and the enforcement model as ineffective.

1975 saw a culmination of a period of intense citizen advocacy for changes. The primary issue mobilizing this advocacy was the then-use of euthanasia methods that came to be recognized as inhumane. Also, many citizens wanted to relieve police of the duties and responsibility of enforcing animal code compliance. Finally, there were widespread complaints to City Council members about problems with ineffective enforcement. Extensive community discussion took place about dogs at large, damage to property and numerous dog-bite incidents. A range of similar concerns were raised in the City of Springfield.

At the time Eugene's city code allowed for dogs to legally be either on-leash or off the leash and under voice control. Ambiguity about what constituted voice control contributed to a wave of litigation in which parties tried to establish the city's liability following dog-bite incidents. After court rulings the City Council deleted that language from city code.

In March, 1975, The Humane Society's Board announced it could no longer provide impoundment services and urged the county to establish its own animal shelter. The Society expressed concern that

the shelter was too small, the county wanted increased service at a reduced annual cost, and intended to focus on its animal welfare goals and shelter only voluntarily surrendered animals. In October 1975, seven months after the Humane Society ended its contract with the County, the Lane County Sheriff, hampered by administrative, logistic and financial problems, declared that he did not want his office to continue to provide animal control services.

These controversies caused Eugene, Springfield and Lane County to explore various alternatives to comprehensively resolve these issues. In July 1976, after lengthy review and discussions, the cities and Lane County established one intergovernmental agency would be designated as lead for animal control. The expected outcomes were enhanced efficiency of operations and simplified reporting relationships. Lane County was selected to operate a revised animal control program that was to occur under a consortium formed by intergovernmental agreement, titled the Tri-Agency Animal Regulation Authority. This new authority was intended to provide uniformity of policy, action and service for the greater metropolitan area. It was headed by a joint Board with one elected member from each of the governing bodies of Eugene, Springfield and Lane County, and was supported by staff from the cities of Eugene and Springfield.

As the Tri-Agency was being developed, a decision was made to base the agency on a nationally recognized *Public Health Model* for animal services. This particular agency model included five basic components that were seen as essential to a modern system of animal control:

1. Licensing Program
2. Enforcement Capabilities
3. Educational services
4. Shelter Facilities
5. Spay and Neuter Clinic

The Tri-Agency then developed a uniform animal regulatory code that was subsequently adopted by all three participating governments. Both cities crafted a very specific set of guidelines which guided the creation of their individual performance contracts with the Tri-Agency. The two most important goals under the contracts were to provide more humane treatment of animals and to make and hold owners more directly accountable for actions of their pets. To accomplish these goals, three main performance standards were adopted.

- Create a more pro-active adoption process.
- Enact tough penalties for violators.
- Establish a comprehensive licensing and educational program.

At its inception the Tri-Agency was charged with providing for property acquisition, shelter facilities and enforcement capabilities. This activity was to be funded by a matrix payment formula based on number of animals impounded, the number of officer assigned and the enforcement activity within each jurisdiction. The original formula produced the following matrix: City of Eugene = 43%, City of Springfield = 19% and Lane County = 38%. Funding for purchase of property and shelter construction was to follow this matrix. Once constructed, the shelter was to be leased to Lane County by the Tri-Agency for a nominal annual fee.

While developing goal statements and performance standards it became apparent that the established management model of a board directly managing staff was needlessly cumbersome and inefficient. The Tri-Agency Board decided to create the position of Director of Services within Lane County government. The first Director, with a background in public health, was hired in 1977 and immediately began

developing plans for a new multi-service facility. Unfortunately, community controversy concerning animal control issues continued and the new Director soon resigned. The Board hired a second Director, who began working at cross purposes to the Tri-Agency Board by advocating a return of animal control services to the Humane Society. This led to the second Director also leaving. An Interim Director was then appointed from among Eugene Police staff. This Interim Director quickly completed a site survey and building plans, and oversaw the construction of the present animal shelter, completed in 1978.

Following several site inspections and interviews with animal control agencies in the San Francisco area, the Tri-Agency Board and staff decided to offer low-cost spay and neuter services and immunizations. This met with immediate resistance from local veterinarians who felt it was unfair competition from the public sector. This led to the resignation of three vets hired by the Tri-Agency in a period of one year. Following this, the City of Eugene Spay/Neuter Clinic was started in 1980 to help achieve area spay and neuter goals.

The five-year period from 1975 to 1980 saw protracted strife and community concern about animal issues. Euthanasia technique used by the Tri-Agency was a point of controversy until it was changed to a more humane method. In October 1976, after the Tri-Agency was established, the Human Society reversed its position on animal control and actively lobbied to regain control of all shelter facilities and operations. Local veterinarians were strongly opposed to the subsidized Spay/Neuter services and well as the low-cost immunizations. However, these conflicts gradually de-escalated and the Tri-Agency settled into its modeled pattern, operating as it was designed until 1981.

At that point the City of Springfield, citing budget shortfalls, announced it would withdraw from the consortium. Springfield decided it would be more cost-effective to provide only complaint-generated code enforcement and to contract with Greenhill Humane Society for minimal shelter space. Greenhill had no affiliation or formal relationship with the Tri-Agency. Springfield later returned to using shelter services at the public shelter. Following Springfield's disaffiliation and a resulting drop in revenue of about 20%, the consortium approach was abandoned in June, 1981, and animal services were then delivered by a division of Lane County government called the Lane County Animal Regulation Authority. In 2007, this agency was later renamed Lane County Animal Services (LCAS). Since the termination of the Tri-Agency, the City of Eugene has contracted directly with Lane County for services that are now delivered by LCAS.

## More Recent Studies and Developments

Ongoing community concerns over animal overpopulation and euthanasia issues led to a series of town-hall meetings on animal services in 2001 and 2002. Lane County subsequently established an Animal Regulation Advisory Task Force, which produced a comprehensive report titled *Findings and Recommendations*, dated November 12, 2003.

The task force studied a wide range of issues and provided numerous recommendations to Lane County and City of Eugene on licensing, spay and neuter, legal, public education, facilities and staffing, and funding issues. Measurable outcomes were also suggested. The report included a study requested by the task force and done by ECONorthwest on the design and feasibility of a surcharge on pet food, as a means of providing revenue for animal services.

On May 10, 2010, LCAS staff provided the following summary of recommendations from the 2003 report and progress on those recommendations to date.

- **Licensing:** At the time of the report the estimated compliance rate for City of Eugene dog licenses was 22%. Current compliance in Eugene is 39%.
  - ✓ Require veterinarians to report rabies vaccinations. *Both Eugene and Lane County adopted this change.*
  - ✓ Subsidize vouchers for spay/neuter. *Both Eugene and Lane County now dedicate 5% of license sales to low-income vouchers.*
  - ✓ Institute subsidized microchip clinics. *LCAS offers these monthly in summer).*
  - ✓ Upgrade data base to assist with license verification and pet redemption. *LCAS uses Pet Track, accessible by Eugene Police and other law enforcement.*
  - ✓ Institute voluntary cat registration. *LCAS offers this service.*
  - ✓ Expand limit laws. *City of Eugene has recently moved from 2 to 3 dog limit.*
- **Spay and Neutering:** This is an area where Eugene takes the lead with their spay/neuter clinic.
  - ✓ Change license cost differential to further support altering. *License fees are now \$15/\$3.*
  - ✓ Create low-income voucher program. *LCAS administers this for both Eugene and Lane County; additionally a new "bully breed" voucher has been established for very low cost altering of these dogs that are most common for long stays in the shelter.*
  - ✓ Increase financial support to Eugene Spay/Neuter Clinic. *I am uncertain what funding changes have been implemented by the City.*
  - ✓ Explore acquisition of mobile spay/neuter vehicle. *No vehicle purchase has been made, but periodically visits by the Neuter Scooter have occurred.*
  - ✓ Encourage creation of 501c (3) Friends of the Lane County Shelter. *No group has formed to date.*
- **Legal:** The focus is to provide tools for enhancing the safety of people and animals.
  - ✓ Conduct a comprehensive review of Lane Code to incorporate a long list of specific code changes. *Lane County adopted a significant update to its code based on these recommendations earlier this year. Preliminary discussions have taken place with staff from Eugene and Springfield to explore better aligning the codes of the jurisdictions.*
  - ✓ Issue juvenile licenses for puppies. *LCAS currently issues "provisional licenses" for those dogs who are not old enough for rabies vaccinations.*
- **Public Education:** This is seen as a key strategy for promoting responsible pet ownership, and creating public awareness about animal services.
  - ✓ Launch marketing program. *In cooperation with the County PIO, LCAS has a comprehensive communication plan using earned and purchased media to educate the community about LCAS services and to promote licensing, enforcement, adoption, and spay/neuter. In addition to television and radio PSAs, a web presence, newspaper ads, and brochures, staff have partnered with local veterinarians and others in the community to distribute brochures and posters.*
  - ✓ Include information in tax statement and In Lane. *A licensing flyer was included in the most recent tax statement, and licensing has been featured in Lane and other county and city publications.*
  - ✓ Consider changing the name from LCARA. *The Board changed the name to Lane County Animal Services in 2007.*
  - ✓ Create a volunteer committee to help with outreach. *The LCAS Advisory Committee has created such a subcommittee.*



- ✓ Promote regular, ongoing columns or segments in print and radio. *A regular column appears in the Eugene Weekly ("Ask the Dog Catcher"), and there is regular radio, television, and newspaper participation in "Pet of the Week."*
- ✓ Create low-income behavior training clinic program. *Additional resources are needed to implement this recommendation.*
- ✓ Work with partners to promote responsible pet ownership. *In addition to the above, the LCAS Advisory Committee has established subcommittees to focus on this effort, providing critical pet retention information on the web site and in print, promoting spay/neuter, licensing, and other elements of responsible pet ownership.*
- ✓ Have a booth at events to sell licenses and offer materials. *Staff and volunteers regularly staff information tables at community events.*
- ✓ Encourage creation of 501c (3) Friends of the Lane County Shelter. *No group has formed to date.*
- ✓ Create a "Pets Okay Rental Referral" service on website. *This list is now available through other organizations in the community.*
- ✓ Create Spanish language outreach materials. *Some LCAS materials are available in Spanish—there is room to do more here.*
- ✓ Expand website to include downloadable pamphlets, task force reports, and codes. *These are now included on the website—the LCAS website is the most often visited page of the County website.*
- ✓ Additional signage in parks and elsewhere regarding licensing, leash, vaccination, and other dog-related code requirements. *Signage exists and could be further enhanced.*
- ✓ Create an ongoing Advisory Committee to continue to identify model programs. *The BCC created the LCAS Advisory Committee in 2007.*
- ✓ Coordinate with City of Eugene PIO to distribute marketing materials through pet product stores, vets, and elsewhere. *Brochures and licensing information are made available through veterinary offices and a number of pet supply stores.*
- **Facilities and Staffing:** Current facilities are cramped, congested, outdated, and inadequate.
  - ✓ Thorough overhaul or complete replacement of facility. *The County has developed a master plan to address this, and is engaging with Eugene and Springfield as co-owners to develop a funding strategy.*
  - ✓ Add 30-60 new kennels. *This strategy has been deferred to complete a master plan for a new or remodeled facility.*
  - ✓ Expand office hours to 7-days per week, 8 hours per day. *Public hours have increased from 21.5 per week at the time of the report to 39.5 hours per week currently.*
  - ✓ Create a non-officer kennel caretaker position to free up officers for enforcement. *The County now employs two Kennel Attendants whose primary role is to care for the animals and provide customer service for adoptions and redemptions. These positions are significantly less costly than the Animal Welfare Officer positions.*
  - ✓ Hire sufficient Animal Welfare Officer positions to patrol all of rural Lane County. *The number of officers was reduced because of budget cuts in 2008.*
  - ✓ Create large animal holding facilities. *This recommendation has been deferred pending the master planning process. Large animals are currently housed through community partnerships.*
  - ✓ Upgrade the fleet of vehicles to be able to serve the whole County. *Vehicles are purchased and replaced as needed for current staffing levels.*
  - ✓ Create a pet adoption location separate from the shelter. *This idea is an option in the master plan.*

- ✓ Perform interior remodeling or expansion of facility to accommodate staff, volunteers, and customers. *A modular unit was placed on the site in 2008 to provide a volunteer training area, office space, and meeting space.*
- ✓ Institute policy of working with rescue and foster resources. *LCAS is part of a large and growing network of rescues, shelters who will accept our animals on transfers, and foster volunteers.*
- **Funding:** Additional revenue streams are critical for providing needed animal care and control.
  - ✓ Maintain current general fund levels from jurisdictions. *General fund levels have generally stayed above the 2003 level. In 2008, the County reduced its general fund support resulting in eliminating one Officer and the Division Manager. Levels have increased in the two budgets since that time.*
  - ✓ Reopen the cattery. *The cattery was re-opened and has successfully re-homed thousands of cats.*
  - ✓ Increase funding with additional revenue initiatives. *The revenue from license sales and donations has increased significantly, providing financial support for implementation of important changes.*
  - ✓ Establish a low surcharge on companion animal food. *After review by the Board this option was not pursued by the Board.*
  - ✓ Initiate comprehensive program for dog license expansion. *This currently includes an annual door-to-door canvass, licensing clinics, earned and purchased media, cooperation with veterinarians who report rabies vaccinations and many of whom sell licenses, and promotion of e-licensing.*
  - ✓ Earmark a percentage of license sales for low-income spay/neuter. *Currently 5% of all license sales are dedicated for vouchers.*
  - ✓ Establish a voluntary cat registry. *LCAS provides voluntary cat licensing.*
  - ✓ Solicit donations for rehabilitation of shelter animals. *LCAS regularly solicits and receives donations for treatment of shelter animals.*
  - ✓ Examine increasing other LCAS fees. *Staff and the Board regularly review and revise as appropriate LCAS fees.*
  - ✓ Work with community partners to cultivate a community coalition with a long range goal of approaching a “no-kill” healthy and adoptable companion animal condition within Lane County. *In 2007 the Board appointed the Save Adoptable Animals Task Force, engaging the community in identifying specific strategies to achieve this vision (see below report). In FY 2009, LCAS achieved a 94% overall live release rate—well within the national measure for “no-kill” shelters.*

In 2007, Lane County created the Lane County Save Adoptable Animals Task Force, charging it to identify programs and practices that could achieve the goal of not killing adoptable animals that do not have serious medical or behavioral problems. The task force delivered a report on September 19, 2007, titled *Save Adoptable Animals Report & Recommendations*. This report includes a set of recommendations to Lane County intended to assist the county in targeting resources on areas that would produce the greatest effect in saving animals. On May 10, 2010, LCAS staff provided the following summary of recommendations from the 2007 report and progress on those recommendations to date.

1. **Euthanasia:** Establish a written euthanasia policy and a Euthanasia Review Panel. *LCAS now has a written policy and procedure addressing euthanasia and the determination for when an animal should be humanely euthanized. A subcommittee of the LCAS Advisory Committee reviews the*

*complete file of every animal euthanized to assess the application of the policy and any needs to change.*

2. **Foster/Rescue Programs:** Expand use of volunteers to care for animals in their home; work with approved rescue organizations to transfer animals into their care until the organization can identify a permanent home for the animal. *LCAS has greatly expanded its foster program, including resources for special needs dogs and cats, as well as for puppies and kittens. LCAS has an ongoing relationship with Save the Pets and other local rescues, as well as working with breed specific and other rescues throughout the northwest.*
3. **Trap/Neuter, Return or Release Programs:** Promote TNR to discourage/minimize feral cats from being impounded and killed at LCARA. *LCAS joined with Greenhill Humane Society, Lane County Veterinary Medical Association, and the City of Eugene to create Feral Fix, a no-cost spay neuter option for feral cats.*
4. **Spay/Neuter Programs:** All animals should be altered prior to adoption; the low-income voucher program should be promoted and expanded. *LCAS now has a written policy and procedure requiring animals to be altered prior to adoption. LCAS worked with KMTR to produce a spay/neuter public service announcement, and promotes the voucher program on its website and through officer contact in the field. Last year, LCAS partnered with Eugene Spay/Neuter Clinic and Greenhill Humane Society to launch the Bully Breed Voucher to provide very low cost spay/neuter surgeries for dogs that are most likely to have offspring that can end up in a shelter.*
5. **Volunteer Participation:** Promote volunteer participation. *LCAS now has a written policy and procedure outlining the volunteer program. The Volunteer Coordinator conducts regular orientation sessions for interested individuals and partners with local schools, churches and other organizations in support of service projects. Currently, volunteers contribute about 600 hours each month to help with dog walking, cat socializing, office work, photography and promotion, grounds keeping, and other important efforts.*
6. **Enhanced Treatment:** Promote enhanced medical/behavioral treatment of impounded animals. *Since the Task Force report, LCAS has created a full time Certified Veterinary Technician position to work with a very part time veterinarian to coordinate and provide medical care at the shelter. Additionally, LCAS contracts with a local dog behavior and training specialist for 12 hours per week to assess and treat behaviorally challenged dogs at the shelter. LCAS also relies on area veterinarians who often provide significant discounts for treating shelter animals.*
7. **Cooperation/Networking:** Promote maximum cooperation with a wide range of animal rescue and adoption organizations. *Shelter staff uses a network of other shelters and rescue organizations to facilitate transfer of LCAS animals.*
8. **Enhanced Adoption Program:** Promote adoption through new policies, off-site adoption events, and other promotion efforts. *Enhanced efforts include an ongoing partnership with Save the Pets to showcase LCAS animals at off-site venues, occasional special events (such as “parking lot sales”), and an improved website. Additionally, LCAS worked with KMTR to produce a public service announcement on adopting from the shelter, and LCAS runs a full page monthly ad in the Register Guard featuring animals that need a permanent home. LCAS participates in national events such as Adopt a Shelter Dog Month (October), and has revised materials and processes at the shelter to make it more adoption friendly (more information on kennel cards, photo displays, etc).*
9. **Review and Revise Dog Licensing Codes:** Look to eliminate limits on the number of companion animals allowed per household, increase marketing to strive for universal canine licensure. *Since adoption of the report, Eugene has increased its dog limit from two to three per household, and the LCAS Advisory Committee continues to work on this issue for the County code. Significant outreach and promotion now takes place regarding dog licensing, including*

mailing inserts, a television public service announcement, significant web presence, a door-to-door canvass, off-site licensing clinics, and the availability of e-licensing.

10. **Shelter Animal Care:** Introduce programs to reduce kennel stress. *Since the task force's work, several efforts have been introduced, including increased daily walks in the neighborhood for dogs (the increase in volunteers has made this possible), regular socialization outside of cages for cats, the regular use of kongs and other dog toys/treats for kennel enrichment.*

**Additional Recommendations:**

- ✓ **Revitalizing LCARA:** This includes revised shelter hours, transparency, policies and procedures, image, LCARA name change, utilize the term "Save Adoptable and Treatable Animals, animal accounting, ordinance review, website, post positions, and LCARA commitment. *Since the task force report, shelter hours expanded to include the lunch hour and until 6:00 pm. Increased transparency includes the availability of information to the public on the web site, including disposition reports for all impounded animals, quarterly statistics on shelter operations, and the production of a monthly staff report to the LCAS Advisory Committee including budget, statistics, license sales, volunteer time, and other information about shelter operations. LCAS has written a complete policy and procedure manual for staff reference. LCAS has developed a communications plan, and is focused on communicating new programs and efforts to the public. The name was changed to Lane County Animal Services, and the Board and staff regularly communicate the new policy of saving adoptable and treatable animals within our available resources. The County completed a thorough ordinance review and revision. The website has been redesigned and is regularly updated and enhanced—it is the most visited page on the County website. LCAS regularly posts vacant positions, including extra help positions, and has revised job descriptions and other program materials to reflect the County's commitment to saving adoptable and treatable animals.*
- ✓ **Animal Care and Behavior:** This includes flexible holding times, efforts to return animals to their owners, maintaining proper nutrition programs, flea/worming/vaccine program, temperament/behavior testing, creative approaches, promoting pet retention/rehabilitation, limiting euthanasia requests, and facilitating education programs. *Since the task force report, euthanasia because of lack of space has been eliminated and there are no maximum holding times. Animal welfare officers and other staff have a focus on returning animals to owners. LCAS policies and procedures have been written and implemented regarding animal nutrition and animal care to include flea treatment, worming, and vaccinations. A part time behavior and training coordinator performs animal assessments and works with staff on behavior plans. Staff and volunteers are encouraged to bring new ideas to the shelter, and many are integrated into LCAS operations. The website is being used to assist with pet retention in the community, and every adopter now receives follow-up contact after the adoption to get feedback on customer service and to help solve any emerging problems with the animal. Any owner requesting euthanasia for their pet is counseled about alternatives, and is asked to bring documentation from a veterinarian or behavior specialist about the need for euthanasia. The number of these euthanasias has decreased significantly in the last two years. Ideas for educational programs continue to be generated, and implementation is dependent on available resources.*

Lane County, the City of Eugene and local non-profit animal welfare organizations have worked individually and collaboratively to effectively respond to recommendations provided in these reports.

Two very important issues that remain unresolved are recommendations to improve or replace the outdated shelter and spay/neuter facility, and the question of finding additional revenue for animal services.

The current animal shelter, completed by the Tri-Agency in 1978, is co-owned by the cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County. The facility houses Lane County Animal Services and the City of Eugene Spay/Neuter Clinic. While the facility was considered state-of-the-art in 1978, it now is inadequate to current needs. In 2003 Lane County brought in an architectural consultant to conduct a needs assessment. The needs assessment recommended construction of a new 22,000 square foot shelter. The assessment was clear that “the goal of any renovation, expansion or new shelter should be to create a safe, efficient, and humane facility.” The report highlighted specific concern about ADA accessibility to the facility, as well as stating “the arrangement and flow of the existing facility does not allow for segregation of animal control functions and public access. This permits conflicts between dangerous animals and the public.” The report identified problems with parking, customer reception, and human/dog, dog/dog and dog/cat conflicts. The report addressed improvements needed to address adoptions, stray animals, animal holding areas, and animal handling and evaluation.

Lane County then contracted with PIVOT Architecture to complete a master plan for LCAS. The *Lane County Animal Services 2007-2008 Master Planning Study* was delivered on March 5, 2008. This study described four options for improving the facility, ranging from a remodel and expansion of the existing facility, to a new expanded facility, or a remodel/expansion combined with a satellite outreach center. Cost estimate for these options ranged from \$6.6 to \$9.8 million.

On April 7, 2010, the Lane County Board of Commissioners was provided a report, *Animal Service Facility Options*, on options for improvement or replacement of the shelter. This report was prepared by a workgroup that included Eugene, Springfield and Lane County representatives. The workgroup examined options for funding, structuring and operating a state-of-the-art facility to replace the existing facility. There was consensus among the workgroup participants that...

- The current facility has outlived its useful life and needs to be replaced;
- Time is of the essence;
- There is a high level of community interest in issues relating to animal services; and
- These conditions offer an opportunity of leveraging a solution.

The workgroup reviewed a range of options for collaborative action among the three governments and local non-profit animal welfare organizations, foremost of which is Greenhill Humane Society. More than a dozen sheltering operations with facilities constructed within the last ten years were contacted to learn what collaborative structure they chose to use. Options for sharing construction costs and ownership were explored and three general options were described: first is an option to replace or remodel the facility through collaboration between the governments, second is an option to expand a collaborative approach to include a non-profit partner, and third is an option to do nothing. The report recommends that the facility be improved or replaced and these options be further developed by regional governmental partners. The primary unanswered questions identified in the report involve the degree of collaboration desired by the participating organizations, and the funding strategy for improvement or replacement of the facility.

## Historic Development of Animal Services Generally

As early as the 1700s individual voices spoke out against those who would starve, beat or abuse farm or work animals. The first animal welfare society in the world was the Society for the prevention of Cruelty to Animals, formed in England in 1824. In the United States, efforts to protect and control animals began early in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Efforts focused on protecting horses and other draft animals but early animal welfare organizations also worked to protect dogs and cats. In that time dogs were frequently used to pull carts and run treadmills and were often allowed to run loose. As a result urban dog populations increased. Dogs often roamed the streets and foraged for food, endangering the public. Rabies was an ongoing health concern. Animal control practices of the time consisted of simply rounding up stray animals and killing them. Little attempt was made to return animals to their owners.

The oldest American animal welfare organization, the American Society for the prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), was formed in New York in 1866. The Oregon Humane Society (OHS) was founded in 1868, making it one of the oldest in the United States. Initially the OHS focused on the conditions of draft animals but within a few years advocated for the protection of dogs and cats as well.

The number of humane societies continued to increase and in 1877 delegates from twenty-seven societies from ten states met and founded the American Humane Association (AHA) with the mission is "to prevent cruelty, abuse, neglect, and exploitation of children and animals and to assure that their interests and well-being are fully, effectively, and humanely guaranteed by an aware and caring society." Oregon's first animal shelter was established by the Oregon Humane Society in Portland in 1918. Since then other national animal welfare organizations have been formed, including the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) in 1954, which is now the largest animal welfare group in the world. Today hundreds of private animal welfare organizations work at both national and local levels. Over 50 private animal welfare organizations are active in the Eugene-Springfield area and Lane County.

In parallel with the growth of animal welfare organizations, government's role in addressing animal welfare and public safety issues has increased over the last 150 years. Very early on it was found necessary to invoke governments' ability to pass laws and ordinances in order to achieve animal welfare and public safety goals. As an alternative to simply destroying animals, the first public pound in the United States was created by the City of Los Angeles in 1863 to hold animals while owners were located.

Public pounds began to be created across the nation to address animal control issues. The ASPCA was successful in gaining passage in the New York Legislature of the nation's first effective animal anti-cruelty law in 1867. States increasingly adopted protective laws and by 1888, as a result of growing public concern for animal welfare, thirty-seven of the then thirty-eight states had passed animal cruelty prevention laws.

Since the 1940s new shelters have been built by cities and counties to replace outdated, overcrowded pound facilities. Shelter medicine became a new veterinary specialty and the spay/neuter movement has become widespread. As private and government animal welfare services developed, several organizations have been formed by animal service professionals to network, exchange ideas and information, and offer training within the profession. These include the Society of Animal Welfare Administrators (SAWA) and the National Animal Control Association (NACA).

State statutes and municipal ordinances have been continually revised and expanded in parallel with developments in public opinion, the development of best practices and the professionalization of animal services. Animal laws and ordinances now address a wide range of issues beyond ensuring humane treatment. Government's role has developed due to recognition that protecting public health and safety is a governmental responsibility and that humane and responsible treatment of animals cannot be left only to voluntary compliance.

Today animal service programs commonly address the control of dangerous animals, the need to prevent spread of rabies, pet overpopulation problems, license requirements, spay/neuter and microchipping requirements for adopted animals, returning lost pets to owners, and holding people accountable when their pets are being destructive or a nuisance. The following points are elements of a comprehensive and progressive governmental animal services program.

- Uniformly enforced laws relating to public health and safety.
- Response to nuisance complaints in a timely manner.
- Investigation of complaints of abuse and neglect.
- Rescue of mistreated and abused animals.
- Sheltering of stray and homeless animals.
- Working to reunite lost pets with their owners.
- Placement of healthy, behaviorally sound animals in responsible homes.
- Euthanization of suffering animals.
- Promotion of mandatory identification of dogs and cats.
- Providing incentives for spay/neuter.
- Providing education for responsible pet ownership.
- Cooperating with local nonprofit animal welfare organizations.

However, the specific mix and level of program elements within any particular community is variable, as is the method of funding and delivering these services. The exact mix of animal service responsibilities and services are determined by each community's history, its citizens' expectations, available resources and the priorities of elected officials of the local government. A government's animal service program is especially dependent on a community's ability to fund the services.

In the course of providing their animal service programs, governments have typically maintained cooperative relations with the numerous private animal welfare organizations that play an important role in a community's overall animal services. In most communities, nonprofit organizations provide important services that supplement the services provided by government. In some rural areas, nonprofit organizations may provide most or all available animal services.

Although the range and level of animal services varies from community to community, public sentiment is fairly consistent. Due to concerns about animal welfare as well as with problems that arise due to animals, citizens are not indifferent but rather they expect some level of animal services in their community. In many communities animal welfare organizations are numerous and active. It is not surprising that animal services are often highly politicized and may be a focus of great interest in a community.

## Source Documents for this Summary

*Ed Kuni Appointed City Dog Catcher; article, Eugene Register-Guard - February 1, 1929*

*Canine News: Eugene Gets A New Pound; article, Eugene Register-Guard - February 9, 1947*

*Dog Pound Master Sees Need for Better Eugene Facilities; article, Eugene Register-Guard - October 27, 1947*

*Humane Society Elects Officers; article, Eugene Register-Guard - June 22, 1949*

*Humane Society Receives Site; article, Eugene Register-Guard - July 24, 1949*

*County Pays Humane Society; article, Eugene Register-Guard - December 23, 1949*

*Humane Society Wants to End Work for County; article, Dan Sellard, Eugene Register-Guard - March 25, 1975*

*Task Force Recommends Tri- Agency Animal Control Authority; article, Eugene Register-Guard - December 19, 1975*

*Humane Society Seeking Expanded Role in Dog Care; article, Eugene Register-Guard - February 21, 1976*

*Why Not A County Dog Program? article, Eugene Register-Guard - October 30, 1977*

*Dog Control; article, Eugene Register-Guard - November 4, 1977*

*Springfield Backs Plan to Save Dog Agency; article, Eugene Register-Guard - November 29, 1977*

*Tri- Agency Authority Facing Reduced Budget; article, Eugene Register-Guard - May 4, 1979*

*Area Officials Seek Solution To Tri-agency Dog Problems; article, Eugene Register-Guard - March 29, 1978*

*Tri-agency Chief Quits, Hits Politics; Eugene Register-Guard - August 1, 1978*

*Is Tri- Agency To Be Bi- Agency? article, Eugene Register-Guard - August 2, 1978*

*Does Tri- Agency Need An Overhaul?; article, Steven Smith, Eugene Register-Guard - May 6, 1979*

*Agency; article, Eugene Register-Guard - July 18, 1980*

*Williams Cites Politics .Tri- Agency Loses another Director; article, Eugene Register-Guard - August 8, 1980*

*And Now, the New Dog-control Plan; article, Eugene Register-Guard - June 18, 1981*



*Tri-Agency*; article Eugene Register-Guard - June 29, 1981

*County to Take Agency's Leash*; article, Eugene Register-Guard - June 30, 1981

*Springfield Reinstates Animal-control Patrols*; article, Eugene Register-Guard - August 15, 1984

*Dog Control: Why the Rush?* article, Eugene Register-Guard - June 20, 1986

*Years of Turmoil, Turnovers Plague Lane Animal Agency*; article, Eugene Register-Guard - August 20, 1989

*Animal Control Retrospective*; memo to Darcy Marentette, from Matt Shuler and Matt Hasek - February 24, 1992

*Animal Control Management: A Guide for Local Government*; book, Geoffrey L. Handy, International City-County Management Association (ICMA) - 2001

*An Initial Study of the Design and Feasibility of a Potential Surcharge on Pet Food*; report, ECONorthwest - July 2003

*Findings and Recommendations: Final Report*; report, Lane County's Animal Regulation Advisory Task Force - November 12, 2003

*Animal Control*; summary of findings, Citizen Subcommittee of the Budget Committee, City of Eugene - January 13, 2004

*Lane County Animal Regulation Authority Needs Assessment Workshop*; summary of workshop, Lane County Animal Services - September 15, 2005

*Save Adoptable Animals Report & Recommendations*; report, Lane County's Save Adoptable Animals Task Force - September 18, 2007

*Lane County Animal Services 2007-2008 Master Planning Study*, report, PIVOT Architecture - March 5, 2008

*Animal Service Facility Options*; memo to Lane County Board of County Commissioners, from Karen Gaffney - April 7, 2010

*Lane County Animal Service*; memo to Eugene Budget Committee members (describing progress on recommendations), Karen Gaffney - May 10, 2010

*Animal Control Management: A new Look at a Public Responsibility*; book, Stephen Aronson, Purdue University Press - 2010

### Attachment B - Survey of Animal Services of Oregon Cities with 15,000 or Greater Population.

NOTE: Cities do not always break out animal-related expenditures and revenue as separate budget line items. In particular, animal code enforcement costs incurred by a city are usually part of a larger personnel budget and cannot be separately identified. In these cases net cost and per capita cost amounts must be understood as omitting some code enforcement personnel costs, although those costs may be minimal. This data was assembled September 2010.

City	FY10 Population	County in which City is Located	Code Enforcement Provider	Shelter Provider	Licensing Provider	Adoption Provider	Public Education Provider	Spay/Neuter Provider	City Animal Services Expenditures	City Animal Service Revenues	City Line Item Net Cost	City Line Item Net Capita
Portland	582,130	Washington, Multnomah, Clackamas	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	\$70,000 under contract with county only for enhanced parks animal control	No Revenue	\$70,000	\$0.12
Eugene	157,100	Lane	Lane County	Lane County	Lane County	Lane County	Lane County	City Clinic	\$285,393 personnel costs; \$732,213 materials & services budgeted in FY11	\$500,000 license & fee revenue budgeted in FY11	\$515,606	\$3.28
Salem	156,955	Marion, Polk	Marion & Polk Counties	Marion & Polk Counties	Marion & Polk Counties	Marion & Polk Counties	Marion & Polk Counties	Marion & Polk Counties	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None
Gresham	101,015	Multnomah	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None
Hillsboro	90,380	Washington	City Police & Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Animal code enforcement is part of police personnel budget	No Revenue	None	None
Beaverton	86,860	Washington	City Police & Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Animal code enforcement is part of police personnel budget	No Revenue	None	None
Bend	82,280	Deschutes	City Police	Non-Profit Jackson County	Deschutes County	Non-Profit Jackson County	Non-Profit Jackson County	Non-Profit Jackson County	\$46,000 contract with nonprofit; Animal code enforcement is part of police personnel budget	\$34,000 share of county license revenue	\$12,000	\$0.15
Medford	77,240	Jackson	Jackson County	Non-Profit Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None
Springfield	58,085	Lane	City Animal Control Officer	Lane County	City License	Lane County	Lane County	Lane County	\$150,980	\$30,000	\$120,980	\$2.08

City	FY10 Population	County in which City is Located	Code Enforcement				Public Education			City Animal Services Expenditures	City Animal Service Revenues	City Line Item Net Cost	City Line Item Net Cost per Capita
			Enforcement Provider	Shelter Provider	Licensing Provider	Adoption Provider	Education Provider	Spay/Neuter Provider					
Corvallis	55,125	Benton	City Police	Non-Profit	Benton County	Non-Profit	City	Non-Profit	\$84,200 for 0.5FTE officer; \$52,000 contract with non-profit	\$44,000 share of county license revenue	\$92,200	\$1.67	
Albany	49,165	Benton, Linn	City Police	Benton County	Benton County	Benton County	Benton County	Benton County	Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
Tigard	47,460	Washington	City Code Enforcement Officers	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
Lake Oswego	36,755	Washington, Clackamas, Multnomah	City Police	Clackamas County	City License	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	\$6,380 impound payments to county; Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	License & fee revenue is not broken out	\$6,380	\$0.17	
Keizer	36,220	Marion	City Code Enforcement Officers	Marion County	Marion County	Marion County	Marion County	Marion County	Code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
Grants Pass	33,225	Josephine	City Police	Josephine County	Josephine County	Josephine County	Josephine County	Josephine County	Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
McMinnville	32,760	Yamhill	Yamhill County	Yamhill County	Yamhill County	Yamhill County	Yamhill County	Yamhill County	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	
Oregon City	30,710	Clackamas	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	
Tualatin	26,130	Clackamas, Washington	City Police & Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
Redmond	25,800	Deschutes	City Police	Nonprofit	Deschutes County	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	\$45,000 contract with nonprofit; Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	\$8,500 share of county license revenue	\$36,500	\$1.41	

City	FY10 Population	County in which City is Located	Code Enforcement		Shelter Provider	Licensing Provider	Adoption Provider	Public Education		Spay/Neuter Provider	City Animal Services		City Animal Service Revenues	City Line Item Net Cost	City Line Item Net Cost per Capita
			Provider	Enforcement				Provider	Provider		Expenditures	Revenues			
West Linn	24,400	Clackamas	City Police	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
Woodburn	23,350	Marion	City Police	Marion County	Marion County	Marion County	Marion County	Marion County	Marion County	Marion County	Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
Newberg	23,150	Yamhill	Newberg-Dundee Police	Newberg-Dundee Animal Shelter	Yamhill County	City License	City	Not Offered	Not Offered	Not Offered	\$2,500 supplies dog control; \$250 building repair animal control; Code enforcement is part of Police personnel budget	\$30,000 dog license revenue; \$8,000 animal release, adoption fees	(\$35,250)	(\$1.52)	
Ashland	21,505	Jackson	City Police	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
Forest Grove	21,500	Washington	City Police & Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Animal code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
Roseburg	21,355	Douglas	Douglas County	Nonprofit	Douglas County	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	
Klamath Falls	21,305	Klamath	Klamath County	Nonprofit	Klamath County	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	
Milwaukie	20,920	Clackamas	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	
Wilsonville	18,020	Clackamas, ...	Washington & Clackamas counties	Washington & Clackamas counties	Washington & Clackamas counties	Washington & Clackamas counties	Washington & Clackamas counties	Washington & Clackamas counties	Washington & Clackamas counties	Washington & Clackamas counties	No expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	
Pendleton	17,515	Umatilla	City Code Compliance Officer	Nonprofit	City License	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	\$23,000 budgeted for contract services-dogs; Code enforcement cost in Police budget	\$13,000 budgeted for dog license revenue	\$10,000	\$0.57	

City	FY10 Population	County in which City is Located	Code Enforcement		Shelter Provider	Licensing Provider	Adoption Provider	Public Education		Spay/Neuter Provider	City Animal Services		City Animal Service Revenues	City Line Item Net Cost	
			Provider	Enforcement Provider				Provider	Provider		Expenditures	Revenues		Item Net Cost	Item Net Cost
Central Point	17,165	Jackson	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	Jackson County	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	
Coos Bay	16,670	Coos	City Police & Coos County	Coos County	Coos County	Coos County	Coos County	Coos County	Coos County	Coos County	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	
Sherwood	16,640	Washington	City Police & Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Washington County	Code enforcement is part of police budget	No Revenue	None	None	
Hermiston	16,215	Umatilla	City Code Compliance Officer	Nonprofit	City License	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	\$30,200 budgeted for Animal Impound Service Contract with local shelter; Code enforcement costs is part of Police personnel budget	\$2500 budgeted for dog license revenue	\$27,700	\$1.71	
Lebanon	15,580	Linn	Linn County	Linn County	Linn County	Linn County	Linn County	Linn County	Linn County	Linn County	Linn County	No Revenue	None	None	
Troutdale	15,535	Multnomah	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	Multnomah County	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	
Dallas	15,445	Polk	City Animal Control Officer	City Shelter	City License	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	Nonprofit	\$4,400 expenditures for materials, supplies budgeted for FY11; Code enforcement is part of Police personnel budget.	\$25,000 license & fee revenue budgeted	(\$21,600)	(\$1.40)	
Canby	15,230	Clackamas	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	No Expenditures	No Revenue	None	None	