

The table below provides details of the interim results and illustrates the percent increase of cost for each of the member jurisdictions, (It should be noted that cost below are estimates based on the budgeted numbers for 2005-06 and actual costs will vary) For example, the total net increase for all Cities/Towns was 276 % - from \$98,642 in 2004-05 to \$390,567 in 2005-06. For individual jurisdictions, the increases range from 71 % (Auburn) to 426% (Lincoln).

SUMMARY RESULTS - Interim Allocation Solution

	FY 2003-04	FY 2004-05	% Increase from FY 03-04 to FY 04-05	Interim 2005-06	% Increase From FY 04-05 to FY 05-06
Auburn	\$ 14,290	\$ 14,447	1.1%	\$ 24,725	71 %
Colfax	\$ 7,611	\$ 7,695	1.1%	\$ 32,474	322%
Lincoln	\$ 31,137	\$ 31,480	1.1%	\$ 165,516	426%
Loomis	\$ 19,281	\$ 19,493	1.1%	\$ 84,346	333 %
Rocklin	\$ 25,249	\$ 25,527	1.1%	\$ 83,505	227%
TOTAL:	\$ 97,568	\$ 98,642		\$ 390,567	276%

Below are specific detailed allocations that show the methodology in more detail and provide a "map" as to how these results were determine.

Allocation of Salaries and Departmental Expenditures

For the purpose of this study, MAXIMUS analyzed the budgeted expenditures and salaries for the 2005-06 fiscal year. The total budgeted expenditures for fiscal 2005-06 is \$792,147. The total budgeted salaries for fiscal 2005-06 is \$1,713,447, which includes benefits.

The expenditures were distributed to one of five functions or service areas: 1) Shelter, 2) Patrol/Field Services, 3) Tahoe, 4) Large Animal, and 4) All. Support for large animals was given special consideration since some jurisdictions did not allow for this type of animal. The cost for large animals was allocated to Placer County.

Placer County - Health & Human Services Department (Animal Control) 2005-06

TOTAL BUDGET 2005-06	Expenses to be distributed to ALL	SHELTER	PATROL	TAHOE	Other*
<u>TOTAL: I \$ 792,147 I</u>	<u>\$ 252,852 I</u>	<u>\$ 192,860 I</u>	<u>\$ 271,245</u>	<u>\$ 72,190</u>	<u>\$ 3,000</u>

*Other accounts for \$3,000 in livestock food cost (Large Animal Support)

Salaries are handled in a separate fashion and will be covered in more detail below.

Allocation of Patrol/Field Service Costs

The allocation of patrol/field services were based on actual hours spent by Placer County Animal Control Officers for the last complete fiscal year. This data indicated the number of hours spent by officers patrolling within County. These hours, now expressed in percentages, were applied to patrol/field services costs and then distributed to the appropriate Group member. The following table represents the percentage of time spent by Placer County Animal Control Officers in the member jurisdiction and unincorporated area of the County.

Placer County - Animal Control Officer Beats

% of Available Hours Spent Patrolling the Following Localities:	
Auburn	0.00%
Colfax	2.90%
Lincoln	10.94%
Loomis	6.10%
Rocklin	0.00%
Placer (unincorporated)	80.06%
TOTAL:	100.00%

Because prior cost sharing allocations were distributed using a different methodology, it is not possible to make comparisons.

Allocation of Shelter Costs

The shelter costs were based on two separate methodologies, both receiving equal weight. 50% of the costs for shelters were allocated based on the Pet Population Methodology and the other 50% were based on the data from the County's PetWhere system.

Pet Population Methodology - Total Pet Owning Households*** *Population Statistics from Department of Finance - FY 2004-05*

POPULATION - ALL	Number of Households*	Percentage.
Auburn	4,249	8.73%
Colfax	573	1.18%
Lincoln	8,549	17.56%
Loomis	1,700	3.49%
Rocklin	13,797	28.34%
Placer* * (unincorporated)	19,813	40.70%
TOTAL:	48,680	100.00%

* Total number of households for all animal types. Some households may own more than one type of animal. Therefore, these numbers do not represent a total of separate households.

*** For the purpose of this study, the population of the Tahoe area (35,879) area has been removed from the Placer unincorporated County population.*

**** Estimation of the Number of Pet Owning Households Source: 2002 U. S. Pet Ownership & Demographic Sourcebook Published by the American Veterinary Medical Association.*

PetWhere Animal Data Methodology - Placer Animal Count Reports
Report for 07/01/03 thru 05/24/05

Group Member	Owned	Stray	Deceased	TOTAL	% of Total
Auburn	57	232	35	324	2.90%
Colfax	25	86	37	148	1.32%
Lincoln	45	112	16	173	1.55%
Loomis	28	211	76	315	2.82%
Rocklin	144	730	347	1,221	10.93%
Placer (unincorporated)	1117	5125	2752	8,994	80.48%
			TOTAL:	11,175	100.00%

APPENDIX 1:
Summary of Meetings with City Managers Memo

MAXIMUS

Animal Control Cost Distribution Analysis Summary of Meetings with City Managers Placer County, California May 23-25, 2005

This document summarizes the discussions held with City Managers (or their designees) concerning development of an equitable methodology to allocate Placer County Animal Control costs to the appropriate service areas. It also offers a recommended methodology for equitable cost allocation based on comments from the participating jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction has its own specific ideas about the most equitable cost allocation methodology. However, there is general agreement on several key points.

MAXIMUS has taken the different viewpoints and presents the suggested methodology to all parties for their review. Once all parties have reviewed this document and have given the go-ahead to proceed with finalizing the cost analysis, MAXIMUS will move rapidly to process the numbers and present everyone with a draft of the numbers. We will then meet jointly with all parties to discuss the findings and assist in developing recommendations for moving forward.

MAXIMUS appreciates the cooperation of all agencies and looks forward to finalizing the analysis and then meeting with the entire group (in mid June 2005) to discuss any outstanding issues.

This document is organized by allocation methodology and identifies any concerns expressed by the city managers in the meetings held in late May 2005. In summary, it was agreed to by all parties that the most equitable method of determining an equitable cost allocation should be weighted most heavily on the numbers and types of animals generated by each jurisdiction (shelter related costs), and by time tracking for field staff working in various animal control beats throughout the County. However, since the County has experienced a number of problems in verifying the accuracy of that data, an interim solution is required until the County can produce accurate data.

Interim Solution

1. **PROPOSED METHODOLOGY:** *Allocate administrative costs based on salaries and wages of personnel working in Field and Shelter activities.*

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS: No one expressed concerns with this allocation methodology in the May meetings.

RECOMMENDATION: Spread administrative costs (those within the Health Department only - NO A-87 County-wide costs will be included) based on the cumulative budgeted salary dollars for FY 2004-05.

MAXIMUS

2. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY: *Separate Field Services costs from all other costs and allocate those costs based on ACO beat assignments. -*

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS: No one expressed concerns with this allocation methodology in the May meetings. The County has accurate time tracking data for their field staff to substantiate this allocation. One city manager expressed concern that a performance based system should be established to ensure that field staff actually patrols areas if specific charges are identified. MAXIMUS agreed to bring this issue forward for discussion.

RECOMMENDATION: MAXIMUS recommends segregating the costs for animal control field services and allocating them based on data provided by Placer County that indicates the number of hours spent patrolling throughout the County for the most recent twelve month period.

3. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY: *Use a combination of two methods for allocating shelter services costs, with each method receiving equal weight. In addition, direct supplies and materials costs for housing large animals will be identified and removed from the allocation to cities.*

- a. *Pet population methodology* - the American Veterinary Medical Association published a Pet Demographics Sourcebook in 2002. Included in that book are formulas for estimating the number of pets owned per household, using national averages of pet ownership and local household sizes.
- b. *County Animal Control data on animals received at the Animal Shelter between July 1, 2003 and May 24, 2005* - Although the County has concerns about the total accuracy of the data in its software system, this data should be used to allocate one-half of the shelter costs.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS: Several city managers expressed concerns with using any type of population based allocation methodology. However, several indicated that they understood and appreciated the concept of the "readiness" aspect of maintaining a shelter. Construction and maintenance of an animal shelter was compared to building and maintaining a fire station. Ideally, you would never need to use the services offered, but you agree to pay a share of the cost as insurance in case you will require the services.

MAXIMUS was asked by one city manager to perform further research and identify a better alternative than a straight population allocation. The "estimated pet population" formula was identified during this research. Since this estimated pet population is based on household size, MAXIMUS believes it will address the concerns of one city that its substantial senior citizen population should be taken into account when allocating costs. The average household size in this city is less than the *rest* of the County population.

Cities who provide their own field services, have extremely active licensing programs, and spend a great deal of effort to keep animals from entering the shelter indicated that a

MAXIMUS

strictly population-based allocation is unacceptable. They much prefer an "animals entering the shelter" based allocation. Although the County has serious concerns about the validity of the data generated by its current software system, MAXIMUS shared some of the data with the city managers and was told that the data appeared reasonable enough to use in allocating the shelter costs.

RECOMMENDATION: MAXIMUS recommends removing the direct supply and materials expense for housing large animals and then allocating the remaining Animal Shelter costs 50/50 using the Pet Population Methodology and the data collected from the County's PetWhere system for the time period beginning 7/1/03 and ending 5/24/05.

4. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY: Use a combination of two methods for crediting localities with any fee revenues collected by the County for Animal Control Services, with each method receiving equal weight. These are the same methods used for allocating Animal Shelter costs to each jurisdiction.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS: One city manager expressed concerns about the revenue credits his community received in support of the Animal Control Division. He requested certain funds be set aside in the County budget to support Animal Control. He also suggested that the County explore providing "pet boarding services" as a way to generate additional revenues and reduce the burden on the cities.

RECOMMENDATION: MAXIMUS recommends allocating fee revenue credits back to localities using the 50/50 combination of Pet Population Methodology and the data collected from the County's PetWhere system for the time period beginning 7/1/03 and ending 5/24/05.

Long- Term Solution

Once the cities and the county agree on an interim allocation methodology, MAXIMUS proposes that the county work towards establishing a reliable database that can accurately identify where animals are collected that ultimately are deposited with the county's Animal Shelter. Once this database is deemed accurate, then the jurisdictions can revise the Animal Shelter allocations based upon the new data. Otherwise, MAXIMUS recommends that the administrative costs and the field services costs be allocated in the same manner over the long-term as is proposed in the interim.

MAXIMUS

Immediate Actions Requested

MAXIMUS requests that each city and the county review the information contained in this summary document and indicate their approval or disapproval of:

1. MAXIMUS using the proposed methods to calculate Animal Control cost allocations.
2. Attending a meeting to be held the week of June 13, 2005 (exact date to be determined) to discuss the numbers generated from this cost analysis and map out the next steps in the process.

CONFIRMATION STATEMENT

The County/City/Town of _____ has reviewed the proposed Animal Control Cost Allocation methodology and

- agrees that MAXIMUS should conduct the cost analysis with these allocation methodologies, OR

- disagrees with the methodology and proposes the following alternative methodology:

Signed

County/City/Town Official

PLEASE RESPOND VIA E-MAIL OR FAX (972) 490-3040 TO MARK CARPENTER (markcarpenter@maximus.com) NO LATER THAN JUNE 7, 2005, 2:00 PM PDT.

**APPENDIX 2:
Tables & Data**

PLACER COUNTY

COST OF SERVICE/USER FEE ANALYSIS (MAXFEE Methodology)

ANIMAL SERVICES GROUP COST DETERMINATION FY 2005-06

Tables and Data

June 14, 2005

For more information, contact:
J. Mark Carpenter / Guy Burdick
4320 Auburn Boulevard, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95841
(916) 485-8102
markcarpenter@maximus.com

Placer County Animal Control. Animal Count Reports (Petwhere)

Report for 07/01/2003 thru 05/24/2005

TOTAL ANIMALS - COMBINED

	Owned	Stray	Deceased	TOTAL	% of Total
Auburn	57	232	35	324	2.90%
Colfax	25	86	37	148	1.32%
Lincoln	45	112	16	173	1.55%
Loomis	28	211	76	315	2.82%
Rocklin	144	730	347	1,221	10.93%
Placer Co (all)*	1117	5125	2752	8,994	80.48%
TOTAL:				11,175	100.00%

Placer County Animal Control - Population Distribution

TOTAL PET OWNING HOUSEHOLDS

<u>POPULATION - ALL</u>	<u>Number of Households *</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Auburn	4,249	8.73%
Colfax	573	1.18%
Lincoln	8,549	17.56%
Loomis	1,700	3.49%
Rocklin	13,797	28.34%
Placer - <u>Unincorporated County**</u>	<u>19,813</u>	<u>40.70%</u>
Total:	48,680	100.00%

* Total number of households for all animal types. Some households may own more than one type of animal. Therefore, these numbers do not represent a total of separate households.

** For the purpose of this study, the population of the Tahoe area (35,879) area has been removed from the Placer unincorporated County population.

*Estimation of the Number of Pet Owning Households
Source: 2002 U. S. Pet Ownership & Demographic Sourcebook
Published by the American Veterinary Medical Association*

Number of Pet-Owning Households - National Percentages

Dogs: Number of dog-owning households = 0.361 x total number of households

Cats: Number of cat-owning households = 0.316 x total number of households

Birds: Number of bird-owning households = 0.046 x total number of households

Horses: Number of horse-owning households = 0.017 x total number of households

Placer County Animal Control - Animal Control Officer Beats

Percent of Available Hours Spent Patrolling the Following Localities:

Auburn	0.00%
Colfax	2.90%
Lincoln	10.94%
Loomis	6.10%
Rocklin	0.00%
<u>Placer (unincorporated)</u>	<u>80.06%</u>
	Total: 100.00%

PLACER COUNTY - ANIMAL SERVICES GROUP

Agency Cost Distribution Detail

Cost Category	Cost	Allocation Key (F/V/D)	Function #1			Function #2			Function #3			Function #4			Function #5			Function #6			Non-Fee			Actual Total Allocated
			General & Admin	Patrol COLFAX	Patrol LINCOLN	Patrol - LOOMIS	Patrol PLACER (Unincorp)	TAHOE Support	Shelter Services - FULL COSTS	Non-User Fee Activities	General & Admin	Patrol COLFAX	Patrol LINCOLN	Patrol - LOOMIS	Patrol PLACER (Unincorp)	TAHOE Support	Shelter Services - FULL COSTS	Non-User Fee Activities	Actual Total Allocated					
Salary & Wages	\$ 1,028,396	F	\$ 184,116	\$ 9,105	\$ 1,864	\$ 23,778	\$ 340,055	\$ 206,573	\$ 222,905	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,028,396		
Actual %	100%		17.903%	0.885%	4.071%	2.312%	33.066%	20.087%	21.675%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	100%		
Variable Cost Distribution %	100%		17.903%	0.885%	4.071%	2.312%	33.066%	20.087%	21.675%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	100%		
Fixed Cost Distribution %	100%																					100%		
Benefits	\$ 685,081	F	\$ 122,650	\$ 6,063	\$ 7,890	\$ 15,839	\$ 226,529	\$ 137,612	\$ 148,491	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 685,074		
Total Direct Labor & Ben.:	\$ 1,713,477		\$ 306,766	\$ 15,168	\$ 69,754	\$ 39,617	\$ 556,584	\$ 344,185	\$ 371,396	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,713,470		
						5.73%	81.98%																	
Services & Supplies			\$ 45,268	\$ 2,238	\$ 10,294	\$ 5,846	\$ 83,608	\$ 50,790	\$ 54,806	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 252,850		
Expenses to be distributed to ALL	\$ 52,852	V	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 192,860		
SHELTER	\$ 192,860	D	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 271,245		
PATROL	\$ 271,245	D	\$ -	\$ 5,953	\$ 27,376	\$ 15,548	\$ 222,367	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 72,190		
TAHOE	\$ 72,190	D	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 72,190	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000		
Other*	\$ 3,000	D	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Expense Line #6	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Total S&S:	\$ 792,147		\$ 45,268	\$ 8,191	\$ 37,670	\$ 21,394	\$ 305,975	\$ 122,980	\$ 250,666	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 792,145		
G & A Distribution %	100%			1.078%	4.959%	2.816%	40.277%	24.467%	92.944	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	100%		
G & A Distribution	\$ 352,034			\$ 3,796	\$ 17,456	\$ 9,914	\$ 141,790	\$ 86,134	\$ 343,610	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 352,034		
Total Departmental Costs:	\$ 1,098,913			\$ 11,987	\$ 55,126	\$ 31,308	\$ 447,765	\$ 209,114	\$ 715,006	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,098,913		
Total Departmental Cost:	\$ 2,505,624			\$ 27,155	\$ 124,880	\$ 70,925	\$ 1,014,349	\$ 553,299	\$ 1,014,349	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,505,624		
Central Services/Overhead Costs																								
City / County Overhead (CAP)	\$ 0			\$ -	\$ -																	\$ 0		
Departmental Overhead	\$ 0																					\$ 0		
Other Overhead / Allocations	\$ 0																					\$ 0		
Total Central Svcs Costs:	\$ 0																					\$ 0		
SERVICE COST SUBTOTAL:	\$ 2,505,624																					\$ 2,505,615		
Total Other Adjustments:	\$ -																					\$ -		
Grand Total:	\$ 2,505,624																					\$ 2,505,615		

PLACER COUNTY - ANIMAL SERVICES GROUP

Agency Cost Summary: Petwhere / Population Distribution									
	Sub.Total	50/50 Split	AUBURN	COLFAX	LINCOLN	LOOMIS	ROCKLIN	PLACER	TAHOE
PATROL									
Patrol Direct Labor & Benefits									
Patrol- COLFAX				\$ 15,168					
Patrol- LINCOLN					\$ 69,754				
Patrol- LOOMIS						\$ 39,617			
Patrol- PLACER (Unincorp)								\$ 566,584	
General & Admin Allocation				\$ 3,796	\$ 17,456	\$ 9,914		\$ 141,790	
Sub total - Labor & Benefits:	\$ 864,079		\$	\$ 18,964	\$ 87,210	\$ 49,531	\$	\$ 708,374	\$
Patrol Expenses									
Patrol- COLFAX				\$ 5,953					
Patrol- LINCOLN					\$ 27,376				
Patrol- LOOMIS						\$ 15,548			
Patrol- PLACER (Unincorp)								\$ 222,387	
Patrol- Services & Supplies (general)				\$ 2,238	\$ 10,294	\$ 5,846		\$ 83,608	
Sub total - Expense:	\$ 373,231		\$	\$ 8,191	\$ 37,670	\$ 21,394	\$	\$ 305,975	\$
TOTAL PATROL COST									
Patrol- COLFAX				\$ 27,155					
Patrol- LINCOLN					\$ 124,880				
Patrol- LOOMIS						\$ 70,925			
Patrol- PLACER (Unincorp)								\$ 1,014,349	
TOTAL - Patrol Cost:	\$ 1,237,310		\$	\$ 27,155	\$ 124,880	\$ 70,925	\$	\$ 1,014,349	
SHELTER									
Petwhere Distribution			2.90%	1.32%	1.55%	2.82%	10.93%	80.48%	
Shelter Direct Labor & Benefits	\$ 185,698	\$ 185,698	\$ 5,384	\$ 2,459	\$ 2,875	\$ 5,234	\$ 20,290	\$ 149,456	
General & Admin Allocation	\$ 46,472	\$ 46,472	\$ 1,347	\$ 615	\$ 719	\$ 1,310	\$ 5,078	\$ 37,402	
Shelter - Petwhere Distribution	\$ 96,430	\$ 96,430	\$ 2,796	\$ 1,277	\$ 1,493	\$ 2,718	\$ 10,536	\$ 77,610	
Shelter - Services & Supplies (general)	\$ 27,403	\$ 27,403	\$ 795	\$ 363	\$ 424	\$ 772	\$ 2,994	\$ 22,055	
Sub total. Shelter Petwhere:			\$ 10,322	\$ 4,715	\$ 5,511	\$ 10,035	\$ 38,898	\$ 286,523	
Population Distribution			8.73%	1.18%	17.56%	3.49%	28.34%	40.70%	
Shelter Direct Labor & Benefits	\$ 185,698	\$ 185,698	\$ 16,207	\$ 2,186	\$ 32,610	\$ 6,485	\$ 52,631	\$ 75,579	
General & Admin Allocation	\$ 46,472	\$ 46,472	\$ 4,056	\$ 547	\$ 8,161	\$ 1,623	\$ 13,171	\$ 18,914	
Shelter Population Distribution	\$ 96,430	\$ 96,430	\$ 8,416	\$ 1,135	\$ 16,934	\$ 3,368	\$ 27,330	\$ 39,247	
Shelter - Services & Supplies (general)	\$ 27,403	\$ 27,403	\$ 2,392	\$ 323	\$ 4,812	\$ 957	\$ 7,767	\$ 11,153	
Sub total. Shelter Population:			\$ 31,070	\$ 4,190	\$ 62,518	\$ 12,432	\$ 100,899	\$ 144,894	
Large Animal / Livestock Food	\$ 3,000							\$ 3,000	
TOTAL - Shelter (Combined):	\$ 715,006		\$ 41,392	\$ 8,905	\$ 68,029	\$ 22,467	\$ 139,797	\$ 434,416	
TAHOE SUPPORT									
Tahoe - Support	\$ 553,299								\$ 553,299
REVENUE									
Animal Licenses	\$ (131,000)								
Business Licenses	\$ (4,000)								
Humane Services	\$ (80,000)								
Spay/Neuter Fees	\$ (25,200)								
Other Sales	\$ (500)								
Donations	\$ (16,000)								
Miscellaneous	\$ (30,000)								
Total Revenue:	\$ (286,700)								
Revenue Split - Petwhere:	\$ (143,350)		(4,156.19)	(1,898.51)	(2,219.20)	(4,040.74)	(15,662.67)	(115,372.70)	
Revenue Split - Population:	\$ (143,350)		(12,510.77)	(1,687.34)	(25,173.63)	(5,006.08)	(40,628.56)	(58,343.62)	
TOTAL REVENUE:			(16,666.96)	(3,585.84)	(27,392.83)	(9,046.82)	(56,291.23)	(173,716.32)	
GRAND TOTALS:									
PATROL:	\$ 1,237,310		\$	\$ 27,155	\$ 124,880	\$ 70,925	\$	\$ 1,014,349	\$
SHELTER:	\$ 715,006		\$ 41,392	\$ 8,905	\$ 68,029	\$ 22,467	\$ 139,797	\$ 434,416	\$
TAHOE:	\$ 553,299		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$ 553,299

PLACER COUNTY – ANIMAL SERVICES GROUP

Agency Cost Distribution Summary Table
FY 2005-06

	AUBURN	COLFAX	LINCOLN	LOOMIS	ROCKLIN	PLACER	TAHOE
PATROL							
Patrol Direct Labor & Benefits	\$ -	\$ 8,964	\$ 87,210	\$ 49,531	\$ -	\$ 708,374	\$ -
Patrol Expenses	\$ -	\$ 8,191	\$ 37,670	\$ 21,394	\$ -	\$ 305,975	\$ -
TOTAL PATROL: \$	-	\$ 27,155	\$ 124,880	\$ 70,925	-	\$ 1,014,349	-
SHELTER							
Petwhere Distribution	\$ 10,322	\$ 4,715	\$ 5,511	\$ 10,035	\$ 38,898	\$ 286,523	\$ -
Population Distribution	\$ 31,070	\$ 4,190	\$ 62,518	\$ 12,432	\$ 100,899	\$ 144,894	\$ -
Large Animal / Livestock Food	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000	\$ -
TOTAL SHELTER (Combined): \$	41,392	\$ 8,905	\$ 68,029	\$ 22,467	\$ 39,797	\$ 434,416	\$ -
TAHOE SUPPORT	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 553,299
REVENUE							
Revenue Split - Petwhere:	\$ (4,156)	\$ (1,899)	\$ (2,219)	\$ (4,041)	\$ (15,663)	\$ (115,373)	\$ -
Revenue Split - Population:	\$ (12,511)	\$ (1,687)	\$ (25,174)	\$ (5,006)	\$ (40,629)	\$ (58,344)	\$ -
TOTAL REVENUE: \$	(16,667)	(3,586)	(27,393)	(9,047)	(56,291)	(173,716)	\$ -
GRAND TOTALS:	AUBURN	COLFAX	LINCOLN	LOOMIS	ROCKLIN	PLACER	TAHOE
PATROL:	\$ -	\$ 27,155	\$ 124,880	\$ 70,925	\$ -	\$ 1,014,349	\$ -
SHELTER:	\$ 41,392	\$ 8,905	\$ 68,029	\$ 22,467	\$ 139,797	\$ 434,416	\$ -
TAHOE:	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 553,299
REVENUE CREDIT:	\$ (16,667)	\$ (3,586)	\$ (27,393)	\$ (9,047)	\$ (56,291)	\$ (173,716)	\$ -
TOTAL:	\$ 24,725	\$ 32,474	\$ 165,516	\$ 84,346	\$ 83,505	\$ 1,275,049	\$ 553,299
% of Total Cost:	1.11%	1.46%	7.46%	3.80%	3.76%	57.46%	24.94%

Comparison Analysis

As part of the project, MAXIMUS was asked to poll other local agencies to determine how they handle the distribution of animal control costs. The table below illustrates the results from the survey.

County Animal Services Survey - June - July 2005

County	2005Est. Population	Allocation Methodology	Provide Field Services	Provide Shelter Services
Butte	214,119	No Reply	-	-
Calaveras	44,796	Fee Offset*	Yes	Yes
Colusa	20,880	Actual Cost	Yes	Yes
Marin	252,485	None	No	No
Solano	421,657	Animal Data	No	Yes
Sutter	88,945	Population Based	Yes	Yes
Tulare	409,871	None	No	No
Tuolumne	58,504	Fee Offset*	Yes	Yes
Yolo	187,743	Animal Data	Yes	Yes
Yuba	66,734	None	No	No

**The County collects fees for various services from residents within the cities in lieu of charging cities for AC services.*