



BOARD OF ANIMAL SERVICES COMMISSIONERS  
CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
Tuesday, June 10, 2014  
10:00 A.M

**LOS ANGELES CITY HALL**  
**200 North Spring Street, Room 1060**  
**Los Angeles, California 90012**

---

DAVID ZAFT  
President

ALANA YANEZ  
Vice-President

JENNIFER BRENT  
LARRY GROSS  
ROGER WOLFSON

Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, you are advised to make your request at least 72 hours prior to the meeting you wish to attend. For information please call (213) 482-9501.

Si requiere servicios de traduccion, favor de notificar la oficina con 24 horas por anticipado.

## **I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL HEARING**

- A. Barking Dog Case Number: BD135124 WL  
Appellant: Asta Elizabeth Bloze  
Complaining Witness: Charles Portney  
Field Operations Supervisor, West LA Animal Care Center, Capt. Jorge Figueroa

## **II. REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING**

**1. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD** - (Comments from the public on items of public interest within the Board's subject matter jurisdiction and on items not on the Agenda.)

**Public Comments: The Brown Act prohibits the Board and staff from responding to the speakers' comments. Some of the matters raised in public comment may appear on a future agenda.**

## **2. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

- A. Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting of May 13, 2014 (Action Required)
- B. Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting of May 27, 2014 (Action Required)
- C. Scheduling of Discussion on Barking Dog Ordinance and Complaint Procedure for Future Meeting

## **3 ORAL REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER**

## **4. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

None

## **5. BOARD REPORT**

- A. April 2014 Animal Sterilization fund and Animal Welfare Trust Fund Report
- B. "Cooling Off" Period after Owner Surrender Transactions. (Action Required)
- C. Recommendation for Mobile Spay/Neuter Vehicle, Continued from May 27, 2014 (Action Required)
- D. Report Proposal for Quarterly Shelter-Wide Adoption Events. (Action Required)

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

Next Commission Meeting is scheduled for 10:00 A.M. June 24, 2014, Harbor Animal Shelter, 957 North Gaffey Street. San Pedro, CA 90731

**AGENDAS** - The Board of Animal Services Commissioners (Board) meets regularly every second (2<sup>nd</sup>) and fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) Tuesday of each month at 10:00 A.M. Regular Meetings are held at City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Room 1060, in Los Angeles, CA 90012. The agendas for Board meetings contain a brief general description of those items to be considered at the meetings. Board Agendas are available at the Department of Animal Services (Department), Administrative Division, 221 North Figueroa Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Board Agendas may also be viewed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

**Please join us at our website: [www.LAAnimalservices.com](http://www.LAAnimalservices.com)**

Public Bulletin Board in City Hall East, 200 North Main Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. Internet users may also access copies of present and prior agenda items, copies of the Board Calendar, MP-3 audio files of meetings as well as electronic copies of approved minutes on the Department's World Wide Web Home Page site at <http://www.laanimalservices.com/CommissionAgendas.htm>

Three (3) members of the Board constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Some items on the Agenda may be approved without any discussion.

The Board Secretary will announce the items to be considered by the Board. The Board will hear the presentation on the topic and gather additional information from Department Staff. Once presentations have finished, the Board President will ask if any Board Member or member of the public wishes to speak on one or more of these items. Each speaker called before the Commission will have one (1) minute to express their comments and concerns on matters placed on the agenda.

**PUBLIC INPUT AT BOARD MEETINGS – Public Participation on Agenda Items.**

Members of the public will have an opportunity to address the Board on agenda items after the item is called and before the Board takes action on the item, unless the opportunity for public participation on the item was previously provided to all interested members of the public at a public meeting of a Committee of the Board and the item has not substantially changed since the Committee heard the item. When speaking to an agenda item other than during Public Comment (see Public Comment below), the speaker shall limit his or her comments to the specific item under consideration (California Government Code, Section 54954.3).

**Public Comment.** The Board will provide an opportunity for public comment at every regular meeting of the Board. Members of the public may address the Board on any items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board as part of Public Comment.

**Speaker Cards.** Members of the public wishing to speak are to fill out one speaker card for each agenda item on which they wish to speak and present it to the Board secretary before the item is called.

**Time Limit for Speakers.** Speakers addressing the Board will be limited to one (1) minute of speaking time for each agenda item except in public comment which is limited to three (3) minutes. The Chairperson, with the approval of a majority of the Board, may for good cause extend any speaker's time by increments of up to one (1) minute. Total speaker time on any agenda item will be limited to ten (10) minutes per item and fifteen (15) minutes for Public Comment, unless extended as above.

**Brown Act.** These rules shall be interpreted in a manner that is consistent with the Ralph M. Brown Act, California Government Code Section § 54950 et seq.

**STANDARDS OF CONDUCT.** Speakers are expected to behave in an orderly manner and to refrain from personal attacks or use of profanity or language that may incite violence.

All persons present at Board meetings are expected to behave in an orderly manner and to refrain from disrupting the meeting, interfering with the rights of others to address the Board and/or interfering with the conduct of business by the Board.

In the event that any speaker does not comply with the foregoing requirements, or if a speaker does not address the specific item under consideration, the speaker may be ruled out of order, their speaking time forfeited and the Chairperson may call upon the next speaker.

The Board, by majority vote, may order the removal from the meeting of any speaker or audience member continuing to behave in a disruptive manner after being warned by the Chairperson regarding their behavior. Section 403 of the California Penal Code states as follows: "Every person who, without authority of law, willfully disturbs or breaks up any assembly or meeting that is not unlawful in its character, other than an assembly or meeting referred to in Section 302 of the Penal Code or Section 18340 of the Elections Code, is guilty of a misdemeanor".

**VOTING AND DISPOSITION OF ITEMS** – Most items require a majority vote of the entire membership of the Board (3 members). When debate on an item is completed, the Board President will instruct the Secretary to "call the roll". Every member present must vote for or against each item; abstentions are not permitted unless there is a Conflict of Interest for which the Board member is obliged to abstain from voting. The Secretary will announce the votes on each item. Any member of the Board may move to "reconsider" any vote on any item on the agenda, except to adjourn, suspend the Rules, or where an intervening event has deprived the Board of jurisdiction, providing that said member originally voted on the prevailing side of the item. The motion to "reconsider" shall only be in order once during the meeting, and once during the next regular meeting. The member requesting reconsideration shall identify for all members present the Agenda number and subject matter previously voted upon. A motion to reconsider is not debatable and shall require an affirmative vote of three members of the Board.

When the Board has failed by sufficient votes to approve or reject an item, and has not lost jurisdiction over the matter, or has not caused it to be continued beyond the next regular meeting, the issue is again placed on the next agenda for the following meeting for the purpose of allowing the Board to again vote on the matter.

**DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SERVICES**  
**STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES**  
**FUND 842- ANIMAL STERILIZATION FUND (ASF)**  
**For the period July 1, 2013 to April 30, 2014**

	July 1-Mar 31,2014	Apr 1-30, 2014	(A + B = C)
<b>Revenue</b>	<b>YTD Revenue (A)</b>	<b>Current Month (B)</b>	<b>Total (C)</b>
Spay and Neuter Fees (\$7 for sterilized; \$2 for intact)	\$637,289.52	\$30,833.32	\$668,122.84
Donations & Contributions	53,603.56	1,074.50	\$54,678.06
General Fund Subsidy (\$710,000 total for 2013-14)	532,505.00	59,165.00	\$591,670.00
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$1,223,398.08</b>	<b>\$91,072.82</b>	<b>\$1,314,470.90</b>
<b>Expenses/Encumbrances</b>	<b>YTD Expenses (A)</b>	<b>Current Month (B)</b>	<b>Total (C)</b>
Spay and Neuter Program	\$888,254.20	\$90,934.50	\$979,188.70
Transfer to General Fund	175,867.00		\$175,867.00
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>\$1,064,121.20</b>	<b>\$90,934.50</b>	<b>\$1,155,055.70</b>
<b>Net Income (Loss)</b>	<b>\$159,276.88</b>	<b>\$138.32</b>	<b>\$159,415.20</b>
Cash Balance, beginning , 04/1/2014			\$3,342,745.84
Cash Balance, end 4/30/2014			<b>\$3,345,741.66</b>
Dog/Cat Spay & Neuter Deposits	\$60,636.50		\$60,636.50
Pet Adoption Deposit	\$1,217,310.58	(\$11,560.00)	\$1,205,750.58
ASPCA <sup>1</sup>	\$37,500.00		\$37,500.00
Fund Balance Residual Encumbrance <sup>2</sup>	\$318,677.45	\$14,555.82	\$333,233.27
Unrestricted & Undesignated Fund Balance	\$1,040,110.04		\$1,040,110.04
Residual Equity Transfer <sup>3</sup>	\$668,511.27		\$668,511.27
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,342,745.84</b>	<b>\$2,995.82</b>	<b>\$3,345,741.66</b>

<sup>1</sup> Represents ASPCA grant received to pay for New Hope adoption fees

<sup>2</sup> Represents net spendable and available funds in the current year

<sup>3</sup> Fund 543 (\$668,137.27) and Fund 841 (\$374) were closed. Proceeds went to Animal Sterilization Fund per CF 10-1277.

**DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SERVICES**  
**SCHEDULE OF DONATIONS & CONTRIBUTIONS**  
**FUND 842- ANIMAL STERILIZATION FUND (ASF)**  
**For the period July 1, 2013 to April 30, 2014**

	July 1-Mar 31,2014	Apr 1-30, 2014	(A + B = C)
<b>Donations &amp; Contributions</b>	<b>YTD Revenue (A)</b>	<b>Current Month (B)</b>	<b>Total (C)</b>
Donations via direct solicitation	3,206.00	5.00	3,211.00
Donation -- Big Fix	3,692.00	352.00	4,044.00
Donations -- \$250 and below	33,961.56	642.50	34,604.06
California Community Foundation -- Nellie Rhode Trust	7,819.00		7,819.00
Online Donations	4,925.00	75.00	5,000.00
<b>Total Donations &amp; Contributions</b>	<b>53,603.56</b>	<b>1,074.50</b>	<b>\$54,678.06</b>

**DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SERVICES**  
**SCHEDULE OF SPAY AND NEUTER EXPENSES**  
**FUND 842- ANIMAL STERILIZATION FUND (ASF)**  
**For the period July 1, 2013 to April 30, 2014**

	July 1-Mar 31,2014	Apr 1-30, 2014	(A + B = C)
<b>Spay and Neuter Program Expenses</b>	<b>YTD Expenses (A)</b>	<b>Current Month (B)</b>	<b>Total (C)</b>
Amanda Foundation (\$500,000 mobile spay/neuter contract)	\$278,205.00	\$34,600.00	\$312,805.00
Value Vet (\$500,000 contract for WLA S/N Clinic)	\$75,146.00	\$2,108.00	\$77,254.00
SNP LA ( \$500,000 contracts for Harbor Clinic)	\$51,137.10	\$5,420.00	\$56,557.10
SNP LA ( \$500,000 contracts for EV S/N Clinic)	\$97,943.10	\$6,220.50	\$104,163.60
Other participating vets	\$385,823.00	\$42,566.00	\$428,389.00
<b>Total S/N Program</b>	<b>\$888,254.20</b>	<b>\$90,914.50</b>	<b>\$979,168.70</b>

**DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SERVICES**  
**STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES**  
**Fund 859 - ANIMAL WELFARE TRUST FUND (AWTF)**  
**For the period July 1, 2013 to April 30, 2014**

	July 1-Mar 31, 2014 Year-to-Date (A)	Apr 1-30, 2014 Current Month (B)	(A + B = C) Total (A + B = C)
<b>Revenue</b>			
Interest Income	\$13,275.41	\$1,016.02	\$14,291.43
Donations & Contributions	\$193,901.54	\$10,910.38	\$204,811.92
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>\$207,176.95</b>	<b>\$11,926.40</b>	<b>\$219,103.35</b>
<b>Expenses</b>			
CEQA - Cat Study Program	\$51,842.08		\$51,842.08
ASPCA TEV refund of Pat Nagely		\$500.00	\$500.00
Medical Supplies-Evidence Animal treatment	\$7,814.75		\$7,814.75
EVC Shelter- Refrigerators		544.98	\$544.98
Transfer to General Fund (For Council-approved facilities improvements)	\$497.88	0	\$497.88
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$60,154.71</b>	<b>\$1,044.98</b>	<b>\$61,199.69</b>
<b>Net Income (Loss):</b>	<b>\$147,022.24</b>	<b>\$10,881.42</b>	<b>\$157,903.66</b>
<b>Cash Balance, beginning 4/1/14</b>			<b>\$1,652,966.66</b>
<b>Cash Balance, end 4/30/14</b>			<b>\$1,663,795.88</b>

	July 1-Mar 31, 2014 Year-to-Date (A)	Apr 1-30, 2014 Current Month (B)	(A + B = C) Total (A + B = C)
<b>UNRESTRICTED DONATIONS</b>			
AVAILABLE	\$974,286.78	\$6,943.82	\$981,230.60
AGAINST ANIMAL CRUELTY	\$9,666.16		\$9,666.16
AWARDS & REFRESHMENTS	\$433.00		\$433.00
<b>TOTAL UNRESTRICTED DONATIONS</b>	<b>\$984,385.94</b>	<b>\$6,943.82</b>	<b>\$991,329.76</b>
<b>RESTRICTED DONATIONS</b>			
WEST VALLEY SHELTER (Shelter maintenance)	\$22,881.45	\$2,093.39	\$24,974.84
HARBOR SHELTER *	\$20,760.32	\$1,024.90	\$21,785.22
NORTH CENTRAL SHELTER *	\$20,205.06	\$844.00	\$21,049.06
SOUTH LA SHELTER *	\$16,451.46	\$211.50	\$16,662.96
EAST VALLEY SHELTER *	\$33,732.43	\$879.11	\$34,611.54
WEST LA SHELTER *	\$49,456.65	(\$835.50)	\$48,621.15
<b>ON-LINE DONATIONS</b>			
SPECIAL TREATMENT AND RECOVERY (S.T.A.R.) PROGRAM	\$8,643.00	\$118.00	\$8,761.00
<b>CHAMELEON DONATIONS</b>			
S.T.A.R. PROGRAM	\$24,933.15	\$50.00	\$24,983.15
FOSTER PROGRAM	\$5,984.87		\$5,984.87
KENNEL PLAQUE SPONSORSHIP	\$20,350.00		\$20,350.00
PUBLIC EDUCATION	\$1,500.00		\$1,500.00
SPECIALIZED MOBILE ANIMAL RESCUE TEAM (SMART)	\$1,227.41		\$1,227.41
<b>BEST FRIENDS ANIMAL SOCIETY</b>			
Restricted to promote adoptions	\$50,744.00		\$50,744.00
Restricted to adoption ad campaign	\$30,000.00		\$30,000.00
<b>CEQA RELATIVE TO PROPOSED "CAT PROGRAM"</b>			
Best Friends Animal Society	\$157.92		\$157.92
Found Animals	\$0.00		\$0.00
California Community Foundation	\$0.00		\$0.00
ASPCA	\$0.00		\$0.00
<b>ASPCA</b>			
CARROLL PETRIE GRANT	\$93,300.00	(\$500.00)	\$92,800.00
<b>GENERAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT</b>	\$4,356.87	\$0.00	\$4,356.87
<b>TOTAL RESTRICTED DONATIONS</b>	<b>\$404,684.59</b>	<b>\$3,885.40</b>	<b>\$408,569.99</b>
<b>UNRESTRICTED ESTATE DONATIONS</b>			
ROBERT EMERSON ESTATE	\$10,228.24	\$0.00	\$10,228.24
LIZ DOUGLAS ESTATE	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
<b>TOTAL UNRESTRICTED ESTATE DONATIONS</b>	<b>\$20,228.24</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$20,228.24</b>
<b>RESTRICTED ESTATE DONATIONS</b>			
MARIE TYNER ESTATE (Maintenance of West Valley shelter)	\$43,242.23	\$0.00	\$43,242.23
AGNES WOOD ESTATE (Maintenance of North Central shelter)	\$112,813.67	\$0.00	\$112,813.67
LOUIS C. MIRABILE ESTATE (Maintenance of SLA shelter)	\$4,316.26	\$0.00	\$4,316.26
SHUSTER & CUNARD ESTATE (Maintenance of East Valley shelter)	\$55,165.68	\$0.00	\$55,165.68
AMELIA PARKER ESTATE Shelter renovations	\$7,130.05	\$0.00	\$7,130.05
JAMES SAMUEL ROGERS FOUNDATION S.T.A.R.	16,000.00	\$0.00	\$16,000.00
MARY LOUISE PORT LIVING TRUST (Maintenance of WLA shelter)	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00
<b>TOTAL RESTRICTED ESTATE DONATIONS</b>	<b>\$243,667.89</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$243,667.89</b>
<b>TOTAL ESTATE DONATIONS</b>	<b>\$263,896.13</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$263,896.13</b>
<b>TOTAL DONATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS</b>	<b>\$1,652,966.66</b>	<b>\$10,829.22</b>	<b>\$1,663,795.88</b>

**DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL SERVICES**  
**Schedule of Donations and Contributions by Program**  
**Fund 859 - ANIMAL WELFARE TRUST FUND (AWTF)**  
**For the period July 1, 2013 to April 30, 2014**

	July 1-Mar 31, 2014 YTD Revenue (A)	Apr 1-30, 2014 Current Month (B)	(A + B = C) Total (C)
<b>Donations &amp; Contributions</b>			
Donations -- Community Assistance Fund	\$917.50	\$55.50	\$973.00
Donations -- Special Treatment And Recovery	\$4,375.00	\$50.00	\$4,425.00
Donations -- Kennel Plaque Sponsorship	\$11,700.00		\$11,700.00
Donations -- Foster	\$355.00		\$355.00
Donation-via Direct AWTF Solicitation	\$12,676.50	\$38.50	\$12,715.00
Donation-via Direct STAR Solicitation	\$3,701.05		\$3,701.05
Donations - Grants			
ASPCA-Carrol Petrie Grant	\$19,850.00		\$19,850.00
Donations AWTF (\$300 and below)	\$119,056.49	\$10,141.38	\$129,197.87
Online Donations			
Animal Welfare	\$12,627.00	\$425.00	\$13,052.00
S.T.A.R	\$8,643.00	\$200.00	\$8,843.00
<b>TOTAL DONATIONS</b>	<b>\$193,901.54</b>	<b>\$10,910.38</b>	<b>\$204,811.92</b>

**BOARD OF  
ANIMAL SERVICES  
COMMISSIONERS**

DAVID ZAFT  
PRESIDENT

ALANA YANEZ  
VICE PRESIDENT

JENNIFER BRENT

LARRY GROSS

ROGER WOLFSON

**City of Los Angeles**  
CALIFORNIA



**ERIC GARCETTI**  
**MAYOR**

**DEPARTMENT OF  
ANIMAL SERVICES**

221 North Figueroa Street  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(888) 452-7381  
FAX (213) 482-9511

BRENDA F. BARNETTE  
General Manager

JOHN CHAVEZ  
Assistant General Manager

---

**Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners**  
**Brenda Barnette, General Manager**

---

**COMMISSION MEETING DATE:** June 10, 2014

**PREPARED BY:** Brenda F. Barnette

**REPORT DATE:** May 22, 2014

**TITLE:** General Manager

**SUBJECT: "COOLING-OFF" PERIOD AFTER OWNER SURRENDER TRANSACTIONS**

**BOARD ACTIONS RECOMMENDED:**

- APPROVE a "Cooling-off" Period Policy after Owner Surrender Transactions.

**SUMMARY**

The Department of Animal Services seeks input from the Board of Animal Services Commissioners regarding a policy related to having a "cooling-off" period after owner surrender transactions.

**BACKGROUND**

There have been concerns about owners surrendering their animal, and then immediately adopting another animal. Some consider this practice to be insensitive and perhaps contributing to a "throw-away" mentality at the expense of older, infirm animals.

To determine how big a problem this is in the Department's shelters, we found that in calendar year 2013, there were 43 adoptions after surrendering a pet and there have been 14 to date in 2014. Although this does not represent a large number of adoptions, it is a practice that seems to invite passion regardless of one's position on the topic.

The Department also collected information from other groups both in Southern California and nationally. The local "Roundtable" meeting, which this General Manager attends along with the directors of other animal care/control organizations including the County of Los Angeles, Pasadena, Burbank, Riverside, the SouthEast Area Animal Control Authority and Palm Springs, was queried. The Department also posted the question of whether other animal shelter organizations had a "cooling-off" period to the Society for Animal Welfare Administrators' (SAWA) national list serve. And, there were a couple of personal interviews with respected experts.

**AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER**

Visit our website at [www.LAAnimalServices.com](http://www.LAAnimalServices.com)

**Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners**  
**"Cooling-off" Period after Owner Surrender Transactions**  
June 10, 2014

The answers the Department received varied from, "They will never get another dog from us," to "They are going to get a dog from somewhere and it may as well be us."

In discussions with these professionals there seemed to be consensus to take a balanced approach. This includes support and recognition for how difficult it is to surrender a pet to the shelter and explaining in a nonjudgmental way that the proposed policy allows them some time to grieve the loss of the pet and to prepare their home for the next pet. The idea is to help them make the right decision for the kind of pet that will do best in their home rather than making a quick decision in a time of sadness and loss. These professionals made recommendations on cooling-off periods that varied from two or three days to two weeks.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

Due to the relatively small number of adoptions immediately after owner surrenders, there would be minimal impact on the General Fund.

**APPROVED:**

---

**BRENDA BARNETTE, General Manager**

---

**BOARD ACTION:**

\_\_\_\_\_ Passed

Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Passed with noted modifications

Continued \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Tabled

New Date \_\_\_\_\_



**BOARD OF  
ANIMAL SERVICES  
COMMISSIONERS**

DAVID ZAFT  
PRESIDENT

ALANA YANEZ  
VICE PRESIDENT

JENNIFER BRENT

LARRY GROSS

ROGER WOLFSON

**City of Los Angeles**  
CALIFORNIA



**ERIC GARCETTI**  
MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF  
**ANIMAL SERVICES**  
221 North Figueroa Street  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(888) 452-7381  
FAX (213) 482-9511

BRENDA F. BARNETTE  
General Manager

JOHN CHAVEZ  
Assistant General Manager

---

**Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners**  
**Brenda Barnette, General Manager**

---

**COMMISSION MEETING DATE:** June 10, 2014 **PREPARED BY:** Ross Pool

**REPORT DATE:** June 4, 2014

**TITLE:** Management Analyst II

**SUBJECT: THREE-YEAR AGREEMENT FOR THE OPERATION OF A MOBILE SPAY  
AND NEUTER VAN TARGETING SPECIFIC ZIP CODES**

---

**BOARD ACTIONS RECOMMENDED:**

1. APPROVE a three-year agreement, with three one-year renewal options, substantially in the form as attached, with SPAY4LA, INC., to operate a mobile spay and neuter van in Zip Codes 90003, 90011, 90018, and 90037. This approval is subject to the proposer complying with the required Office of Contract Compliance's compliance forms;
2. DIRECT staff to transmit the proposed agreement concurrently to the Office of the Mayor, and the Office of the City Attorney for approval as to form, and subsequently to the City Council, and authorize the General Manager of the Department of Animal Services to execute the subject agreement upon receipt of necessary approvals.

**SUMMARY:**

The Board of Animal Services Commissioners authorized the Department to release a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the operation of a mobile spay and neuter van in specific zip codes. Staff released the RFP with proposals due on November 1, 2013.

One proposal was received from SPAY4LA, INC. To evaluate the proposals, staff formed a panel consisting of two Department employees. Each panel member certified that they had no conflict of interest, and that they were able to evaluate the proposals fairly.

Panel members evaluated the proposal according to criteria listed in the RFP: the proposers' experience and qualifications, proposed services, business plan, and proposed compensation to the City.

**AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER**

Visit our website at [www.LAAnimalServices.com](http://www.LAAnimalServices.com)

**Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners**  
**Subject: Three-Year Agreement for Mobile Spay-Neuter Van**

The evaluators developed an initial score. The Department then convened a scoring debriefing meeting to discuss these initial scores. As a team, the evaluators reviewed the proposal and discussed significant scoring deviations. After listening to why an evaluator scored a proposal category relatively high or low, all evaluators had the opportunity to revise their scores using their best judgment. At the end of this process, final individual scores were totaled and an average score was developed for each. Inasmuch as there was only one proposal submitted the evaluators ensured that SPAY4LA, INC., was able to meet the criteria of the RFP.

Experience and Qualifications: SPAY4LA, INC. is a mobile spay and neuter clinic that has been operating since 2010. The mobile van is a 33-foot motor home that has been customized into a self-contained spay and neuter clinic. The mobile van operates five days per week at different locations within South Los Angeles. Through grant funding the van is able to provide services to low-income residents and immigrant communities. Since 2010, SPAY4LA, INC. has performed over 19,000 surgeries. Included in this number are 2,567 (13%) that were accomplished through the Department's voucher program.

Proposed Services: SPAY4LA, INC. proposes to provide approximately 5,520 sterilizations in its first year and increase this capacity to 7,000 surgeries in the second and third years. SPAY4LA, INC. will provide each pet with a spay or neuter procedure, microchip, e-collar and pain medication as part of the service. In addition they will also provide core vaccinations and other complimentary services, such as a nail trim, at no additional charge. The van will operate five days a week, 48 weeks per year to provide 240 days of service to owners in specific Zip Codes. The van will perform 23 surgeries per day to meet its first-year goal of 5,520 spay and neuter procedures.

Outreach:

The vendor, SPAY4LA, Inc. has a comprehensive outreach program to inform the community of the services offered in the targeted zip codes. The vendor distributes bilingual flyers on a monthly basis. In addition, an appointment phone line is staffed Monday through Friday by bilingual staff members. This allows callers to make appointments without having to leave a phone number and wait for a call back. In 2012, staff members began going door to door in targeted zip codes informing residents of the available services. This canvassing program allowed staff to answer questions and book appointments immediately. SPAY4LA, Inc. also maintains a relationship with a Spanish radio personality who has the van's veterinarian to call into the station and discuss spay and neuter services offered and answer questions from prospective patients. Bilingual marketing information is also distributed to local businesses, schools, churches and community centers.

Business Plan: Using the average daily mix over the past two years operating in South Los Angeles, the plan is to perform 5,520 surgeries during the first year of the contract. Of the total number of surgeries, approximately 80% will be dogs and the remaining 20% cats. Cost of the services will be as follows:

Dog neutered: \$80  
Dog spay: \$90

Cats neutered: \$60  
Cats spay: \$65

Compensation: SPAY4LA, INC. will be reimbursed using \$500,000 from the Animal Sterilization Fund. The vendor will be reimbursed according to the number of surgeries performed and upon the mix of animals.

**Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners**  
**Subject: Three-Year Agreement for Mobile Spay-Neuter Van**

**RECOMMENDATION:** The panel believes SPAY4LA, INC.'s experience, qualifications, business plan, and proposed services bring much-needed benefits to the Department and the public, and therefore recommend that they be awarded the agreement.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no impact to the General Fund. The \$500,000 to pay mobile animal sterilizations will be used from Animal Sterilization Fund.

**APPROVED**

---

**BRENDA BARNETTE, General Manager**

Attachment:

Draft SPAY4LA, INC. spay/neuter mobile clinic agreement

---

**BOARD ACTION:**

_____ Passed	Disapproved _____
_____ Passed with noted modifications	Continued _____
_____ Tabled	New Date _____



# **City of Los Angeles Department of Animal Services**

## **PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT**

For the Operation of a Mobile Spay/Neuter Clinic to  
Provide Spay/Neuter Services In Specific Zip Codes

D – R – A – F – T

City Agreement Number: \_\_\_\_\_

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

I	Representatives of the Parties and Service of Notice	3
II	Term	4
III	Amount of Payment	4
IV	Standard Provisions for City Contracts	4
V	Scope of Services	4
	A. Spay/Neuter and Related Services	4
	B. Operations	5
	C. Fees, Billing, and Record Keeping	7
	D. Pre-Release Programs Participation	9
	E. Code of Ethics	9
	F. Quality Control	10
VI	Miscellaneous Provisions	11
VII	Successors and Assigns	11
VIII	Force Majeure	12
IX	Severability	12
X	Disputes	12
XI	Incorporation of Exhibits	12
XII	Entire Agreement	12
	Signature Page	13

PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES  
AND  
SPAY 4LA, INC.

FOR THE OPERATION OF A MOBILE SPAY/NEUTER CLINIC

TO City Agreement Number \_\_\_\_\_

THIS PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT ("Agreement") is entered into as of the date the Office of the City Clerk attests this Agreement ("Execution Date") between the City of Los Angeles ("City"), a municipal corporation, acting by and through the Department of Animal Services ("Department"); SPAY4LA, INC. ("Contractor"), authorized to do business in the State of California, with regard to the following:

WHEREAS, the City of Los Angeles has found that subsidizing a mobile spay/neuter clinic is a feasible and necessary method of making spay/neuter services accessible to low-income areas, where the number of intact animals tends to be higher, intake rates higher, and where there tend to be fewer "brick and mortar" spay/neuter clinics; and

WHEREAS, the Department has funded this service for years under previous contracts; and

WHEREAS, the Department released a Request for Proposals ("RFP") to enter into a new agreement, Contractor submitted a proposal in response to the RFP, met the requirements, and was awarded this Agreement by the Animal Services Board of Commissioners ("Board") on [DATE], according to the terms of the RFP; approved by the City Council on [DATE] for a three-year contract, renewable at the City's sole discretion for up to three additional years, for a period of up to six years (C.F. 14-XXXX) and

WHEREAS, the Contractor will provide free spay/neuter surgeries for dogs and cats owned by low-income residents in Los Angeles; and

WHEREAS, the Department will subsidize said surgeries according to the terms of this Agreement, and according to the prices for spay/neuter surgeries incorporated herein.

NOW THEREFORE, In consideration of the above premises and of the covenants and representations set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

**Section I. Representatives of the Parties and Service of Notice**

**A.** The representatives of the parties authorized to administer this Agreement, and to whom formal notices, demands, and communications shall be given are as follows:

1. The representative of the City shall be the General Manager of the Department, or that person's authorized representative, as follows:

Brenda F. Barnette  
General Manager, Department of Animal Services  
221 North Figueroa Street, Suite 500

4

## **Section V. Scope of Services**

The Contractor shall obtain, operate, and maintain a Mobile Spay/Neuter Clinic from which the Contractor will provide free spay/neuter services for animals owned by Los Angeles residents residing in Zip Codes 90003, 90011, 90018 and 90037. ~~;~~ Contractor will provide all staffing, equipment, and supplies; and will obtain all permits, licenses, and registrations required to operate the Mobile Clinic. In particular, the veterinary services to be provided in Zip Codes 90003, 90011, 90018, 90037, are as follows:

### **A. Spay/Neuter and Related Veterinary Services**

#### **1. Surgical Sterilizations**

The Contractor will perform:

- a. Spay and neuter surgeries on all qualified dogs and cats eight weeks of age or older.
- b. Pre-surgical physical examinations on all surgical candidates to determine if an animal is qualified for surgical treatment.
- c. Other ancillary medical procedures associated with surgical sterilizations, according to the provisions outlined below:
  - i. The Contractor will conform to all surgical standards as dictated by the California Veterinary Medicine Practice Act (CVMPA).
  - ii. Animals deemed unfit or unhealthy by a veterinarian may be rejected for surgical sterilization.
  - iii. Animals that are deemed pregnant or in estrus may be surgically sterilized at the discretion of the veterinarian.
  - iv. Animals of advanced age may require pre-surgical geriatric blood screening.
  - v. If surgical exploration is needed to determine if an animal has already been spayed, surgery shall be deemed performed and the same fee shall apply as if the spay surgery was performed. The invoice will reflect that the animal had already been spayed.

#### **2. Emergency Medical Treatment**

Contractor shall monitor all animals under its care and control for post-surgical complications and shall provide appropriate post-surgery medical treatment to animals in the event of an emergency related to the surgery, at no additional cost to the City or the pet owner, so long as such complications are discovered while the animal is under the Contractor's care and control.

The Contractor shall provide appropriate medical treatment to animals in the event of medical emergencies for animals in the care and control of the Contractor. The Contractor will stabilize the animal in the event he or she needs to be transported to another private veterinary hospital, which will be at no additional cost to the City or the pet owner if the emergency is ~~determined to be~~ related to or caused by the sterilization surgery.



Charges for medical emergency treatment for animals in the care and control of the Contractor but not caused as a result of the sterilization by the Contractor, ~~either whether performed~~ by the Contractor or at ~~referred~~-veterinary hospitals that are pre-approved by the Department, may be charged to the pet owner, provided the pet owner has approved the treatment in advance via telephone notification. The time of day, date, the phone number, the name of the person calling and the name of the owner approving the treatment will be recorded by Contractor and made available to the Department upon request.

### **3. Care of Animals**

Contractor's care of animals in its custody shall be in conformance with all federal, state, and local humane laws and statutes. A California-licensed veterinary technician, or equivalent, shall remain on duty following the procedure until each animal's recovery status meets the conditions set forth by the CVMPA to send home with his or her owner or transfer to the care of the shelter staff, depending on where the animal came from.

### **4. Release of Animals**

All animals shall be released to pet owners or adopters with post-operative instructions, including emergency telephone numbers which shall be staffed 24-hours. Should complications occur, the Contractor shall retain responsibility and care for the animal until the complication is abated.

## **B. Operations**

### **1. Vehicle Requirements**

Contractor shall obtain, operate, and maintain, at its sole cost, a vehicle appropriately modified and licensed to be the Mobile Spay/Neuter Clinic. Contractor shall maintain said vehicle in top working condition at all times, and shall make all reasonable efforts to ensure that at no time are services impacted by failure of the vehicle to be in top working condition. Contractor shall bear all costs of maintenance, including but not limited to, purchasing or leasing, engine maintenance, routine repairs, fuel, parking, and insurance.

### **2. Service Locations of Mobile Clinic Operations**

Contractor shall be responsible for determining and scheduling the locations of the Mobile Clinic operations. The locations shall be at the Contractor's discretion, subject to Department disapproval, and the services shall be provided in Zip Codes 90003, 90011, 90018, 90037 primarily in specific Zip Codes within the City of Los Angeles. The Department may provide to the Contractor, when feasible, data about where services are needed most, which will be helpful to the Contractor to determine service locations. Although the Department shall make its best effort to provide such information within a reasonable time, the Department shall be under no obligation to provide such information.

### **3. Days and Hours of Operation**

Contractor shall operate the Mobile Clinic an average of five (5) days per week, to be scheduled at the Contractor's discretion, and subject to disapproval of Department. Contractor's hours of operation shall be such that members of the public bringing their animals to the Mobile Clinic are reasonably accommodated for their time. Contractor shall advertise the days of operation at least one month prior, and publish its scheduled days of operation online and by other appropriate media to effectively reach the intended population in Zip Codes 90003, 90011, 90018 and 90037.

#### **4. Equipment and Supplies**

Contractor shall obtain, at its own expense, all equipment and supplies to be used in the operation of the Mobile Clinic, including all medical supplies, medicines, cleaning agents, microchips, tools, anesthesia machines, autoclaves, and any other necessary tools, instruments, supplies, and equipment. Contractor shall maintain in good working order, at its own expense, all equipment used in the operation of the Mobile Clinic, and shall ensure that repairs or replacement of equipment does not unreasonably interrupt its services.

#### **5. Licenses and Permits**

Contractor shall obtain at its own expense, the following licenses and permits:

- A current Veterinary Premise License for the Mobile Clinic, naming the Contractor's veterinarian as the Managing Licensee, as required by the California Veterinary Medical Board.
- A current Veterinarian License for the Contractor's veterinarian(s), as required by the California Veterinary Medical Board.
- A Controlled Substance Registration Certificate, as required by the U.S. Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA).
- All other necessary permits to operate the Clinic(s), including current licenses from the Board of Consumer Affairs, and any other regulatory agencies requiring licensure.

All licenses requiring display will be displayed in a designated area as prescribed by law. Copies shall be provided to the Department. Contractor shall maintain all licenses and permits current throughout the term of this Agreement, and shall not begin services under this Agreement until such licenses and permits are obtained. The Contractor will operate the Mobile Clinic according to all federal, state, and local laws.

#### **6. Maintaining a Written Protocol of Procedures**

Contractor shall maintain at all times an approved written protocol detailing all procedures, including, but not limited to animal handling, vaccination, anesthesia surgery guidelines, and drug inventory. This protocol must be available for review and approval by the Department at the inception of this Agreement and at all times during its term. The Contractor shall post this protocol in a public area at all times.

#### **7. Cost Of Supplies, Services, And Personnel**

The cost of setting up, staffing, maintaining and performing services under this Agreement shall be the Contractor's sole responsibility.

#### **8. Waste Disposal**

- a. Hazardous Waste: As used in this Agreement, the term "hazardous waste" shall mean any hazardous or toxic substances, biohazards, medical wastes, sharps, discarded animal tissues or animal carcasses, or other materials or wastes, used or discarded by the Contractor in connection with its operations, which can damage the environment or be harmful to health. The Contractor will be solely responsible for the proper, legal disposal of hazardous waste generated by the Mobile Clinic, at its own cost.
- b. Non-Hazardous Waste: When the Mobile Clinic is parked overnight at a Department

shelter, non-hazardous waste, such as office waste, paper, etc., may be disposed of using the shelter's disposal bins.

#### 9. Signage

The Contractor shall place on the Mobile Clinic, in a prominent location, signage indicating that the Mobile Clinic is providing services paid for by the City of Los Angeles.

#### 10. Temporary Overnight Parking at Department Care Centers

Subject to available space, Contractor may be allowed to park the Mobile Clinic overnight at a Department Care Center, in any of said Care Center's available parking area (public parking or employee parking, etc.). The Director of Shelter Operations or person in charge shall make a good faith effort to accommodate the Mobile Clinic. However, Department staff may prohibit said parking if there is a lack of space or in the case of an upcoming special event, or other specific event that will preclude parking availability. In all cases, no guarantee of parking is expressed or implied. Any overnight parking at a Department Care Center shall be by Right to Enter signed by Contractor.

#### 11. Verification of Clients' Residency

To verify that the services provided under this agreement are provided to residents of Los Angeles in ~~specific~~ Zip Codes 90003, 90011, 90018 and 90037, the Contractor shall establish a protocol to verify clients' residency. Specifically, Contractor shall request each client to provide appropriate proof of residency in the targeted Zip Codes.

### C. Fees, Billing, and Record Keeping

#### 1. Fees for Spay/Neuter Surgeries

Fees for spay/neuter surgeries paid by the Department to the Contractor shall be as follows:

Dog spay	\$90
Dog neuter	\$80
Cat spay	\$65
Cat neuter	\$60

Fees shall be effective for the first year of the Contract (i.e. the first twelve months beginning at the date of execution, regardless of calendar year or Fiscal Year). Thereafter, Contractor may request reasonable price adjustments; if Contractor finds it necessary to adjust prices, Contractor shall submit a written request for a reasonable price adjustment to the Department, supported by appropriate documentation to justify the requested adjustment. "Appropriate documentation" shall mean documents such as copies of invoices from the Contractor's vendors, copies of payroll, Contractor's income statement, and/or other documents showing a change in the Contractor's costs of labor and/or materials. The Department shall not consider any request for price adjustments without said documentation. Any price adjustments shall be subject to Board approval, and shall be effective only after said Board approval or as otherwise effected by the Board. Contractor shall not adjust prices without prior written approval of the Board.

#### 2. Invoices

Upon completion of sterilization, Contractor shall bill the Department for services by sending an invoice to the Department of Animal Services, 221 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 500, Los Angeles, California, 90012. Invoices must include the following:

- Date of invoice

- b. Name, address, and phone number of Contractor
- c. Invoice number
- d. Quantity, unit price, and description of each service
- e. Dates services were provided
- f. Reference to this Agreement
- g. Total amount payable
- h. Signature of veterinarian
- i. A statement to certify that sterilizations were performed as indicated (or that the animal had already been spayed) and that corresponding proof of sterilization and clients' residency/income shall be maintained on file by Contractor (as required below). Specific proof of residency used by Contractor shall be maintained on file by Contractor.
- i-j. Name, address and Zip Code of owner showing client resides in one of the four authorized Zip Codes shall be included with invoice.

### 3. Payments to Contractor:

City shall pay Contractor as follows:

- a. The amount paid shall be according to the fee schedule above.
- b. Contractor shall remit invoices for the above services to the Department.
- c. All payments are subject to Department review and approval of Contractor's documentation and work.
- d. ~~Invoices received by 3:00 p.m. every first and third Monday of each month will be paid by the following Friday after receiving the invoice. Payment for invoices received after this time may be delayed. [Need Accounting Section input.]~~

### 4. Proof of Sterilizations

Contractor shall retain on file at its facility, and at its own cost, documents which shall serve as proof of sterilization. Said proof of sterilization may be in the form of medical records created by the Contractor, application forms, or other documents normally kept on file by the Contractor which clearly identify the animal and bear the client's and veterinarian's signatures verifying that spay/neuter services have been completed to the client's satisfaction.

### 5. Proof of Client's Residency and Income Eligibility

To verify that funding for this Agreement is used to subsidize spay/neuter surgeries for animals owned by residents of Los Angeles, and in the specific Zip Codes, as intended, Contractor shall retain on file at its facility, photocopies of verification which demonstrate that the client 1) is a resident of Los Angeles, and 2) resides in those specific Zip Codes. Such verification shall include a picture and complete address.

### 6. Records Retention and Auditing

Contractor shall retain said proofs of sterilization, and clients' residency and income, on file for a minimum of three (3) years, and shall make them available for audit upon reasonable request by City personnel anytime during normal business hours. All invoices sent to the Department for payment must be verifiable against these back-up documents retained by Contractor.

If said back-up documents do not match billing or are not available for audit, Contractor shall refund to the Department any amounts previously paid to Contractor and not verified by said proofs of sterilization, with the following exceptions:

- a. Incomplete or mismatched back-up documents: The Department will pay for sterilizations where names or addresses in back-up documents do not match or are not complete, provided the Contractor obtains a reasonable explanation for the discrepancy or missing documents, agrees with the explanation(s) provided, and records the reason(s) in the back-up documents. Examples of “a reasonable explanation” include: recent relocation of household, animal license and utility bill listed in names of different members of the same household, and [TBD] **In all cases, the owner must provide documents that prove residency in the specific Zip Codes within the City of Los Angeles.**
- b. Absence of back-up documents: The Department will pay for sterilizations where names or addresses cannot be documented, provided the Contractor obtains a reasonable explanation for the lack of matching documents, agrees with the explanation(s) provided, and records the reason(s) in the back-up documents. An example of “a reasonable explanation” for an absence of documents is if a client is homeless or indigent. Use of this exception shall not exceed 5% of all surgeries billed by the Contractor for payment during the audit period. The Contractor shall reject all explanations that are not reasonable.

#### **D. Special Events Participation**

Contractor may participate in the Department’s special adoption events.

#### **E. Code of Ethics**

Contractor shall abide by the following Code of Ethics in providing services under this Agreement.

1. General: The Contractor shall perform services in an ethical and lawful manner. The Contractor shall not use medical or surgical techniques that are not approved by the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) nor perform any services that the City has not authorized.
2. Communication Guidelines: Communication with the public shall be conducted in a positive, courteous manner.
3. Harassment or Abuse: The Contractor’s personnel shall not engage in any conduct which would harass, oppress, or abuse any animal owner, Department staff member, or volunteer in connection with the services provided.
4. False or Misleading Representations: The Contractor’s personnel shall not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation with regards to the services provided.
5. Treatment of the Public: Contractor’s personnel shall at all times treat the public with the utmost courtesy.

#### **F. Quality Control**

##### **1. Contractor Employee Acceptability**

The Contractor shall immediately remove and replace any of its employees who violate the terms and conditions of this Agreement and upon request of the Department.

##### **2. Quality Control Plan**

Contractor shall establish and maintain a Quality Control Plan to assure that the requirements of this Agreement are met. Elements may include but are not limited to: number of sterilizations performed by animal, by type of sterilization and by size of animal; number and type of other services performed; number of emergencies by animal by type of emergency; and, number of animals sent to private veterinarians for emergencies. A copy shall be provided to the Department Contract Administrator for review and approval on this Agreement start date and as changes occurs.

**3. Quality Assurance**

The Department Contract Administrator will evaluate the Contractor's performance using such procedures as may be necessary to ascertain Contractor compliance with this Agreement including, but not limited to onsite inspections, photographing of interior of the Clinic, and written reports by Department veterinary or contract administration staff; qualified outside inspectors may also be used. The Contractor shall be required to immediately correct all deficiencies found by the Department.

**4. Performance Evaluation Meetings**

The Contractor shall meet with the Department Contract Administrator as needed, at a time and place that is mutually agreeable, to discuss the Contractor's operations, assess the Contractor's capacity to provide the required services for the Department, discuss the services provided, and other matters of mutual interest.

**5. Adequate Stock**

Contractor shall maintain an adequate stock of all supplies required for the performance of services, such as drugs, medical supplies, general office maintenance supplies, and clerical supplies, so that services are not unreasonably impacted by a lack of supplies.

**6. Reporting Requirements**

The Contractor shall provide to the Department monthly reports by the 10th day after the end of the month that summarizes the services provided by the Contractor. The information should include but not be limited to, the number of surgeries performed daily on dogs and cats, including the number of surgical complications (including unexpected or unintended animal deaths) reported each month and how each case was resolved. A form may be provided; reports are to be submitted along with the monthly invoices.

**7. Reporting of Unexpected Animal Deaths**

The Contractor shall report to the Department any unexpected deaths of animals under the care and control of the Contractor, within two business days of the death, by submitting a report.

**Section VI. Miscellaneous Provisions**

**A. Termination**

The Department may terminate this Agreement for City's convenience at any time by giving Contractor thirty (30) day's written notice thereof. Upon receipt of said notice, Contractor shall immediately take action not to incur any additional obligations, cost or expenses. Thereafter, Contractor shall have no further claims against the City under this Agreement.

In the event Contractor defaults in the performance of any of the terms or conditions of this Agreement, or becomes unable through personal non-capacity to fulfill its obligations under this Agreement, the Department shall have the following options without any further notice

or authorization from Contractor, and its choice of any option shall in no way waive its right to select any other option at any time:

1. The Department may give Contractor a written notice of such default. If Contractor does not cure said default within 30 days after notice (forthwith for a default involving sanitary or safety conditions) or make reasonable progress to cure said default, the Department may terminate this Agreement, and/or;
2. The Department may recover, to the extent allowed by law, any and all loss or damage which may be due the Department.

This Agreement may be terminated by Contractor upon providing to the Department sixty (60) days advance written notice thereof.

#### **B. Insurance**

The Contractor shall acquire and maintain the insurance coverage and liability limits for this Agreement as listed in Exhibit X, "Insurance Requirements." Evidence of coverage shall be provided according to the City's "Instructions And Information On Complying With City Insurance Requirements," included in Exhibit X. Contractor's insurance shall be approved by the City of Los Angeles, City Administrative Officer, Risk Management Division, prior to start of services.

#### **SECTION VII. Successors and Assigns**

All of the terms, conditions, and provisions hereof shall ensure to the benefit of and be binding upon the parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns provided, however, that no assignment of this Agreement shall be made without written consent of the parties to this Agreement whose consent shall not be unreasonably withheld.

#### **SECTION VIII. Force Majeure**

Notwithstanding any other provisions hereof, neither the Contractor nor the City shall be held responsible or liable for failure to meet their respective obligations under this Agreement if such failure shall be due to causes beyond the Contractor's or the City's control. Such causes include but are not limited to: strikes, fire, flood, civil disorder, acts of God or of the public enemy, acts of the federal government, or any unit of State or local government in either sovereign or contractual capacity, epidemics, quarantine restrictions, or delays in transportation to the extent that they are not caused by the parties' willful or negligent acts or omissions and to the extent that they are beyond the parties' reasonable control.

#### **SECTION IX. Severability**

Should any portion of this Agreement be determined to be void or unenforceable, such shall be severed from the whole, and the Agreement will continue as modified.

#### **SECTION X. Disputes**

Should a dispute or controversy arise concerning provisions of this Agreement or the performance of work hereunder, the parties may elect to submit such to a court of competent jurisdiction.

#### **Section XI. Incorporation of Exhibits**

The following Exhibits are incorporated into and made part of this Agreement:

Exhibit A, Standard Provisions

Exhibits [TBD]

## Exhibit X, Insurance Requirements

### **Section XII. Entire Agreement**

This Agreement, including Exhibits [TBD], contains all of the agreements, representations, and understandings of the parties hereto and supersedes and/or incorporates any previous understandings, proposals, commitments, or agreements whether oral or written and may be modified or amended only as herein provided. This Agreement is executed in four (4) duplicate originals, each of which is deemed to be an original.

DRAFT



**IN WITNESS THEREOF**, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed by their respective duly authorized representatives.

**The City of Los Angeles,  
Department of Animal Services**

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Brenda F. Barnette, General Manager

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
Michael N. Feuer, City Attorney**

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Dov S. Lesel, Assistant City Attorney

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTEST:  
Holly L. Wolcott, Interim City Clerk**

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy City Clerk

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**CONTRACTOR - SPAY4LA, INC.**

By \_\_\_\_\_

Print Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

*(second signature required of corporations)*

By \_\_\_\_\_

Print Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Los Angeles City Business Tax License Number \_\_\_\_\_

IRS Taxpayer Identification Number \_\_\_\_\_

City Agreement Number \_\_\_\_\_

**BOARD OF  
ANIMAL SERVICES  
COMMISSIONERS**

DAVID ZAFT  
PRESIDENT

ALANA YANEZ  
VICE PRESIDENT

JENNIFER BRENT

LARRY GROSS

ROGER WOLFSON

**City of Los Angeles**  
CALIFORNIA



**ERIC GARCETTI**  
**MAYOR**

**DEPARTMENT OF  
ANIMAL SERVICES**

221 North Figueroa Street  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(888) 452-7381  
FAX (213) 482-9511

BRENDA F. BARNETTE  
General Manager

JOHN CHAVEZ  
Assistant General Manager

---

**Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners**  
**Brenda Barnette, General Manager**

---

**COMMISSION MEETING DATE:** June 10, 2014

**PREPARED BY:** John Chavez

**REPORT DATE:** May 23, 2014

**TITLE:** Asst. General Manager

**SUBJECT: PROPOSAL FOR QUARTERLY SHELTER-WIDE ADOPTION EVENTS**

---

**BOARD ACTIONS RECOMMENDED:**

That the Board:

1. AUTHORIZE the Department to release a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the selection of a contractor to provide event planning services for four new quarterly events to increase shelter adoptions.
2. DIRECT the Department to report back with the recommended proposer and award a one-year agreement, with two one-year renewal options.

**SUMMARY**

Adoptions are down two percent when comparing the first 10 months of this year to the same period last year. To help increase adoptions, the Department is proposing a new quarterly weekend adoption event at all six shelters not to be combined with current special events. Discount events such as "Spring 'em" and Mother's Day weekend always increase shelter adoptions by drawing the community to the shelters.

Given the lack of departmental staffing and the need for expertise in the area of special events planning, obtaining the services of an event planner is essential for implementing these quarterly efforts.

**PROPOSED SCOPE OF SERVICES**

The successful proposer must provide information addressing:

- 1) Demonstrated experience providing event planning services and demonstrated effectiveness in increasing public awareness and increasing sales of the customers' products.

**AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER**

Visit our website at [www.LAAnimalServices.com](http://www.LAAnimalServices.com)

## Report to the Board of Animal Services Commissioners

### Proposal for Quarterly Shelter-Wide Adoption Events

June 10, 2014

- 2) A sample plan showing, in detail, how it would provide event planning services for a Department of Animal Services' discount adoption weekend event. This plan shall include, but not be limited to:
  - a) Advertising, including but not limited to press releases, fliers, Public Service Announcements, radio/television spots.
  - b) Electronic and print media targeted, and why.
  - c) Promotional items and activities to be used, including gift bags, games, attractions to maximize foot traffic at shelters.
- 3) Post-event reporting analyzing the effectiveness of the outreach strategy. This report shall include what worked, what didn't, recommendation(s), if any, for future plans. This analysis shall include what discount amounts are most effective at increasing adoptions while maximizing revenues, and whether the plan successfully increased the adoptions of the animals being promoted (e.g., cats, older dogs, kittens). This post-event reporting shall also provide the Department with projected total adoptions for the year for these quarterly event weekends and show a 20% increase over the previous year's adoptions for those weekends.
- 4) A detailed cost breakdown for providing four special events yearly.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

There is no General Fund impact. Funding will come from the Animal Welfare Trust Fund.

**Approved:**

---

**BRENDA BARNETTE, General Manager**

---

#### BOARD ACTION:

\_\_\_\_\_ Passed

Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Passed with noted modifications

Continued \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Tabled

New Date \_\_\_\_\_



The Poko Project

# LA No-Kill Data Project

Final Report: Audit and Analysis

Quick Links to Recommendations (Ctrl+Click):

[Collaboration Issues & Recommendations](#) pp 8-9

[Data Audit Findings & Recommendations](#) pp 9-15

[Administrative & Policy Recommendations](#) pp 18-19

Quick Links to Shared Files (Ctrl+Click):

[LA No-Kill Data Project Dropbox Folder](#)

[PDF of Findings – Figures and Tables](#)

## TABLE of CONTENTS

*(Ctrl+Click on any heading or subheading to follow link)*

<b>I. PROJECT OVERVIEW</b>	3
<b>II. DATA REQUEST</b>	3
<b>III. DATA PREPARATION</b>	4
<b>IV. DATA SET ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS</b>	4
<b>A. Data Request</b>	5
<b>B. De-duping</b>	5
1. License status change records.	5
2. Multiple impounds.	6
<b>C. Data Cleaning</b>	6
1. Recoding conventions.	6
2. Recoding flags.	6
<b>D. Field Expansion</b>	6
1. Expansion conventions.	7
2. Documentation.	7
<b>E. Custom Coding</b>	7
1. Groupings of interest.	7
2. Alignment with industry standards.	7
3. Meaningful rollups.	7
<b>F. Triangulation</b>	7
<b>G. Quality control</b>	8
<b>H. Project Collaboration</b>	8
1. Revised data pulls.	8
2. Code definitions.	8
3. Data entry rules.	8
4. Historical information.	9
5. Online portal access.	9
<b>V. DATA AUDIT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	9
<b>A. Missing field values</b>	9
<b>B. Inconsistent data entry</b>	10
<b>C. Code application ambiguities</b>	11
<b>D. Issues caused by field use conventions</b>	12
1. Redemption vs. Release.	12
2. Tracking Fosters.	13
3. Foster Programs as Receiving Organizations.	13
<b>E. Statistical issues caused by exceptions to standard intake and outcome</b>	14
1. Internal transfers.	14
2. "Remote impound" transfers to Best Friends.	14
<b>VI. DATA ANALYSIS METHODS</b>	14
<b>A. Descriptive statistics</b>	15
1. Descriptive data presentation.	15
2. Graphing conventions.	15
3. Measures of change.	15

4. Data Interpretation .....	16
<b>B. Statistical analysis .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>C. Statistical Consulting .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VII. ACCESS TO PROJECT RESULTS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>A. IMPROVEMENTS IN INFRASTRUCTURE .....</b>	<b>18</b>
1. Update/upgrade shelter software .....	18
2. Troubleshoot and overhaul all online portals .....	18
3. Expand capacity of administrative staff .....	18
<b>B. IMPLEMENT ROUTINE QUALITY CONTROL .....</b>	<b>18</b>
1. Conduct an audit of data entry practices .....	18
2. Produce a comprehensive manual of business rules .....	18
3. Develop and implement standardized quality control (QC) .....	18
4. Develop and implement quality assurance (QA) .....	18
<b>C. INTEGRATED REPORTING .....</b>	<b>19</b>
1. Produce annual reports of multi-year trends .....	19
2. Produce reports with City of LA oversight and the general public as target audience .....	19
3. Require contractors and partners to produce reports that align transparently with LAAS metrics .....	19
4. Require contractors and partners to produce reports that correspond to the fiscal year .....	19
<b>D. TRANSPARENCY AND OPEN ACCESS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
1. Release data-related records consistent with CPRA .....	19
2. Archive all documentation in a manner that allows easy and timely public access .....	19

**APPENDIX A: PROJECT PROPOSAL**

**APPENDIX B: DATA REQUEST**

**APPENDIX C: DATA AUDIT & ANALYSIS ACCESS**

## LA NO-KILL DATA PROJECT DATA AUDIT and ANALYSIS – FINAL REPORT

### REPORT DIRECTORY (Ctrl+Click to follow links)

- [I. PROJECT OVERVIEW](#)
- [II. DATA REQUEST](#)
- [III. DATA PREPARATION](#)
- [IV. DATA SET ISSUES & SOLUTIONS](#)
- [IV. DATA AUDIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS](#)
- [V. DATA ANALYSIS METHODS](#)
- [VI. ACCESS TO PROJECT RESULTS](#)
- [VII. ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS](#)
- [Appendix A: Project Proposal](#)
- [Appendix B: Data Request](#)
- [Appendix C: Data Audit & Analysis](#)

### I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

In July 2013, the LA No-Kill Data Project was proposed by The Poko Project, a group of private citizens, to conduct an audit and analysis of Los Angeles Animal Services' (LAAS) shelter data in support of the goal of "no-kill." A copy of the proposal is provided in [Appendix A](#). The project sought to look at trends and influences associated with key shelter metrics – specifically, live intake, live release and euthanasia. Another interest involved identifying trends associated with "at-risk" groups of animals and to determine contributing factors.

In terms of citizen participation, the goal was (and is) to add insights, in the form of sound data work and statistical methods, to LAAS' current data operations. To do this, The Poko Project sought to partner with LAAS under the sponsorship of LA's Animal Services Commission (ASC). In addition, the project engaged with UCLA's Statistics Consulting group as consultants in designing, performing and interpreting statistical tests. The results are available to the public through the online service "Dropbox." The following is a link to the public Dropbox folder: [LA No-Kill Data Project](#)

### II. DATA REQUEST

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

To accomplish the audit and analysis, The Poko Project requested "raw data" associated with each animal impounded into an LAAS shelter over the period July 2009 through September 2013. The data are stored in LAAS' shelter database, Chameleon. Each time an animal is admitted into an LAAS shelter, a new impound record is created, which carries each animal's unique identification number ("ARN"). Information is attached to each record with intake and outcome details. These details help identify and describe the animal, the circumstances under which it was impounded and information about its final outcome. These details ALSO are the basis for identifying trends and changes in shelter metrics.

For this project, specific types of data ("fields") were requested; the resulting data set contains this information for each animal impounded during the above time period – for a total of approximately 248,000 records. The raw data was delivered on October 26 in a compressed (.rar) file. A copy of the data request is provided in [Appendix B](#).

### III. DATA PREPARATION

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

Once received and formatted into Excel, the data were processed in a series of steps intended to produce a “clean”, accurate, and analytically useful final data set. These steps – referred to as data preparation – are the foundation of the audit and produce a final data set that is used for the analysis. They include:

- **De-duping** Removal of duplicate records to avoid “double counting” the same individual
- **Field Audit** Examining individual fields to identify type of data and range of values
- **Field Alignment** Reviewing output of grouped fields to detect coding relationships
- **Value Checking \*** Auditing individual and aligned field outputs to identify data issues
- **Data Cleaning** Correcting values and/or using additional coding to flag values to indicate issues
- **Field Expansion** Adding fields to enable new codes of interest to be attached to an individual’s record
- **Custom Coding \*\*** Creating new codes that allow the analysis to focus on the most important metrics
- **Test Audit** Compiling output in analytically relevant ways to locate and address remaining data issues
- **Triangulation** Comparing prepared data with original data to locate and reconcile differences
- **Documentation** Preparation of a data set directory, list outline, and test audit results

\* This step is the crucial step in the data audit. Results are used to identify the issues and flag data for recoding or qualification.

\*\* This step is critical to the data analysis. With field expansion, custom coding allows the data to be analyzed in ways that are focused on the metrics of interest.

**Quality Control** This aspect of data preparation is, ideally, integrated into the process by involving double-checking and “more eyes” on the output of each step by members of the data team. This also involves input and collaboration with those who work most closely with the data. The goal is to increase the extent to which an audit correctly identifies and is able to “fix” or otherwise deal with data-related issues, especially those that most impact the validity of the data analysis.

### IV. DATA SET ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

Issues with the data set are to be expected with the first iteration of an independent review, especially with an unfamiliar data set that hasn’t previously or recently been examined. These issues are the targets of the data audit. Data preparation, outlined above, is meant to reveal errors, inconsistencies, ambiguities and problematic conventions, focusing on those that have the most potential to introduce inaccuracies and misalignments in data analysis. In addition, problems with the data request itself can emerge.

Methods of prepping the data (e.g., data cleaning or custom coding) can address some issues, while others can be qualified in reporting. Typically, some data issues can be mitigated in future iterations by refining the data request and/or obtaining additional information from data entry and administrative staff. Others need to be addressed by changing business rules for data entry and/or the codes and fields used to capture data.

Because data preparation generally results in a final data set that modifies the raw data, the potential exists for producing statistics that don’t align with original data. One safeguard to ensure error isn’t introduced and masked by data preparation is triangulation of the prepared data against reports from the original data set. Discrepancies are then reconciled, or if this isn’t possible, noted for qualification. Also, “spot audits” by members of the data team and collaboration with the customer can guard against error.



The following presents findings related to audit methods – specifically the data request and preparation. Some findings lent themselves to presentation in tables; others were more effectively summarized in narrative form. Not all data request and preparation steps above are discussed – only those with findings having the most potential to impact the quality of the audit and/or accuracy of the analysis.

#### A. Data Request

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

Issue	Finding(s)	Implications	Recommendations
<b>1) Inadequate Date Range</b>	<p><b>a) Start date</b> based on intake <math>\geq</math> 7/1/09 resulted in missing outcome dates for animals impounded before 7/1/09.</p> <p><b>b) End date</b> based on intake <math>\leq</math> 9/30/13 resulted in missing data for 2013; high seasonality makes estimating difficult.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Missing outcome data made analysis of FY09-10 unreliable.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Missing data prohibited analysis of full annual cycle by either FY or CY.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Plan data set with start date 3-6 mo ahead of intended analysis period.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Plan data set to allow for full FY or CY analyses, with FY aligning best with LAAS reporting.</p>
<b>2) Fields not useful</b>	<p><b>a) DOB</b> isn't a required data entry field; DOB is missing for 14% cats and 4% dogs impounded live.</p> <p><b>b) S/N date</b> isn't used to record or update all animals impounded and sterilized by LAAS or its contractors/ partners.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Age and age group can't be determined from DOB; this data defines at-risk groups.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Audit of S/N status after release isn't possible; adherence to S/N ordinance can't be documented using this field.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Require age data. Determine if age range field is in use; if not, recommend its use to avoid missing age data and inherent DOB errors.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Determine if another field is used; if not, recommend mandatory S/N data entry for all animals released live, even if manual.</p>

#### B. De-duping

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

For this project, accurate analysis required retaining records of “legitimate” impound events and eliminating duplicates. An impound event is defined as an intake and outcome for an individual animal. At intake, a new record is created for each impound event and an ARN (“animal record number”, or “A number”) is either assigned by the software or recorded from previous transactions involving the animal. After an outcome is recorded, the record for that impound event is complete. There were two decisions regarding de-duping to ensure retention of records appropriate for the data analysis.

- 1. License status change records.** As a consequence of requesting license status and date data, duplication of records for thousands of animals was discovered. Further examination indicated these were strictly administrative changes to license information, not impounds. The data set was subject to software-based de-duping of those records for which an identical record appeared by intake date containing only updated license information. This may have introduced

removal of records in error; however, triangulation with LAAS reports indicated that this effect was not widespread if present at all.

**2. Multiple impounds.** Animals are sometimes returned after adoption or impounded more than once. This creates duplicate records by ARN number in the data set – one for each impound. Because of the convention LAAS uses to track foster status, foster returns are also treated by the software as unique impound events and are thus present as duplicates. To determine the need to de-dupe, LAAS' goal to end euthanasia for space was invoked. Any intake event – including foster intake – can be presumed to require shelter space. For this reason, all impound duplicates were retained.

It should be noted that foster intakes (and outcomes) can be excluded by the software when doing so is required for statistical purposes. It should also be noted that reports of “lives saved” can count ONLY unique animals, not all impounds.

## C. Data Cleaning

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

**1. Recoding conventions.** In a few cases (<100 of 248K records, or <.05%), revised codes were entered directly into the relevant field to address what appeared to be a data entry issue (e.g., obvious mis-keys). These are considered idiosyncratic “one-offs” that nonetheless indicate the need for periodic auditing. In contrast to “one-offs”, larger groups of records revealed what appeared to be systematic errors (e.g., animals coded dead at intake but released live). To the extent possible, the appropriate recoding was determined by clarifying LAAS definitions and business rules.

The convention for recoding in “batches” involved creating a new field (column) with a “2” being added to the source field title. The new column, generally adjacent, contains the same data as the source column, except for the revised values. This method retains the original values next to the revised values for cross-auditing or further data cleaning.

**2. Recoding flags.** Most of the records recoded in a new field involved data that potentially impacted statistics for key metrics – DOA vs. Live Intake counts, or Return-to-Owner (RTO) vs Transfers. In these cases, the groups of records affected were recoded with the new value appended with an “X”, with “X” standing for “changed.” A value of “DiedX”, for example, means “changed to Died”, with the adjacent original field retaining what this value was changed *from*. This convention made it possible to use the “X” to flag changed records in the data next to the original value, while also allowing the new value to be grouped easily with its “equivalences” (e.g., records coded “Died” combine easily with “DiedX”).

## D. Field Expansion

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

The original data set requested fields that represent specific types of information captured in online forms (“screens”) at data entry. These forms and the types of values they enter may not translate to a data set that directly or transparently generates statistics of interest. For example, LAAS' configuration of Chameleon doesn't have a field to enter “live intake” or “live release” – these statistics rely on combining different subcategories of data.

In this data analysis, there were also numerous metrics important to assessing progress that had no counterpart in data entry – for example, different categories of at-risk animals, such as pit-bull-type dogs, or seniors. Field expansion and custom coding allow for data to be regrouped in ways that are most meaningful for analysis. Most field expansion involved forming different groupings of more-at-risk animals (e.g., dog breed types, age groups) or creating coding hierarchies that made “rolling up” intake and outcome data better reflect metrics of interest.

**1. Expansion conventions.** In the data set, added fields were generally positioned adjacent to the source fields. Specific types of added fields included “grouping fields” (e.g., codes from another field are grouped into fewer codes), “calculated fields” (e.g., values are derived by using a formula applied to values from another field), “recoded fields” (e.g., fields created to assign values that correct or clarify original values). All of these are examples of expansion of the original data set for analytical purposes.

**2. Documentation.** The data directory, produced for the final data set, identifies all fields included and lists them as “original” or as one of the above subtypes of added fields. In most cases the directory also includes a summary of how the added field was populated.

#### **E. Custom Coding**

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

**1. Groupings of interest.** Field expansion makes it possible for individual animals to be assigned custom codes that form analytically meaningful groups. For this analysis, groups were formed related to dog breed, dog size, age at intake, zip code jurisdictions, transfer agency type, transfer agency affiliation, and length-of-stay (LOS).

**2. Alignment with industry standards.** The data set, which reflects LAAS’ configuration of Chameleon, didn’t align “as is” with industry standards for certain categories. For example, it mixes one category of return-to-owner (RTO) and transfer to an organization together. Custom coding locates mixed or misaligned types and reassigns them to the appropriate category.

**3. Meaningful rollups.** The metrics of most interest – live intake, live release, and euthanasia – have finer-grained details that are attached to each individual’s record. Live release, for example, consists of adoption, RTO and transfer and each of these categories can be further subdivided into meaningful groups. Transfers, for example, can be to Best Friends, New Hope partners, or other agencies. Custom coding allows for analysis at both fine and coarse “grains” by enabling aligned “roll-ups.”

#### **F. Triangulation**

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

To accomplish triangulation, the data published on the LAAS website ([About Us/Statistics](#)) and in the monthly [WoofStats](#) reports were used as a reference for side-by-side comparison with data compiled from the final data set in a test audit. The results of triangulation were documented in a dedicated file (Dropbox link: [LAAS Triangulation - Tables](#)) with comments provided to identify and, to the extent possible, reconcile discrepancies. Overall, the values were close, with variance likely stemming from data cleaning and code revisions affecting roll-up.

## G. Quality control

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

Preparation of the final data set was iterative, with repeated “spot-audits” to ensure that data cleaning and custom coding produced the intended analytical groups and accurate counts. At the beginning and end of data preparation, questions were sent to the LAAS IT Supervisor to clarify code definitions and data entry business rules. While not all questions were answered, and some answers need additional clarification, I am confident that the data set is soundly prepared.

That said, examination and cross-auditing of the final data set – to validate the results of data cleaning or custom coding – has not been done. Should there be a need, however, the raw data, the original data set in Excel format, and the final data set with documentation are available to any party wishing to conduct quality control or a cross-audit.

## H. Project Collaboration

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

This project was intended to be proactively collaborative, with the Animal Services Commission as a sponsor and LAAS as a partner. The hope was to involve both entities at points when input would help ensure accurate and useful findings.

The Animal Services Commission received the first draft of the project proposal in early Sept – however, the project was never formally considered as part of the agenda or any working forum. Nonetheless, there was no objection and informal support for the work, and in October 2013, LAAS agreed to provide and then delivered the raw data set based on the data request [\(see Appendix B\)](#).

Questions following data preparation were submitted to LAAS on two occasions – early and at the end of this phase. Although the response time was somewhat lengthy (3-4 weeks), the answers were able to inform the audit and analysis. Ideally, there would be closer collaboration and more timely access on an as-needed basis.

The following are instances where better collaboration would benefit this type of project in the future. Indeed, these comments and suggestions might contribute to a higher standard of transparency and support a goal of ongoing open public access and better understanding of LAAS’ shelter data and metrics.

- 1. Revised data pulls.** Following an initial data audit, it became clear that a revised data set including additional fields might have been beneficial. This would have involved conferring with the IT Supervisor followed by time to revise, format and deliver the custom query. Because of significant internal demands on the IT Supervisor’s time, this was not attempted.
- 2. Code definitions.** Email exchanges related to code definitions were ultimately effective in answering general questions. Documentation in the form of a data directory with code definitions and examples of proper and improper applications would provide anyone interested in the data with a self-service resource.
- 3. Data entry rules.** To locate possible causes of data entry issues, it would have been extremely helpful to have access to business rule documentation – and also to shelter operations staff. While the IT Supervisor is the authority on how the shelter database,

Chameleon, operates and is configured, the staff actually *doing* data entry are better resources for how business rules are or aren't being applied. Together, with code definitions, this type of administrative document would be an invaluable internal and external resource.

**4. Historical information.** Test audits and formal data analysis revealed trends that suggest specific events – occurring unpredictably over the course of weeks or months – might have influenced the data (vs. a continuation of ongoing influences). In addition, the evolution of the database and new or changing conventions might also influence how data act. LAAS staff were not able to respond to questions aimed at uncovering historical influences, which makes interpretation grounded in front-line context impossible.

However, this analysis is a type of permanent record – historical insights can be applied moving forward to previously analyzed data. In all interpretations, it should be understood that there are multiple influences on trends that may or may not be obvious. Any “cause and effect” claims, in particular, should not be made without due diligence that involves asking the question: “What else could be responsible?”

**5. Online portal access.** Questions meant to be addressed through the data set included the extent to which compliance data for animals released live were being captured in Chameleon. This includes S/N status upon release. While required by law, many animals are currently released live to transfer groups prior to sterilization. The same is true for micro-chipping and licensing.

In addition to direct data entry, LAAS uses online portals for outside parties to report relevant data. For example, there is a portal for New Hope partners to update information about transferred animals and one for contract vets to report sterilization and micro-chipping information. It appears that Chameleon is not integrated directly with online portals – in other words, reported data don't populate related Chameleon fields. It would have been useful to have read-only access to determine how portal fields map to Chameleon for the purposes of considering how integration for tracking compliance might be improved.

## V. DATA AUDIT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

The following summarizes the results of the data audit. The intention of each summary is to identify opportunities for improving data operations. Specifically, there is an ongoing need for LAAS, as a major metropolitan public service provider, to model best practices in data operations that result in timely, sound and useful statistical reports that can THEN drive decisions. The status quo can be progressed by audit results.

### A. Missing field values

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

Issue	Findings	Implications	Recommendations
<b>1. Primary Breed</b>	<b>No breed info</b> at live intake of 61% of dogs.	Can't adequately assess trends in more-at-risk groups or by using breed as an indicator of size.	Require primary breed for both dogs and cats at live intake. Use additional or custom fields to identify affiliation with at-risk breed types or size groups.

Issue	Findings	Implications	Recommendations
<b>2. Date of Birth</b>	<b>No DOB</b> at live intake of 14% of cats and 4% of dogs.	Can't use DOB field to identify age and assess trends by different age groups.	Ensure either DOB or other field is used, such as Yr/Mo or a custom age range, for all live intakes.
<b>3. Owner Surrender Reason</b>	<b>No surrender reason</b> at live intake for 20% of cats and 19% of dogs.	Can't adequately assess trends in reasons for OS.	Require this field, with appropriate training to elicit honest responses or otherwise enter "refused."
<b>4. S/N Date</b>	<b>S/N Date not recorded</b> for 33% of animals adopted and 52% of animals transferred.	Unable to track adherence of LAAS or contractors and partners with mandatory S/N ordinance.	Ensure the dates for S/N performed at LAAS or as per agreement with contractors and partners are recorded, even if manual entry is required.
<b>5. Receiving Organization</b>	Identification of a <b>receiving group is missing</b> for 208 transferred animals.	Loss of information about outcomes to specific receiving organizations.	Reinforce accurate entry of receiving organization for possession changes involving an outside group or agency.
<b>6. Zip Codes</b>	<b>Zip codes are missing</b> or anomalous for what should be local transactions (e.g. no such zip code, intake or outcome zip is distant).	Difficult to analyze intake and outcome patterns that correlate with zip code; this is a metric of interest in intake statistics.	Initiate field validation or automatic postal code checking through the software; or, audit for outliers and correct.

**B. Inconsistent data entry**[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

Issue	Findings	Implications	Recommendations
<b>1. Died in foster</b>	1284 animals returned from foster were given coding that signifies DOA: "Body Dispo/ Sanitation"; these returns should be coded as "Died in Foster."	Animals that die after initial impound but before a final outcome are always live intakes. This error impacts live release rates 1-2%; it also causes the outcome "Died" to be undercounted.	Establish clear business rules for all animals that die in care; audit DOA and died outcomes and correct inaccuracies; maintain DOA and Died as distinct groups for reporting and statistics.
<b>2. Died in kennel</b>	658 foster and public intake animals that died after being returned (length of stay >1 day) were given Died in Foster coding; they should be coded "Died in Kennel ."	Foster vs. shelter deaths are different groups; all deaths at shelters after a return warrant separate tracking and retention of details.	Ensure animals that die while in physical possession of LAAS are assigned accurate location codes.



Issue	Findings	Implications	Recommendations
<b>3. Outcomes to organizations</b>	Outcomes to organizations are considered transfers; numerous records show RTO and Adoption outcomes to organizations.	Accurate counts for transfers are reduced; adoptions and RTO are increased. This affects live release statistics by channel.	Clarify rules for assigning outcomes to organizations. Determine if this convention is used to “flag” affiliation with an organization; if so recommend a custom field for “soft” credits.
<b>4. Born in care</b>	<p><b>a) Litters.</b> Not clear if all animals born in care receive the same Intake coding.</p> <p><b>b) DOB.</b> Appears some newborns may retain the intake date of the mother; DOB is BEFORE intake date.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Unable to accurately track total counts of litters and individuals born in care.</p> <p><b>b)</b> When DOBs occur before intake age; age group can’t be calculated for related analyses.</p>	These issues can be addressed by analyzing all circumstances of “born in care”, confirming business rules for assigning codes, and auditing codes assigned to litters periodically.
<b>5. Intake Condition</b>	Codes being applied at intake conflict with codes applied for outcomes; specifically, 771 animals coded dead were released alive and 395 that received DOA coding had a live intake condition code and/or a positive LOS.	This field appears to be evolving as a catchall for additional details. There are numerous “apples to oranges” purposes in the coding and the audit reveals misalignments with outcome codes. This makes it difficult to use for analysis – it’s an inefficient use of a field.	Clarify business rules. Reconsider the type of information this field targets, and consider revising use, possibly by shifting functions to other or custom fields. Determine code alignment for intake and outcome and periodically audit.

### C. Code application ambiguities

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

Issue	Findings	Implications	Recommendations
<b>1. Intake Type: Legal seizures</b>	Two intake types – “ACTF” and “Evidence” – deal with legal seizure of animals. The difference between the two isn’t transparent in the coding.	Legal seizure tracking is now split into two categories; this may or may not be an inefficiency.	Review the situations involving legal seizures; as needed, revise coding or field use.
<b>2. Intake Subtype: “OBS”</b>	<p>Animals impounded and processed for behavioral observation receive “OBS” as the intake subtype.</p> <p>This appears to be equivalent to a “quarantine” code (e.g., for bite cases).</p>	All other intake subtypes indicate how the animal came into possession (e.g., field, OTC, trap). This is a misaligned use; intake circumstances are lost. Also OBS flags an animal as a behavior case, which may or may not influence outcome.	Consider using another field to capture intake data related to behavior – even if this application is different than a legal quarantine (e.g., an owner or staff report of risky behavior).

Issue	Findings	Implications	Recommendations
<b>3. Outcome Subtype: "Enroute"</b>	Coding in intake fields appears to conflict with outcome coding: <b>"Died Enroute."</b>	"Died Enroute" appears subject to ambiguity with DOA. This undercounts the outcome "Died" and over-counts "DOA".	Review application of "Died Enroute" in relationship to the moment of possession; clarify business rules for data entry with staff.
<b>4. Euthanasia Subtypes: Behavioral</b>	Animals euthanized for behavioral reasons receive <b>Beh Obsv</b> or <b>Beh Hist</b> coding; Beh Obsv is based on direct observation, Beh Hist is based on reported behavior.	Beh Hist cases appear to allow indirect behavioral accounts to be the basis for euthanasia.  Factors behind decisions to euthanize for behavior are important to retain; euthanasia for unobserved behavior is a red flag; also may underestimate euthanasia for space.	Inventory additional euthanasia data for behavioral cases. Document current and identify model criteria for confirming "unadoptable and untreatable" behavior. Create and publish LAAS policy that moves toward model criteria. Implement QC that provides routine public accountability.
<b>5. Euthanasia Subtypes: Medical</b>	<b>a)</b> Animals euthanized for medical reasons include <b>Irr Suffer, Med Non Mg and 8 Wk Unsust.</b>  <b>b)</b> <b>Med Rehab and 8 Wks Sust</b> , which indicate treatable conditions, are also subtypes.	<b>a)</b> While irremediable suffering is truly an "untreatable" status, Med Non Mg and 8 Wk Unsust may relate more to available resources – funding, facilities and staffing. This category "hides" otherwise treatable cases.  <b>b)</b> Treatable subtype codes don't actually indicate euthanasia FOR a medical condition, just that a condition existed concurrently. Euthanasia of medically treatable animals is euthanasia for space.	Inventory additional euthanasia data for medical cases. Document current and identify model criteria for confirming "unadoptable and untreatable" medical conditions – independent of existing resources. Create and publish LAAS policy that moves toward model criteria. Implement QC that provides routine public accountability. Medical cases are at-risk animals and these categories indicate a "scale" of implied care that influences likely outcome; these categories need to be retained to allow analysis over time.

**D. Issues caused by field use conventions**[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

- 1. Redemption vs. Release.** "Redemption" indicates an animal is returned to owner (RTO) after paying a fee. When no fee is paid, the code "Released" is used, whether or not the release is to an owner or a transfer to an organization. Return-to-owner (RTO) is an industry-standard



live release category that is always tracked separately from transfers. Currently, LAAS reports Redemption (RTO) and Release outcomes separately, with Release “hiding” the no-fee RTOs. RTO is thus undercounted in reports. This could be addressed by adding an Outcome Subtype used with Redemption to indicate RTO with no fee payment. All RTOs would then be confined to the Redemption code.

**2. Tracking Fosters.** Regardless of intake coding, animals sent to foster are assigned the Outcome Type “Foster.” Upon return, animals are assigned the Intake Type “Foster”, with the appropriate Outcome Type code being assigned for the next outcome. These both represent different impound events in the software – as there’s an intake and an outcome. As a result, even though Foster is considered an internal transfer that doesn’t involve a change in possession, these two records do not have continuity with one another in the data set. The newer record doesn’t “synch” in any way with the older.

There are a few implications for using this convention to track fosters. First, this introduces duplicates into the data set – sometimes several for the same animal going in and out of foster care. This can be dealt with through the software by excluding records coded “Foster” when appropriate – for example, when calculating live intake and live release statistics. Unique foster cases (e.g., individual animals), however, can’t be directly determined – this requires de-duping foster outcomes to remove multiple times in foster.

This convention also makes using standard Chameleon reporting to identify and count animals in foster *at any one point in time* difficult – because there is no continuity in an animal’s record. Each new record is thus “detached” from the others – it’s not possible to produce a standard report for all foster outcomes that shows which have been returned. However, custom coding by animal in a designated field, while still unsynched for an animal’s multiple records, can be used to produce a report identifying and counting animals still in foster.

Another consequence has to do with a metric called length-of-stay (LOS). LOS tells us how long an animal is in LAAS possession – which relates directly to resources (e.g., space, care and staffing). LOS also measures how long it takes different groups of animals to get to an outcome. The current convention of tracking fosters makes calculating LOS to include time in foster care difficult, because days in foster care aren’t recognized by the software. One workaround, which maintains the convention but facilitates LOS tracking, is to use custom fields to capture foster intake and outcome dates and provide LOS calculations. This does, however, add administrative steps.

**3. Foster Programs as Receiving Organizations.** Live release outcomes require identification of the receiving party – whether it’s an adopter, owner or an organization. In the data set, the titles of LAAS foster programs appear in this outcome field: the “Bottle Baby Foster Program” (BBFP) and the “Adult Animal Foster Program” (AAFP). While generally paired with a Foster outcome, other types of outcomes (Adoption, RTO, Died) sometimes carry this code. This impacts tracking outcomes by receiving organization, and identifies an LAAS foster program with a private release. If there is a need to retain program or organizational affiliation with an adoption, RTO or other outcome, a custom field might be used for this purpose (e.g., a “soft” credit field).

## E. Statistical issues caused by exceptions to standard intake and outcome [\(Back to Directory\)](#)

**1. Internal transfers.** LAAS regularly transfers small numbers of animals from high-intake shelters (e.g., South LA and North Central) to shelters where live outcomes are more likely (e.g., West LA and West Valley). In the data set, the receiving shelter replaces the original intake shelter. This impacts intake statistics for the original shelter – intake counts are reduced, which masks evidence of the demand for space. And although intake zip code is retained, the zip code is attributed to a distant shelter.

While internal transfer counts aren't comparatively high, tracking how transfers correlate to outcomes at receiving shelters is important. This is especially true if transfers cause pressure for space and increased euthanasia. It appears this might be happening at West LA and West Valley; this warrants further investigation. WoofStats does appear to document "to and from" transfers, which indicates there is a field for this in Chameleon.

**2. "Remote impound" transfers to Best Friends.** Early in 2012, LAAS instituted a process referred to as "remote impound" in partnership with Best Friends' Pet Adoption Center. This permitted Best Friends to admit animals directly at the Northeast Valley facility without "pulling" them from a shelter where LAAS had initially impounded them. The program admitted litters of kittens and puppies (e.g., "bottle babies") and lactating mothers; also, "Good Samaritan" drop-offs of numerous adult cats and dogs from the public.

The administrative protocol involves written notification by Best Friends to staff at the East Valley shelter. Staff at East Valley then "remotely" create a record and ARN number in Chameleon and "virtually" transfer the animals to Best Friends using the outcome coding "Transfer/Northeast".

The remote impound program introduces a source of error into LAAS statistics if not qualified. It inflates physical intake counts for East Valley, which is a measure of the demand for and use of shelter space. It also attributes live release to East Valley without actually possessing the animals.

This convention makes East Valley appear to be "turning around" high intake through high live release, when actual intake and final outcomes occur at Northeast Valley under the control of Best Friends. In generating and interpreting LAAS and East Valley statistics, this consequence needs to be accounted for and qualified.

## VI. DATA ANALYSIS METHODS [\(Back to Directory\)](#)

The final data set was used in the second phase of the LA No-Kill Data Project – the analysis. The background and details of the analysis are described in the project proposal [\(see Appendix A\)](#). Briefly stated, the purpose of this pilot project was to examine trends in key shelter metrics over multiple years and to relate observed changes to possible influences. Specifically, the analysis focused on live intake, live release and euthanasia data followed by in-depth study of groups of more-at-risk animals. This generated preliminary results in the form of descriptive statistics followed by more sophisticated analysis to evaluate statistical significance and identify contributing factors.

## A. Descriptive statistics

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

The majority of project results are presented as tables and graphs summarizing different “studies” of intake and outcome data. These visuals present the data in one or more of the following ways: a) absolute counts; b) rates (% of a relevant total count); or c) a subgroup’s proportion of the whole (relative % or ratio). In most cases, visuals are designed to show trends month-by-month or year-by-year during the study period (July 2009 – Sept 2013).

1. **Descriptive data presentation** The projects’ focus on change over time requires detecting significant differences in counts of animals compared to previous counts. “Difference” is always defined as change relative to a “baseline” period. The tables and graphs seek to display change over multiple years.

Due to data set limitations, incomplete fiscal year data for 2009 and calendar year data for 2013 affects the ability to include a complete annual cycle for these years. As a result, the baseline for most graphs is CY 2010, which is compared to CY 2012. CY 2013 is excluded from change summaries due to the reasons described above. However, the inclusion of 2013 data in all graphs allows forecasting based on three quarters of data. In the tables, the baseline is Oct 2009-Sept 2010, enabling full year comparisons through Oct 2012-Sep 2013.

2. **Graphing conventions** Most of the graphs include software-produced data tables at the bottom, which display source data used to create the graph. This allows readers to access and verify this data adjacent to the graph. Custom insets at the top of most graphs are intended to summarize change. The insets generally present total counts or rates by year along with absolute difference and/or % difference over time.

3. **Measures of change**

- a) **Absolute difference** Absolute difference provides a value calculated by simple subtraction: **New Value – Old Value**. When applied to counts, this statistic provides a transparent snapshot of changing numbers of animals increasing (or decreasing), which impacts the need for LAAS resources. Or, this can describe change in a rate or percentage.

For example, a shelter might adopt 50 of 100 cats in Jan - an adoption rate of 50%. In Feb, perhaps 80 out of 120 (66%) are adopted. The absolute difference by *count* is +30. The absolute difference by *rate* is +16%. From these statistics, the shelter could say: “30 more animals were adopted in Feb and our adoption rate rose 16%. This required adoption resources for 30 additional animals.”

What absolute value DOESN’T indicate is the extent of change – whether or not 30 more adoptions or a rate that goes up 16% is something to take note of. To do this, knowing the *starting value* or having a comparison value *relative* to the new value is of importance.

**b) Percent (%) Difference** Percent difference is a measure of relative change that a new value represents as a proportion (%) of a previous value. This value is calculated as follows: **(New Value – Old Value)/Old Value**. The resulting value is always expressed as %.

To continue with the example above, the % difference in counts between Feb and Jan is +60% (i.e., 30 is 60% of 50). The % difference in adoption rate is +33%. (i.e., 16% is 33% of 50%). To accompany the above statement, the shelter could say: “In Feb, we adopted 60% more animals than in Jan and exceeded our previous adoption rate by 33%.” In this way, % difference can be used as a measure of how “fast” change is occurring over a specific time period.

**c) Interpretive Caviats** The above statistics are often used to quantify change across time periods or between groups (e.g., shelters, outcome types) as a measure of relative improvement. Absolute difference provides a more direct measure of actual animals involved, whereas % difference provides an indirect measure of relative change.

For that reason, % difference is easily misinterpreted – and can be misleading. For example, 20 adoptions compared to 10 reflect a 100% difference; the same 20 adoptions added to 100 is only a 20% difference. If these were two shelters, which one is “doing better?”

Another caviat involves understanding that % difference for low starting rates is more easily influenced than for high starting rates. Going from 80% to 90%, for example, is a 12.5% difference. Going from 10% to 20% is a 100% difference. Which indicates more improvement?

The rule of thumb for sound interpretation is to always reference the starting value for assessing change in counts or rates. Counts AND rates need to be considered together.

**4. Data Interpretation** It should be noted that some audiences will find tables and graphs “busy”, with a lot of details occupying a limited amount of space. This decision was made as a trade-off to using multiple visuals and writing narratives to help with interpretation. The primary audience was considered – Commissioners, LAAS administrators, and the general public – and the need for single “snapshots” that are “data rich”, yet allow transparent connection to source data. As a result, visuals were designed to be “standalones” that have high information value on one screen (or page) but also incorporate conventions providing the layperson with interpretive (and cross-auditing) support.

At the time of this report, no additional interpretations or highlights of tables and graphs are presented. These perspectives may be added as time permits. However, the lack of interpretive notes should not be a significant factor for most audiences in understanding general trends and changes over time.

**B. Statistical analysis** Statistical analysis involves applying standard statistical methods and interpretive techniques to data of interest. For this project, statistical analysis is used to test trends in live intake, live release and euthanasia to determine if changes are significant over time (vs. a result of random variation).

Statistical analysis is also the basis for in-depth “at-risk” studies to examine trends in more-at-risk vs. less-at-risk groups of animals. More-at-risk groups included: cats, pit-bull-type dogs, chihuahuas, big dogs, and animals by age group. In addition to testing for significant differences, statistical methods were used to search this data for indicators of the most likely influences.

Further analysis looks at how at-risk groups are being impacted by different live release programs, such as adoption promotions, New Hope partnerships, and the public-private partnership with Best Friends. Another study looks at an intake intervention program, instituted at one shelter, to determine if intake trends there are significantly different from trends at other shelters.

C. **Statistical Consulting** The Statistics Department at UCLA partnered pro bono with The Poko Project to assist with statistical analysis. Under the supervision of a professor who represents the UCLA Statistics Consulting group, teams of seniors in a capstone course served as the consultants and analysts for this project. Using methods based on the technique of regression, data teams determined appropriate methods, performed statistical tests, applied accepted interpretive techniques, drew conclusions and prepared technical reports summarizing findings.

The technical reports will be posted as is. Readers should be aware that, while the “take-aways” are presented for the general audience, some of the content applies technical language and domain-standard visuals that may not be easily comprehended by the layperson. If time permits, these papers will be adapted for the general public.

## VII. ACCESS TO PROJECT RESULTS

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

One of the goals of this project was to make the data, methods and results transparent and available to any interested party. This includes the Animal Services Commission, LAAS administrators and other staff, the animal welfare community in Los Angeles and elsewhere, and the general public. The results were not directed toward the priorities or agenda of any single influence or entity. That said, an overarching goal was to provide the Commission and LAAS with a working example of how “good” data and sound statistical methods can be used to build institutional and community knowledge – that can then drive decisions in a way that is timely, transparent and accessible to the public.

Project results can be accessed using the online file sharing service, “Dropbox.” The link to the main folder permits access to all subfolders:

[LA No-Kill Data Project Dropbox Folder](#)

All files can be examined online and downloaded. The intention is for the link to be disseminated by parties that access the folder. There is no need to have a Dropbox account. More information about Dropbox, a directory to its contents, and a link to a PDF of the complete set of graphs and tables can be found in [Appendix C](#).

At the time of this report, work related to the analysis is still in progress. Additional files will be added as they become available. Existing files are subject to revision or may be retired (but will remain posted) should the situation demand. A detailed outline of the contents with links to subfolders will be supplied as a standalone in the main folder pending project completion.

LAAS retains a copy of the raw data set for comparison purposes. An unchanged copy of the original data set as delivered by LAAS is posted (as an .rar file), along with an unchanged copy formatted in Excel. The final data

set, also formatted in Excel, is also posted. (CAUTION: All versions of the data set are very large files and will require a lengthy download.)

All results files are stored by The Poko Project as originals should any party be interested in comparing with posted files. LAAS, as the source of the data, has not audited any output from this project. Public posting, however, invites cross-auditing and input by LAAS, which may result in qualification, revision or retirement.

A separate report will make policy recommendations to the Animal Services Commission based on the analysis and major findings.

## VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

[\(Back to Directory\)](#)

The data audit and analysis provided insight into LAAS shelter data operations as a whole. In addition to recommendations involving database issues, this work also provided an opportunity to envision what continuing toward best practices might look like. The following are administrative and policy recommendations to improve ability to use shelter data to best advantage and to model best practices.

### A. IMPROVEMENTS IN INFRASTRUCTURE

#### 1. Update/upgrade shelter software to:

- a) successfully address problems and gaps in current functionality;
- b) anticipate needs for improved statistical monitoring of key shelter metrics;
- c) adequately assess the impact of ongoing and new programming; and
- d) produce timely and useful standard, policy and public-oriented reports.

#### 2. Troubleshoot and overhaul all online portals (e.g., New Hope, Licensing, Vet) to expand and improve the ability to:

- a) capture data relevant to key metrics;
- b) integrate more effectively with the shelter database; and
- c) produce timely and useful standard, policy and public-oriented reports.

#### 3. Expand capacity of administrative staff (e.g., cross-train several individuals) to be able to field requests and deliver both standard and “one-off” data sets and reports in a timely manner (e.g., in anticipation of or response to current and future Commission agenda items and ongoing public concerns).

### B. IMPLEMENT ROUTINE QUALITY CONTROL

#### 1. Conduct an audit of data entry practices by shelter and administrative staff to detect and correct inconsistencies related to key shelter metrics.

#### 2. Produce a comprehensive manual of business rules that standardize “noses in to tails out” data entry, compilation, and summarizing for reports.

#### 3. Develop and implement standardized quality control (QC) measures for data entry by LAAS, contractors and partners that results in regular (e.g., quarterly), QC reports documenting the adherence to reporting requirements, business rules for data capture and unbiased compiling and summarizing data.

#### 4. Develop and implement quality assurance (QA) processes under Animal Services Commission oversight to assure QC measures are being met including periodic (e.g., semi-

annual) QC report compilation and summary and followed by direction for ongoing improvement.

**C. INTEGRATED REPORTING**

- 1. Produce annual reports of multi-year trends** highlighting significant changes in key shelter metrics (e.g., intake, live release, euthanasia, at-risk groups) to correspond with and follow the end of the fiscal year (e.g., report comes out in October).
- 2. Produce reports identifying the audience** as all levels of City of LA oversight and the general public, including standard definitions related to shelter metrics and transparent and easy-to-interpret tables, figures and summaries of trends.
- 3. Require contractors and partners** to capture data and produce regular reports (e.g., quarterly) that **align transparently with LAAS shelter metrics** and reflect evolving statistical priorities.
- 4. Require contractors and partners** to produce reports that **correspond to the fiscal year** and that facilitate triangulation with LAAS monthly (e.g., WoofStats) and FY reporting; also require identification and accounting for variances in key metrics over/under a certain threshold.

**D. TRANSPARENCY AND OPEN ACCESS**

- 1.** Consistent with CPRA, **require LAAS, contractors and partners to document** methods for capturing, compiling, summarizing and reporting data relevant to LAAS shelter metrics and to provide timely and appropriate public access to this documentation as well as unmodified source (e.g., “raw”) data.
- 2.** In alignment with CPRA and City-endorsed best practices, **archive all documentation** related to the above in a manner that allows easy (e.g., self-service) and/or timely (e.g., within 10 business days) public access.

## APPENDIX A

### PROJECT PROPOSAL

[Back to Directory](#)

[TO PROJECT PROPOSAL](#)

DRAFT



**DRAFT: PILOT PROJECT PROPOSAL**[Back to Directory](#)**WORKING TITLE: "LA No-Kill Data Analysis"****DATE: Saturday, October 19, 2013****PREPARED BY: Dr. Sue Mattson****PREPARED FOR: The Los Angeles Animal Services Commission****REVIEW RECIPIENTS: Commissioner McCurdy (President), Commissioner Jensvold (Vice President)****COURTESY RECIPIENTS: LAAS – General Manager Brenda Barnette; UCLA – Dr. Vivian Lew, Dr. Jan De Leeuw, Dr. Don Yvlisaker****Statement of Need**

The Los Angeles Animal Services Commission (ASC), under the direction of the Mayor of the City of Los Angeles (LA) and representing its citizens, acts to set policy for the Los Angeles Animal Services Department (LAAS). A critical part of the ASC's role is taking action and tracking outcomes that support LAAS in achieving "no-kill" status.

This requires monitoring trends that signal change in the shelter population related to LAAS' no-kill functions. These functions include shelter intake, adoption and other live-release outcomes, humane euthanasia, spay-neuter of shelter and public animals, licensing, micro chipping, basic and acute medical care, and treatment of manageable medical and behavioral conditions.

The ASC has an ongoing interest in detection, analysis and response to statistics arising from the above LAAS functions. The ASC thus recognizes the benefits of expanding and improving upon the means by which LAAS trends are evaluated against historical data and its short- and long-term goals. However, this interest must be addressed during a period when LAAS resources, which might otherwise provide support, continue to decrease.

As a response, the ASC proposes to meet this need for additional statistical work by forging a creative partnership with a local resource – UCLA – in a way that complements and adds capacity to existing LAAS resources. The following describes a pilot project that engages UCLA's expert, independent data analysis relevant to key LAAS functions to understand trends and assess progress toward no-kill goals.

**Background**

For over a decade, LAAS has been responding to a shift in public opinion and related policy that currently targets what is referred to in animal sheltering as "no-kill." For the purposes of this proposal, no-kill is defined by LAAS as a live-release rate of 90% or more for all animals admitted into its shelter system, or otherwise brought into LAAS possession by contractors, partners or other entities.

LAAS routinely collects data for each animal admitted through its sheltering and public clinic functions. LAAS also regularly produces reports – for example, WoofStats – that highlight descriptive statistics used for various purposes, including judging the performance of LAAS operations, assessing the efficacy of activities supporting no-kill and tracking overall progress toward its no-kill goal.

This data, most of which is administered through the commercial database, Chameleon, is captured, maintained, processed, analyzed, summarized and reported through resources internal to LAAS. Summaries of high-level statistics are made available to various stakeholders through public channels including the LAAS website, at ASC and other public meetings and upon request.

There are indeed many stakeholders keenly interested in, and impacted by, LAAS data, analysis and reporting. The City of LA, as the custodian of public dollars and the public trust, is a primary stakeholder. Others include:

- private citizens who are (or aren't) companion animal owners
- public animal advocacy groups both formal ( "DAWS" panels) and informal (The Poko Project)
- nonprofit rescue organizations and independent rescuers (New Hope partners and others)
- nonprofit spay/neuter and other shelter service providers (Amanda Foundation, Downtown Dog Rescue)
- nonprofit funders and advocacy groups (Found Animals, Actors and Others for Animals, HSUS, ASPCA)
- contractors to LAAS for clinic and sheltering services (SNP-LA, Best Friends Animal Society)
- agencies and groups that have transfer/transport relationships with LAAS , its contractors and partners
- for-profit retail and service providers that focus on the companion animal market
- entities that provide contracts, grants and gifts to fund public and nonprofit companion animal programs

As the entity responsible for providing policy direction for LAAS and for assessing policy efficacy, the ASC has a significant role in and burden to make decisions that take into account and advocate for the above stakeholders. LAAS data therefore plays an integral role in the ability of the ASC to perform due diligence to that end.

With transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to the public being paramount to stakeholders – and aligned with directives from the Mayor’s office – there is every reason to strive for increasingly higher standards in administering, analyzing and reporting this publically funded data. There is also a shift in city administrative culture to create momentum that embraces creative, cross-sector, technologically current and entrepreneurial solutions in solving complex community problems. This pilot project is an example of such a solution.

### **Recommended Action**

In considering how the ASC might expand and improve its ability to monitor performance of LAAS and enact sound no-kill policy, this proposal identifies the ASC as the sponsor of a pilot project that engages the UCLA Statistical Consulting Group (UCLA) as a partner with LAAS, on an initial pro bono basis, to plan and execute a basic audit and in-depth analysis of data, as administered and provided by LAAS, that are relevant to its no-kill goals.

The initial momentum for launching the project through ASC sponsorship is President Lisa McCurdy, with subsequent oversight by a commissioner yet to be determined. The point of contact for partnering with LAAS is General Manager Brenda Barnette, or a delegate, working with IT Supervisor Dara Ball. The point of contact for UCLA is Dr. Vivian Lew, with additional support to facilitate the inaugural partnership by Dr. Sue Mattson, a private citizen and volunteer who will serve in the capacity of a liaison providing administrative, technical and reporting support when appropriate.

### **Rationale**

There are several trends currently being monitored to assess progress toward no-kill across and at each of six municipal shelters in LA. These trends relate to intake (“impound”), adoptions and other live-release outcomes, euthanasia and spay/neuter. There is also one key performance indicator being used to track overall progress – the live-release rate (“save rate”), which has a counterpart in the euthanasia rate (“kill rate”).

In WoofStats, which is the current resource for monitoring trends, the data reported represent total counts of animals that fall into a specific category. These counts are derived from raw data that have been “rolled up” into totals, which then provide a snapshot of the number of animals that share characteristics of interest at certain points in time. For example, at the highest level, WoofStats tells us how many cats and dogs were impounded, adopted, or euthanized each month or year-to-date.

This type of simple statistical summary is known as “descriptive” – it describes the shelter population at a point in time. WoofStats adequately tells us “the what” – what is happening within the shelter population – and is a preliminary means for determining whether and why change is occurring.

To monitor change, these high level counts are then compared side-by-side with another time period of interest. Reviewers then “eyeball” counts to attempt to answer these questions: Is there a difference? Is it significant? Is it related to any particular activity, and if so, how can we know what that is?

However, this critical data, which is currently the only resource available to the ASC and LAAS for monitoring and responding to trends, is actually just a starting point statistically. WoofStats counts and simple rate calculations provide “clues” but are inadequate, in most cases, to confirm questions of significance or “the why” with any degree of confidence. In such a complex system, conclusions based on “eyeballing” data can thus only be considered highly speculative, and therefore a source of risk to both the ASC and LAAS.

To determine if trends are statistically significant and to form valid and reliable conclusions – as well as to connect to possible causes – requires more sophisticated analysis and interpretation that makes use of more powerful statistical tools and reasoning.

The purpose of this pilot project is to accomplish this, and, concurrently, to triangulate the descriptive statistics in WoofStats in a basic audit. Doing so will lend scientific credibility to interpretation and conclusions, which will better support policy decisions by the ASC, operations by LAAS and the no-kill activities of animal welfare groups and interested citizens.

## Synopsis of Work

[Back to Directory](#)

### What data will be analyzed?

The data that will be analyzed for the pilot project are the "primary" or "raw" data that are rolled up into the summary statistics in WoofStats. More precisely, a comprehensive but **targeted subset of raw data contained in Chameleon** will be subjected to a data audit and sophisticated analysis by resources provided by UCLA including advanced statistical software and expert interpretation. The first step in this process is called a "data dump."

A data dump is simply an electronic file generated by an authorized administrator who creates a custom report that is set up within the resident software – in this case, Chameleon. The data are exported into Excel and include relevant types ("fields") of data for relevant individuals ("records") in a database to cover a time period of interest. See Attachment A for a partial example of a data dump from Chameleon from another large shelter system – noting the example is not meant to be an exact reference.

For the purposes of the pilot project, the following describes the proposed "data dump" (see Attachment B):

- a) derived from the **LAAS database Chameleon**
- b) **authorized by GM Barnette** and prepared in coordination with IT Supervisor Dara Ball
- c) delivered electronically as a **CSV file for UCLA's Statistics Consulting Group**
- d) limited to **fields relevant to the analysis** (and to be further defined as needed), such as:
  - i) **animal identification:** ARN number, name
  - ii) **animal characteristics:** species, primary breed, sex, DOB/age at intake, color/markings, pre-altered status, spay/neuter date, microchip date/status, license date/status
  - iii) **intake data:** date, type/subtype (stray, owner surrender, evidence, etc.), reason, condition (normal/healthy, injured, medical condition/sick, pregnant, etc.), zip code, agency/shelter
  - iv) **outcome data:** date, type/subtype (adoption, New Hope, euthanasia, etc.), reason/circumstances (adoption event, transfer/transport, lack of space/medical, etc.), zip code, receiving agency/organization
  - v) **other indicators of progress:** TBD by interested parties (in first or future iterations)
- e) limited to **records relevant to the analysis** – in this case, **all individual cats and dogs**
- f) limited to the time period **FY 2009-2010 through the present** (July 1, 2009 through the present).

What will **not** be requested is any **personally identifying information (PII)** - or data that effectively leads to PII – **for a previous, current or other private individual** connected to possession of an animal. This includes names, addresses, phone numbers, emails, driver's licenses, etc. It is understood, however, that **required exclusions of PII do NOT apply to information that identifies an agency/organization** that receives animals through a transfer agreement.

In terms of process, the report is set up once and can then be produced on demand. Set up may take 30 min - 1 hr. Generally, a test file is produced for review by the customer and the statistician as part of determining its adequacy and to finalize the specific questions to be addressed. This accommodates the possibility of adjusting custom report criteria to add or delete data fields prior to beginning analysis.

Subsequent data dumps can be produced for export in just a few minutes, and customization tweaked as needed with minimal additional staff time. The original files remain on the originating server for archival purposes and can always be used to triangulate against any audit or analysis.

### What analysis will be performed?

The proposed analysis will involve appropriate statistical tests, to be determined by UCLA, that are routinely used to analyze complex data sets. These tests will be used to answer questions about trends seen in WoofStats – in this case, connected to intake, outcomes and other LAAS operations – that indicate progress toward no-kill in the shelter population.

With raw data – vs. the summary data in WoofStats – the details attached to each individual animal in the data set can be subjected to iterations of statistical tests. These tests act to determine the most likely influences on high level trends (e.g., intake, save or kill rates) as well as those at very fine-grained levels (e.g, intake changes by zip

code, outcome differences among breeds, relative impact of external transfers by group). WoofStats is simply not capable of providing this level of scientifically valid information – indeed, that is not the purpose of WoofStats. Hence, the value of adding this capacity to LAAS resources through this pilot project.

**General questions** for either high level or fine-grained trends will be directed at **significance and validation**:

- **Which trends are significant from a statistical perspective?**
- **Which are just as likely to reflect random year-to-year variation?**
- **Which trends are consistent with those occurring prior to implementing new programs?**
- **Which are likely to indicate a true response to new programs?**
- **Do trends from WoofStats triangulate with those arising from more sophisticated analyses?**
- **If not, what parts of the data set and/or data operations may need a closer audit?**

**Specific questions** will be directed toward making **inferences about cause**. For example:

- **What types of intake are having the most influence on observed trends? Owner surrenders? Strays picked up in the field? Strays with possible owners?**
- **What's driving trends in outcomes that vary among shelters? Adoptions? New Hope pulls? Transports?**
- **Which reasons for euthanasia are having a significant influence on trends? Space? Unsustainable under 8 weeks? Non-manageable medical conditions?**

It may also be possible to explore the impact of specific pilot or shelter-specific programs, such as Downtown Dog Rescue's Shelter Intervention Program at the South LA facility, or SNP-LA's clinic program at East Valley. And, this type of analysis can identify sub-populations within the shelter system that aren't benefitting to the extent predicted (or intended) despite amplifying no-kill programming. For example, at-risk breeds such as pit bull types or chihuahuas, big dogs, unweaned kittens, senior or special needs animals whose trends may in fact be contrary to higher level trends.

#### **How will the results be used?**

The results of the pilot project are meant to be a resource for various groups of stakeholders, with the ASC and those who interact in the commission forum being the primary audience. While there will be multiple uses for the results, the intention is to provide the ASC, LAAS and the citizens of LA an opportunity to better understand what's working, what's not, and to offer valid statistical interpretations that address the question: Why?

**This will benefit the ASC and LAAS in three crucial ways:**

- 1) knowing what's working and what's not can inform how to shape policy to add or shift resources;**
- 2) identifying the reasons behind significant change can focus policy and resources on specific activities; and**
- 3) understanding what's driving the system and its parts is the *only* means of knowing how to sustain it.**

The product will be entirely different from the worksheets and graphs currently encompassing WoofStats. There will be a **technical report** and **PowerPoint presentation** that will document the research questions, statistical methods, results, interpretations and conclusions, as well as offer recommendations for addressing gaps and opportunities.

Accompanying the technical report will be a **"brief"** that will be shaped specifically with the policy maker and layperson in mind. And, **all of the above plus the raw data set will be posted** in an appropriately designed and configured location on the LAAS website.

Ultimately, this will support better decisions by all stakeholders – decisions that continue to support and can even escalate progress toward a no-kill LA. Finally, the results – which might be considered analogous to an annual report – can be used to "manage up" or otherwise inform discussions in other municipal settings, or as a resource for communicating with interested parties, such as the media and community leaders.

## Outline of Activities and Timeline

[Back to Directory](#)

While the details of the work to be performed necessarily require input from various agency stakeholders and UCLA, and may require more than one iteration, the following is a preliminary outline of milestones for the purposes of describing this project:

### **Milestone 1 (Target date: Thu Sep 12)**

Successful introduction of project at the Sept 10 ASC meeting for further consideration (Owner: Sue Mattson)  
Draft of pilot project requirements and “deliverables” for review by AWC (Owner: Sue Mattson)

### **Milestone 2 (Target date: Thu Sep 19)**

Draft of preliminary proposal for review by ASC, LAAS, and UCLA (Owner: Sue Mattson)

### **Milestone 3 (Target date: Thu Oct 3)**

Draft of final proposal for review by the above parties and the City Attorney (Owner: Sue Mattson)

### **Milestone 4 (Target date: Tue Oct 8)**

Initial requirements for “data dump” delivered to LAAS (Owner: Sue Mattson)

### **Milestone 5 (Target date: Thu Oct 17)**

Final draft proposal details formalized and sent for review to ASC, LAAS and UCLA (Owner: Sue Mattson)

### **Milestone 6 (Target date: Thu Oct 24)**

Agenda item for public comment and sponsorship vote at Oct 24 ASC meeting (Owner: Commissioner McCurdy)  
Pilot project launched with delivery of “data dump” to UCLA (Owner: Sue Mattson w/ASC Sponsor)

### **Milestone 7 (Target date: Tue Dec 10)**

Preliminary findings/progress update at Dec 10 AWC meeting (Owner: Sue Mattson w/UCLA)

### **Milestone 8 (Target date: Thu Jan 9)**

Final findings/draft report for review by AWC and LAAS (Owner: Sue Mattson w/UCLA)  
Agenda item for presentation, discussion and public comment at Jan 14 AWC meeting (Owner: AWC Sponsor)

### **Milestone 9 (Target date: Thu Jan 23)**

Final report for review by AWC and LAAS (Owner: Sue Mattson w/UCLA)  
Agenda item for discussion, public comment and acceptance at Jan 28 AWC meeting (Owner: AWC Sponsor)

### **Milestone 10 (Target date: Thu Feb 6)**

Draft of “brief” version adapted for the public provided for AWC and LAAS review (Owner: Sue Mattson w/UCLA)  
Agenda item for announcement of publication and next steps at Feb 11 AWC meeting (Owner: AWC Sponsor)

### **Milestone 11 (Target date: Tue Feb 11)**

Final report and “brief” version posted on LAAS websites and other appropriate platforms  
Raw data files posted in appropriate manner on LAAS website for open access by public  
Pilot project completed with future iterations of process and product to be determined by AWC

## **Costs**

For the pilot project, there is little cost to LAAS other than staff time to set up the existing LAAS database – which is the commercial software “Chameleon” – to produce a custom report that includes previously identified data fields that are exported into an Excel or csv file onto a CD, thumb drive or online file transfer service. Once this custom report is set up one time, it can be modified to add or omit fields with minimal staff effort, and each subsequent export can be produced by updating report specifications in just a few minutes.

Other costs incurred toward the end of the pilot project might be associated with preparing preliminary and final report findings for review followed by those for publication. Expenses might include making paper copies and staff time to configure files and the LAAS website for posting.

Cost savings for the pilot project are significant, due to the pro bono services being provided by UCLA. These include: expert data science consulting and statistical analysis under the direction of eminent local statisticians, professional support by local citizen volunteers in planning and executing the pilot and adapting reported findings

for public access, and future administrative efficiency resulting from developing a process, product and partnerships that can provide support for future iterations of this vital – and ongoing – ASC resource.

### **Benefits**

- Statistically sound data analysis that will enable better monitoring and evaluation of the progress of LAAS, its contractors and its partners toward the goal of no-kill
- Improved ability to make timely and accurate policy decisions based on “good data”
- Ability to use finer-grained data to identify problems and opportunities in specific program areas and make focused adjustments to improve impact
- Initiation of innovative cross-sector partnerships consistent with emerging best practices that seek to add capacity to under-resourced public work
- Exemplary use of database and data science expertise and methodologies to answer policy-related questions
- Mitigation of public concerns about conflict of interest associated with strictly internal data processing and reporting by adding independent and unbiased expert auditing and analysis
- Modeling the principles of transparency, accountability, responsiveness to public concerns, excellence in customer service and entrepreneurial problem-solving – all consistent with the Mayor’s action plan

### **Risk of Taking Action**

- There may be unforeseen difficulties in executing the plan as intended due to it being a pilot process, product and partnership without precedent
- The opening of the process and product to input and interpretation by a wider group of stakeholders than has historically been included may be challenging to manage in a timely, objective and responsive way
- Findings may reveal the need for changing what is currently being done, which may require additional resources including staff, time and money and adjustments in how work is performed and monitored
- Findings may be met with contrasting points of view by agency and public parties that are played out in ways that are difficult to foresee and challenging to work through

### **Risk of Inaction**

- Ongoing and emerging questions regarding the status of no-kill and the related LAAS functions will continue to be answered only by existing means, which have repeatedly been referred to as “understaffed,” or “without adequate bandwidth”
- Undetected or unaddressed flaws in data operations and analysis may continue to be the basis for operational and policy decisions
- Existing data operations and analysis may generate findings that are neither accurate nor statistically sound by industry standards
- Inquiries from the AWC and public about performance related to LAAS no-kill functions will continue to be treated as “one-offs” – repeated requests to LAAS that contribute to administrative inefficiency
- The understandings of the “statistics of no-kill” will be extremely limited, particularly with regard to finer-grained indicators of:
  - programs and practices that are or are not working
  - unrecognized opportunities to boost impact
  - solutions that may or may not be scalable or sustainable in the long term

## **APPENDIX B**

### **DATA REQUEST**

[Back to Directory](#)

[TO DATA REQUEST](#)

**EXAMPLE of DATA REQUEST (aka Data Dump) from Chameleon for a large municipal shelter**

**Columns: Data fields (types of info) for each animal**

Animal #	Primary Breed	Intake Type	Intake Subtype	Intake Reason	Intake Condition	Outcome Type	Outcome Subtype	Intake Date	Outcome Date	Days to Outcome
A0319077	LABRADOR RETR	OS		DOA	NORMAL	DIED	DEAD ON AR	1/6/10	1/6/10	0
A0751199	STAFFORDSHIRE	OS	Own Req	OWNER DIED	NORMAL	EUTH-UNTREATABLE	NOTREAT BM	1/6/10	1/6/10	0
A0952656	PIT BULL	OS		AGG PEOPLE	NORMAL	EUTH-BEHAVIOR	BEHAV HIST	1/5/10	1/5/10	0
A0985054	PEKINGESE	OS		AGG ANIMAL	NORMAL	TRANSFER	TRANSFER	1/5/10	1/6/10	1
A1020601	MASTIFF	OS		COST	NORMAL	EUTH-TREATABLE	TREAT B/M	1/5/10	1/7/10	2
A1068516	LABRADOR RETR	OS		BITES	NORMAL	EUTH-BEHAVIORX	AGG/PS/FRF	1/2/10	1/17/10	15
A1077098	PIT BULL	OS		BEHAVIOR	NORMAL	EUTH-BEHAVIORX	AGG/PS/FRF	1/6/10	1/6/10	0
A1174444	ROTTWEILER	OS		AGG ANIMAL	NORMAL	EUTH-BEHAVIOR	BEHAV HIST	1/6/10	1/6/10	0
A1189956	MASTIFF	OS		BITES	NORMAL	EUTH-UNKNOWN	Unknown	1/6/10	1/17/10	11
A1204472	POMERANIAN	OS		MEDICAL	NORMAL	TRANSFER	RESCUE	1/5/10	1/20/10	15
A1208670	PIT BULL	Stray	Pos Own		NORMAL	EUTH-HEALTHY	PIT BULL	1/1/10	1/9/10	8
A1208671	LABRADOR RETR	Stray			NORMAL	RTO	MICROCHIP	1/1/10	1/2/10	1
A1208675	GERM SHEPHERD	Stray			NORMAL	EUTH-MEDICAL	UNTHR/EMAC	1/1/10	1/9/10	8
A1208676	CHOW CHOW	Stray	Pos Own		NORMAL	RTO	MICROCHIP	1/1/10	1/2/10	1
A1208680	PIT BULL	Stray	Pos Own		SICK	EUTH-TREATABLE	TREAT B/M	1/1/10	1/1/10	0
A1208685	DACHSHUND	Stray			NORMAL	ADOPTION	GENERAL	1/2/10	1/14/10	12
A1208696	LABRADOR RETR	Stray			NORMAL	ADOPTION	GENERAL SP	1/2/10	1/16/10	14
A1208710	GERM SHEPHERD	OS			NORMAL	EUTH-BEHAVIORX	AGG/PS/FRF	1/2/10	1/6/10	4
A1208713	YORKSHIRE TERR	Stray	Pos Own		NORMAL	ADOPTION	GENERAL	1/2/10	1/14/10	12
A1208750	CHIHUAHUA SH	Stray			NORMAL	ADOPTION	GENERAL SP	1/2/10	1/12/10	10
A1208856	GOLDEN RETR	OS		BITES	NORMAL	EUTH-BEHAVIORX	AGG/PS/FRF	1/5/10	1/17/10	12
A1208867	PIT BULL	OS	Own Req	NO TIME	NORMAL	EUTH-MEDICAL	URI/KCOUGH	1/5/10	1/12/10	7
A1208875	CATAHOULA	OS		EUTH OLD	NORMAL	EUTH-UNTREATABLE	NOTREAT BM	1/5/10	1/5/10	0
A1208894	PIT BULL	OS	Own Req	MEDICAL	INJURED	EUTH-MEDICAL	UNTHR/EMAC	1/5/10	1/5/10	0
A1208908	SHELTD SHEEPDOG	OS		EUTH ILL	NORMAL	EUTH-UNKNOWN	Unknown	1/5/10	1/5/10	0
A1208988	YORKSHIRE TERR	OS		COST	NORMAL	ADOPTION	GENERAL	1/6/10	1/8/10	2
A1208994	GERM SHEPHERD	OS	Own Req	AGG PEOPLE	NORMAL	EUTH-UNTREATABLE	NOTREAT BM	1/6/10	1/17/10	11
A1209056	BOXER	OS		NO HOME	NORMAL	RTO	Unknown	1/6/10	1/7/10	1
A1209175	PIT BULL	OS		AFRAID	NORMAL	EUTH-UNTREATABLE	PITBULL NT	1/7/10	1/9/10	2

\*The above are just a few records exported from Chameleon from a large municipal shelter in CA. The Chameleon field names were renamed to eliminate ambiguity for the analyst. The codes used within each field are configured as lists in Chameleon by the administrator so these will likely be different for LAAS. This data dump was for a project involving pit bulls, and is not meant to portray an exact reference. The LAAS data dump will include a larger set of data fields.

\*\* Estimated time to produce. Less than 30 min (Chameleon service rep); Less than 1 hr (LA County Chameleon admin); Up to 2 hrs (Poko Project volunteer). The Poko Project has secured funding for addl staff and/or technical support in the event LAAS resources are unable to accommodate due to lack of time and/or staff.



## ATTACHMENT B

[Back to Directory](#)

### Preliminary request of Chameleon data fields for custom report (aka data dump)\*

#### Time period:

Intake dates July 1, 2009 through the present (using fiscal year for ease of comparison)

This provides sufficient baseline (approx. 30 mo) and post-NKLA programming (approx. 22 mo)

#### Records:

All cats and dogs (including all kittens and puppies) impounded during the above time

Include active animals (no outcome yet)

#### Fields:

##### Animal identification

ARN number

name

##### Animal characteristics

species

primary breed

sex

DOB

color/markings

S/N pre-altered status

S/N date

microchip date/status

license date/status

##### Intake data

intake date

intake type

intake subtype

intake reason

intake condition

intake zip code

intake agency/shelter/location

##### Outcome data

outcome date

outcome type

outcome subtype

outcome reason/notes

outcome zip code

receiving agency/organization

##### Other indicators of progress

TBD by interested parties (in first or future iterations)

\* Exact names of fields may be different in LAAS version of Chameleon; after initial review and/or testing, additional fields may be needed and/or useful so this should be considered a starting point with adjustments likely. Adjusting the custom report and producing it will take a minimal amount of staff time (15 min or less).

## **APPENDIX C**

### **DATA AUDIT & ANALYSIS ACCESS**

[Back to Directory](#)

[TO ACCESS LINKS](#)

## ACCESS to DATA PROJECT DOCUMENTS

### LA NO-KILL DATA PROJECT DROPBOX FOLDER

[Back to Directory](#)

All project documents, including this report, the data set and methods work, all figures & tables, and various references and resources related to the audit and analysis are posted for public sharing in a Dropbox folder.

This is the link:

[LA No-Kill Data Project Dropbox Folder](#)

The link will be “permanent” and the folder can be accessed 24/7 by anyone with the link. Anyone with the link to the main folder will be able to access all of its contents. Individual files also have links, which are provided in Section 2 (below) of this Appendix. Other files and folders cannot be accessed from an individual file.

The conventions for indexing files and folders evolved through the course of the project – in general, documents related to different “studies” (e.g., Intake, Live Release Rate, Outcomes) can be tracked by a numeric “tag” and sequential numbering.

Most files are formatted as PDFs. All PDFs are formatted to be viewed online and/or downloaded and printed on letter-sized paper. The data set and related Excel files are NOT meant to be printed, but may be downloaded for review or independent analysis.

This folder and its contents are a work in progress, and will be updated as additional work is done. The best way to “stay current” will be to access the Dropbox folder and check the document titled “RECENT UPDATES.”

### SECTION 1: PDF Files with Internal Links

While the Dropbox folder contains ALL project documents, the figures and tables that represent the basis for analysis have been prepared as PDF files for each study and for all studies combined. Each PDF is prefaced with a directory to its main sections, with links that navigate to the relevant page (and back to the directory).

This is by far the easiest way to review project findings – and most files will not be updated. If a file is updated, it will ALSO be updated in the PDF. However, reviewers will need to re-access PDFs in the main Dropbox folder to ensure that the contents are current.

The following are links to the PDF files containing figures and tables from the analysis:

[LA NO-KILL DATA PROJECT – ALL STUDIES](#)

[4.0 INTAKE STUDIES-All Files Combined](#)

[4.1.0 SHELTER INTERVENTION PROJECT STUDY-All Files Combined](#)

[5.0 LIVE RELEASE RATE STUDY-All Files Combined](#)

[6.0 OUTCOMES STUDIES - All Files Combined](#)

[7.0 AT-RISK STUDIES - All Files Combined](#)

Section 2, below, provides direct links to the files in the Dropbox folder as of the date of this report.

## SECTION 2: DROPBOX FOLDER DIRECTORY

### [Back to Directory](#)

Note: Filenames in Directory and Dropbox Folder may be different. Content not affected.

- FOLDER 1:** [SHELTER STATISTICS BACKGROUND](#) (not all files represented here)  
[ASIOMAR – GLOSSARY](#) (terms and definitions relevant to defining “no-kill”)  
[ARTICLE – What is Your Rate?](#) (background and examples of methods for calculating Live Release Rate)
- FOLDER 2:** [LA SHELTER DATA REPORTS](#) (not all files represented here)  
[FINAL REPORT: LA NO-KILL DATA PROJECT](#) (comprehensive data audit findings and recommendations)
- FOLDER 3:** [DATA SET & DIRECTORY](#) (not all files represented here)  
[PROPOSAL: LA No-Kill Data Project](#)  
[DIRECTORY, LISTS and DATA AUDIT](#) (Excel Workbook)

## FIGURES & TABLES

- FOLDER 4:** [INTAKE STUDIES](#)  
[0-Intake-All Files Combined](#)

### Mo-by-Mo Trends by Species

- Cats vs Dogs Comparing Shelters [1-Intake-Shls Cmprd X Mo-Cats v Dogs-Grphs](#)  
 Cats & Dogs by Shelter (4pg) [2-Intake- By Shelter X Mo-Cats & Dogs-Grphs-4pg](#)

### Trends by Age Group

- Cats vs Dogs by Age Group by Mo [3.1-Intake-Age Grp-LAAS X Mo-Grphs](#)  
 % Each Age Group by Shelter by Yr [3.2-Intake-Age Grp %-Shls Cmprd X Yr-Grphs-2pg](#)  
 4-Yr Change by Age Group by Shelter (2pg) [3.3-Intake-Age Grp-By Shl-4Y-Data Tbls-2pg](#)

### Trends by Intake Type

- 4-Yr Change in Intake Type by Shelter (2pg) [4-Intake-Type-By Shl-4Y-Data Tbls-2pg](#)

### Trends by Owner Surrender (OS) Reason

- LAAS** [5-Intake-OS Reason-LAAS-4Y-Cats v Dogs-Data Tbls](#)  
**EVL** [5.1-Intake-OS Reason-EVL-4Y-Cats v Dogs-Data Tbls](#)  
**HAR** [5.2-Intake-OS Reason-HAR-4Y-Cats v Dogs-Data Tbls](#)  
**NOR** [5.3-Intake-OS Reason-NOR-4Y-Cats v Dogs-Data Tbls](#)  
**SLA** [5.4-Intake-OS Reason-SLA-4Y-Cats v Dogs-Data Tbls](#)  
**WLA** [5.5-Intake-OS Reason-WLA-4Y-Cats v Dogs-DataTbls](#)  
**WVL** [5.6-Intake-OS Reason-WVL-4Y-Cats v Dogs-Data Tbls](#)

### Trends by Top 50 Dog Breeds

- LAAS** [6-Intake-Dog Brd-ALL-Data Tbls](#)  
**EVL** [6.1-Intake-Dog Brd-EVL-Data Tbls](#)  
**HAR** [6.2-Intake-Dog Brd-HAR-Data Tbls](#)  
**NOR** [6.3-Intake-Dog Brd-NOR-Data Tbls](#)  
**SLA** [6.4-Intake-Dog Brd-SLA-Data Tbls](#)  
**WLA** [6.5-Intake-Dog Brd-WLA-Data Tbls](#)  
**WVL** [6.6-Intake-Dog Brd-WVL-Data Tbls](#)

### Trends by Top 20 Zip Code, Jurisdiction and City

- 4-Yr Change in Top 20 Zip Codes [7-Intake-Top 20 Zips-By Shl-4Y-Data Tbls](#)

### Trends in S/N Status

- 4-Yr Change in S/N Status by Shelter [8.1-Intake-SN Status-By Shl-4Y-Data Tbls-2pg](#)  
 4-Yr Change in S/N Status in Top 20 Zip Codes w/ Income Indicator [8.2-Intake-SN Status X Top 20 Zips-4Y-Data Tbls](#)

[Back to Directory](#)**FOLDER 4.1:**      [SHELTER INTERVENTION PROJECT STUDY](#)[0 SIP-All Files Combined](#)[1 SIP-Study Summary](#)**4-Yr Trends in Over-the-Counter (OTC) Owner Surrender (OS) vs Non-OS (Non-OS) from Apr-Sep  
DOGS**

<b>Graph Series 1:</b> Systemwide Trends	<a href="#">2.1 SIP-OS-All Shls-Dogs-Grphs</a>
<b>Graph Series 2:</b> South LA Shelter Trends	<a href="#">2.2 SIP-OS-SLA-Dogs-Grphs</a>
<b>Graph Series 3:</b> Shelters Compared	<a href="#">2.3 SIP-OS v NonOS-ShlComp-Dogs-Grphs</a>
<b>Graph Series 4:</b> Change by Shelter Compared	<a href="#">2.4 SIP-OS Chg-ShlComp-Dogs-Grphs</a>

**CATS**

<b>Graph Series 1:</b> Systemwide Trends	<a href="#">3.1 SIP-OS-All Shls-Cats-Grphs</a>
<b>Graph Series 2:</b> South LA Shelter Trends	<a href="#">3.2 SIP-OS-SLA-Cats-Grphs</a>
<b>Graph Series 3:</b> Shelters Compared	<a href="#">3.3 SIP-OS v Non OS-ShlComp-Cats-Grphs</a>
<b>Graph Series 4:</b> Change by Shelters Compared	<a href="#">3.4 SIP-OS Chg-ShlComp-Cats-Grphs</a>

**DATA TABLES****DOGS**    [4.1 SIP-Dogs-Data Details](#)**CATS**    [4.2 SIP-Cats-Data Details](#)**KEY TO GRAPHS****Graph Series 1: Systemwide Trends** (for comparing to SLA)

<b>Left</b>	OS vs Non-OS Counts (Top) and % Change in Counts (Bottom)
<b>Middle</b>	OS vs Non-OS % of OTC (Top) and % Change in OS % of OTC (Bottom)
<b>Right</b>	Ratio of OS vs Non-OS (Top) and % Change in Ratio (Bottom)

**Graph Series 2: South LA Shelter Trends** (for comparing to system)

<b>Left</b>	OS vs Non-OS Counts (Top) and % Change in Counts (Bottom)
<b>Middle</b>	OS vs Non-OS % of OTC (Top) and % Change in OS % of OTC (Bottom)
<b>Right</b>	Ratio of OS vs Non-OS (Top) and % Change in Ratio (Bottom)

**Graph Series 3: Shelters Compared** (each compared to SLA)

<b>Top</b>	OS vs Non-OS Counts
<b>Middle</b>	OS vs Non-OS OS % of OTC
<b>Bottom</b>	Ratio of OS vs Non-OS

**Graph Series 4: Change by Shelter Compared** (each compared to SLA)

<b>Top</b>	OS vs Non-OS % Change in Counts
<b>Middle</b>	OS vs Non-OS % Change in OS % of OTC
<b>Bottom</b>	Ratio of OS vs Non-OS % Change in Ratio

[Back to Directory](#)

**FOLDER 5:**      [LIVE RELEASE RATE STUDIES](#)  
                    [0-LRR-All Files Combined](#)  
                    [0.0-LRR-Methods Compared-Tutorial](#)

[1-LRR-All Shelters](#)  
                    [2-LRR-East Valley](#)  
                    [3-LRR-Harbor](#)  
                    [4-LRR-North Central](#)  
                    [5-LRR-South LA](#)  
                    [6-LRR-West LA](#)  
                    [7-LRR-West Valley](#)

Three methods for calculating Live Release Rate are compared. Each combines counts for Cats and Dogs.

#### **METHODS**

- 1) % **Live Intake:** Live Release Count/Total Live Intake Count
- 2) % **Final Outcomes:** Live Release Count/Total Final Outcomes Count
- 3) % **Total Inventory:** Live Release Count/Total in Inventory Count

#### **ALTERNATIVE DENOMINATORS**

**Live Release** = Adoption, Return-to-Owner (RTO) and Transfers to other organizations

**Final Outcomes** = All Live Release types plus Euthanasia, Died, and Unknown

**Total Inventory** = All Final Outcome types plus Shelter & Foster continuing to next period

[Back to Directory](#)**FOLDER 6: [OUTCOME STUDIES](#)**[0.0 Outcomes -Graphs-All Files Combined](#)**DATA TABLES** (48 mo, Oct 09-Sep 10 through Oct 12-Sep 13)**4Y Trends in Outcome Types and Subtypes**

<b>CATS</b>	Summary Statistics	<a href="#">1.1 Outcomes-Cats-4Y Summary</a>
	Details by Subtype	<a href="#">1.2 Outcomes-Cats-4Y Details</a>
<b>DOGS</b>	Summary Statistics	<a href="#">2.1 Outcomes-Dogs-4Y Summary</a>
	Details by Subtype	<a href="#">2.2 Outcomes-Dogs-4Y Details</a>

**4Y Trends in Transfers to Partners by Type**

<b>CATS</b>	Best Friends and New Hope	<a href="#">9.1 Outcomes-4Y-TransfGrps-Cats-DataTbl</a>
<b>DOGS</b>	Best Friends and New Hope	<a href="#">9.2 Outcomes-4Y-TransfGrps-Dogs-DataTbl</a>

**GRAPHS** (45 mo, Jan 2010 through Sep 2013, CalendarYr)**Mo-by-Mo Trends in Live Intake, Live Release and Euthanasia****Systemwide and By Shelter**

<b>CATS</b>	<b>LAAS</b>	<a href="#">1.3 Outcomes-Cats-LAAS X Mo</a>
		EVL <a href="#">1.4 Outcomes-Cats-EVL X Mo</a>
		HAR <a href="#">1.5 Outcomes-Cats-HAR X Mo</a>
		NOR <a href="#">1.6 Outcomes-Cats-NOR X Mo</a>
		SLA <a href="#">1.7 Outcomes-Cats-SLA X Mo</a>
		WLA <a href="#">1.8 Outcomes-Cats-WLA X Mo</a>
<b>DOGS</b>	<b>LAAS</b>	<a href="#">1.9 Outcomes-Cats-WVL X Mo</a>
		<a href="#">2.3 Outcomes-Dogs-LAAS X Mo</a>
		EVL <a href="#">2.4 Outcomes-Dogs-EVL X Mo</a>
		HAR <a href="#">2.5 Outcomes-Dogs-HAR X Mo</a>
		NOR <a href="#">2.6 Outcomes-Dogs-NOR X Mo</a>
		SLA <a href="#">2.7 Outcomes-Dogs-SLA X Mo</a>
		WLA <a href="#">2.8 Outcomes-Dogs-WLA X Mo</a>
		WVL <a href="#">2.9 Outcomes-Dogs-WVL X Mo</a>

**Shelters Compared Side-by-Side**

<b>CATS</b>	Live Release & Euthanasia Counts	<a href="#">3.1 Outcomes-Cats-Shls X Mo-Counts</a>
		Live Release Rates <a href="#">3.2 Outcomes-Cats-Shls X Mo-LR Rates</a>
		Euthanasia Rates <a href="#">3.3 Outcomes-Cats-Shls X Mo-Eu Rates</a>
<b>DOGS</b>	Live Release & Euthanasia Counts	<a href="#">4.1 Outcomes-Dogs-Shls X Mo-Counts</a>
		Live Release Rates <a href="#">4.2 Outcomes-Dogs-Shls X Mo-LR Rates</a>
		Euthanasia Rates <a href="#">4.3 Outcomes-Dogs-Shls X Mo-Eu Rates</a>

**Yr-by-Yr Trends in Live Intake, Live Release and Euthanasia**

<b>CATS</b>	Systemwide Counts and Rates	<a href="#">5.1 Outcomes-Cats-LAAS X Yr</a>
	Counts Compared by Shelter	<a href="#">5.2 Outcomes-Cats-Shls X Yr-Counts</a>
	Rates Compared by Shelter	<a href="#">5.3 Outcomes-Cats-Shls X Yr-Rates</a>
<b>DOGS</b>	Systemwide Counts and Rates	<a href="#">6.1 Outcomes-Dogs-LAAS X Yr</a>
	Counts Compared by Shelter	<a href="#">6.2 Outcomes-Dogs-Shls X Yr-Counts</a>
	Rates Compared by Shelter	<a href="#">6.3 Outcomes-Dogs-Shls X Yr-Rates</a>

**Trends in Live Release Types and Euthanasia Reasons**

<b>CATS</b>	Systemwide by Mo	<a href="#">7.1 Outcomes-Cats-LAAS X Mo-Subtype Rates</a>
	Shelters Compared by Yr	<a href="#">7.2 Outcomes-Cats-Shls X Yr-Subtype Rates</a>
<b>DOGS</b>	Systemwide by Mo	<a href="#">8.1 Outcomes-Dogs-LAAS X Mo-Subtype Rates</a>
	Shelters Compared by Yr	<a href="#">8.2 Outcomes-Dogs-Shls X Yr-Subtype Rates</a>

[Back to Directory](#)

**FOLDER 7:**      [AT-RISK STUDIES](#)  
                          [0.0-AtRisk-All Files Combined](#)

At-Risk populations that were focused upon include Cats vs. Dogs, Age Groups, Dog Breed and Dog Size. Each population was studied to determine trends in Live Release and Euthanasia.

Descriptive statistics identify 4-Yr trends in Adoption, Transfer and Euthanasia for at-risk populations. Transfers to partners (Best Friends, New Hope transporters, and New Hope local adopters) were also analyzed to determine how partners are impacting at-risk populations. These statistics show combined total counts by partner for at-risk groups transferred over two years – from Oct 2011 to Sep 2013. This allows an approximation of the impact of the NKLA incentive program for New Hope groups, which was launched in Fall 2011.

Statistical analyses looked for significant differences between at-risk and comparison groups and trend changes between 2010 and 2013. In addition, statistical analyses were used to determine the most likely influences on trends over time. Technical papers resulting from statistical analysis to be posted and summarized separately.

**Trends in Age Group Outcomes**

4-Yr Trends in Adoption, Transfer and Euthanasia  
     Cat Transfers over 2-Yrs (2pg)

[1.0-AtRisk-AgeGrp-Cats&Dogs-DataTbls](#)  
[1.1-AtRisk-TrfPart-AgeGrp-Cats-DataTbls-2pg](#)

**Trends in Top 5 Dog Breeds and Size Groups**

4-Yr Trends in Adoption, Transfer and Euthanasia  
     Dog Transfers over 2-Yrs (2 pg)

[2.0-AtRisk-Top5Brd&Size-Dogs-DataTbls](#)  
[2.1-AtRisk-TrfPart-Brd&Size-Dogs-DataTbls-2pg](#)

**KEY TO STUDIES: (D=Descriptive study; S=Statistical analysis)**

**Species (D,S)**

**Age Groups (D, S)**

<8wks (neonate)  
 6mo-1yr (juvenile)  
 1yr-3yr (youngadult)  
 3yr-6yr (adult)  
 >6yr (senior)

**Dog Breed**

Top 5 Breeds (D)  
 Pit Bull-Type vs. Non-Pit Bull-Type (S)  
 Chihuahuas vs. Non-Chihuahuas (S)

**Dog Size (D,S)**

S/ML (S=<30lbs; ML=30-60lbs)  
 L (L=>60lbs)