

City of San Marcos

630 East Hopkins San Marcos, TX 78666

Meeting Minutes City Council

Wednesday, November 7, 2018

3:30 PM

City Hall Conference Room

630 E. Hopkins - Work Session

I. Call To Order

With a quorum present, the work session meeting of the San Marcos City Council was called to order by Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt at 3:30 p.m. Wednesday, November 7, 2018 in the City Hall Conference Room, 630 E. Hopkins, San Marcos, Texas 78666.

II. Roll Call

Present: 5 - Mayor Pro Tem Lisa Prewitt, Council Member Saul Gonzales, Council Member

Melissa Derrick, Mayor Jane Hughson and Council Member Ed Mihalkanin

Absent: 2 - Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Scott Gregson and Mayor John Thomaides

PRESENTATIONS

 Receive a staff presentation and hold discussion regarding resources needed to increase live outcomes at the San Marcos Regional Animal Shelter, and provide direction to the City Manager.

Bert Lumbreras, City Manager, provided an update on the most recent events impacting the shelter and commended the staff for their fantastic work regarding the recent large intake due to a seizer by Hays County. He provided that this is a community problem and not a City of San Marcos problem and he hopes that we will be able to work with our regional partners to accomplish the goal of increase live outcomes. He provided a brief overview of the presentation that will be presented by Mr. Jeff Caldwell, Director of Neighborhood Enhancement and Ms. DerryAnn Krupinsky, Assistant Director of Neighborhood Enhancement.

Ms. Krupinsky began the presentation by providing the mission statement of the Animal Shelter. "Our mission is to care for, protect, and find quality homes for abandoned and neglected animals, aid in the reduction of pet overpopulation, and provide community education for the mutual benefit of animals and people." She provided the purpose of the presentation being to provide information and status of the shelter and to seek direction on Animal Services division's path to increase live outcomes. She provided the discussion

roadmap and began with the history of the San Marcos Regional Animal Shelter.

Ms. Krupinsky reviewed the core services of the San Marcos Regional Animal Shelter. The Core Services that they do well now and that the Staff takes pride in included: Animal Control, Safety, Clean/sterilize, Microchip, Pet licensing, Stray intake, Owner surrender and Rabies control. She continued and explained that the Council can consider the following as core services that they are doing, and with the right attention could do better: Adoptions, Technology/Photos, Rescues/transfers, Spay/neuter, Ill & injured animals, Owner reunions, and Fosters. She explained that the following core services need attention right now: Shelter facility, Staffing, Customer experience, Animal training and Outreach & events. Discussion was held regarding offering rabies control and the availability of free or low-cost vaccinations. She explained that sustaining higher live outcomes depends on bolstering the core services at the shelter with adequate resources proportionate to population growth in Hays County.

Ms. Krupinsky took time to celebrate the shelter's achievements. She provided that the average live outcome percentage has grown from 45% in FY16 to 73.4% in FY18. The factors for success include the staff, regional partners, Animal Advisory Board, the community and partners such as APA, PAWS and Emancipet.

Ms. Krupinsky continued and explained the 90% live outcome goal. She provided that the benchmark for being called "no-kill" is having a live outcome rate of 90% or higher. She stated that historically our rate factored in all animals. Moving forward, the adoptable animals may be factored separately from the bite tendency/aggressive and severely ill/injured (untreatable) animals. She explained that sustaining success takes a comprehensive approach utilizing robust partnerships with rescues and fosters, substantial resources including budget and staffing, and community education and involvement. Animal overpopulation is a community problem, which must be addressed with the commitment and dedication of the community.

Ms. Krupinsky provided the model programs that they have reviewed. They are as follows:

City of Austin: No-kill resolution passed in 2010; the implementation plan was a robust, 34-prong approach presented by the Animal Advisory Committee, with input from staff, public, partners, and other stakeholders; heavily

supported by City & Community. Live outcome rate was 65%; reached no-kill status in 2011.

City of Waco: Went from 36% live outcome rate in 2012 to 92% in 2016. Success was through collaboration, innovation, and improvements.

Williamson County: Went from 58% live outcome rate in 2007 to 90% in 2010. Success was due to committed staff & implementation of programs.

Ms. Krupinsky reviewed a comparison of the model programs. This comparison is attached as Exhibit A.

Ms. Krupinsky provided the regional partnership FY 18 figures. They were provided as follows:

San Marcos Regional Animal Shelter: Intake 5,025; Budget \$849,280

San Marcos: Intake 2,483 (49.9%) \$612,977 (71% of budget) Hays County: Intake 1,623 (32.3%) \$141,462 (17% of budget)

Kyle: Intake 810 (16.1%) \$71,469 (9% of budget) Buda: Intake 109 (2.2%) \$23,373 (2.8% of budget)

Ms. Krupinsky provided the regional partnership FY 19 assumptions. They were provided as follows:

San Marcos Regional Animal Shelter: Intake 5,855; Budget \$1,018,376

San Marcos: Intake 2,681 (45.8%) \$579,436 (56.9% of budget) Hays County: Intake 1,911 (32.6%) \$259,596 (25.5% of budget)

Kyle: Intake 1,023 (17.5%) \$141,881 (13.9% of budget)

Buda: Intake 240 (4.1%) \$37,463 (3.7% of budget)

It was also provided that Maintaining a regional shelter will require restructuring our partners' contracts to include operations, facilities and capital expenses starting in FY20.

Ms. Krupinsky provided the next steps for expanded and ideal services related to a new facility, addressing staffing levels, animal training and outreach and events.

Ms. Krupinsky reviewed the cost estimates to sustain/exceed current live outcome rates as a regional shelter. She explained that the cost estimates are to move the needle towards higher live outcomes and does not include the cost to go "No Kill." This estimate was provided as follows:

Portable Building for next 5 years: \$300,000

5 Shelter Techs, average annual cost: \$210,000

1 Behaviorist / Trainer, average annual cost: \$64,000

Volunteer/Events Program Budget: \$15,000

Additional Supplies, Materials, Incentives: \$40,000

2 Vet Techs, average annual cost: \$104,000

Temp Staff During Peak Intake Months: \$20,000

2 Adoption Techs, average annual cost: \$84,000

Current Facility Renovation/Needs: \$175,000

3 Coordinators (Foster, Rescue, Adoption Initiatives), average annual cost:

\$192,000

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST: \$1,204,000

Ms. Krupinsky reviewed the development of a no-kill/high live outcome plan. She indicated that a consultant from Best Friends would be coming in to assist with the development of the plan. During the process, staff will solicit input, review and update policies, procedures and ordinances, attempt to reduce intake, increasing the number of animals moving out of the shelter, weighing the pros and cons of each activity while taking into consideration other factors like facilities, volunteers, donations, partners, cat-specific approaches, medical fund and services, supplies, staffing and transfers. She provided that partners would be an essential piece to the success of this initiative.

Discussion was held regarding spay and neuter programs that will be funded with the additional funds received in the FY18-19 budget. This included providing mobile spay/neuter clinics. Mr. Caldwell provided that they are working with an activist that is trying to get funding for a van through CAPCOG to provide spay/neuters regionally. Discussion was held regarding the adoption trailer that was funded via a \$35,000 grant.

Ms. Krupinsky reviewed the three options for moving forward. 1. Stay on the current course, 2. Take a more focused approach & continue the regional partnership, 3. Take a more focused approach as a single entity. She further explained the options listed above.

Option 1: Adopt Resolution to bring back, within 6 months, an implementation plan with timeline. Work with community and regional partners to develop a comprehensive implementation plan to achieve 90%. Stay on current course by using available funding/resources within multiple budgets as we can fund.

Option 2: Adopt Resolution to bring back, within 6 months, an

implementation plan with timeline. Work with community and regional partners to develop comprehensive implementation plan to achieve 90% within the next 5 years. Develop a focused approach with our community and regional partners to incrementally implement intervention programs in each community and start allocating additional funding each year.

Option 3: Adopt Resolution to bring back, within 6 months, an implementation plan with timeline. Work with community to develop a comprehensive implementation plan to achieve 90% within the next 5 years. City take on the responsibility with the community to restrict intake, fund needs as identified as strategies and budget as needed incrementally over multiple budgets.

Staff provided a recommendation for Option 2.

Discussion was held regarding funding that will be needed, contracts with the regional partners and how they pay the contracts.

Discussion was held regarding an additional regional shelter owned and operated by Hays County. Mr. Lumbreras provided that another County shelter did not appear to materializing so that is why we are where we are currently. Discussion was held regarding working with our regional partners on innovation programs and having satellite centers.

Discussion was held regarding the activity and discussions being held by the Animal Shelter Advisory Board.

Discussion was held regarding the implementation plan resolution that will be coming back to Council in December and the timeframe in which to achieve the 90% live outcome goal.

Discussion was held regarding the initiatives that would be contained within the implementation plan.

Council provided consensus for Staff to move forward with Option 2, as recommended.

III. Adjournment.

Mayor Pro Tem Prewitt adjourned the Work Session of the San Marcos City Council at 5:00 p.m.

Jamie Lee Case, TRMC, City Clerk

Lisa Prewitt, Mayor Pro Tem

Notice of Assistance at the Public Meetings

The City of San Marcos does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission or access to its services, programs, or activities. Individuals who require auxiliary aids and services for this meeting should contact the City of San Marcos ADA Coordinator at 512-393-8000 (voice) or call Texas Relay Service (TRS) by dialing 7-1-1. Requests can also be faxed to 855-461-6674 or sent by e-mail to ADArequest@sanmarcostx.gov

City of San Marcos Page 6