

## Appendix 6

# Humane Society Response to Appendix 1, Detailed Analysis of Field Services Issues

December 14, 2001

# THE HUMANE SOCIETY FOR TACOMA AND PIERCE COUNTY

## Response to Appendix 1, Pierce County Performance Audit

The Humane Society's first look at this appendix was when we received the final draft of the Performance Audit. Unfortunately, audit staff elected to withhold this information from the Humane Society until the Humane Society had already responded to what was an incomplete "final draft".

### **Field Time in Pierce County, 2000**

**The first sentence** of this section appears to be backwards. Dispatch areas are, in fact, "contiguous" with separate jurisdictions, providing flexibility in responding to complaints.

**The third paragraph** contains an erroneous analysis of field time. The auditor states that 6090 hours of service is approximately 2.9 full-time equivalent staff. This understates our service to the County by more than half. Unfortunately, the auditor fails to recognize a number of factors. The Humane Society does not charge, as field time, the following essential activities performed by every member of the field staff: writing reports, testifying in court, making phone calls to complainants and pet owners, booking impounded animals, obtaining search warrants, and training.

The Humane Society has made it very clear to audit staff that only **actual** field service hours are charged as field time. This means time spent in a van en-route to County calls or out of the van responding to County calls. We do not charge, as field time, any of the activities listed in the previous paragraph. If, in fact, our service is equivalent to 2.9 FTE, how could the following be explained: in its contingency planning for discontinuation of field services for Pierce County, the Humane Society would be required to lay off six members of the field staff.

### **Field Time in Pierce County, May 2001**

#### **Top of page 29: Fifth Bullet:**

The auditor states the use of a field officer for dispatch does not add to field time, and it would be less expensive to use a customer service representative for this purpose. While appearing to be a simple solution, this recommendation is based on incomplete information. The Humane Society's collective bargaining agreement provides for a skeleton crew in the shelter on Sundays. If the number of employees is increased, contract language will be reinstated which provides eight hours pay for five hours work for staff working on Sunday. Therefore, using Customer Services personnel in this capacity would actually cost more. As we noted on Page 12 of our response to the portion of the final draft we were provided, an officer serving as dispatcher on Sundays provides us with flexibility not available from a customer service representative. The officer can deal with some issues over the phone, eliminating the need to dispatch another officer, and the officer providing dispatch is available to respond to emergencies.

**Page 31: Paragraph Two:**

The Humane Society believes using field staff for euthanasia is best for the organization, as noted on Page 7 of our original response.

The calculation of field time for May 2001 discussed on pages 29 and 31 (and recapped on the calendar on page 30) mystifies the Humane Society. To try to understand the work of the auditor, we analyzed all the truck logs for May. We eliminated all time spent by officers on breaks or lunch. The results are reported on the spreadsheet at the back of this response. As the spreadsheet shows, after eliminating breaks and lunches, officers spent a total of 433.86 hours in the field in Pierce County in May. We are unable to explain the auditor’s figure of 407 hours since no supporting documentation was provided.

The issue of breaks merits further discussion. Federal law requires a 10-minute paid break for every employee for each four hours worked. It appears the auditor believes that break times should not be part of the hours charged to the contract. If federal law mandates the time be paid, who else but the County should be responsible for breaks taken while working for the County?

The auditor states that the 407 hours the auditor counted for fieldwork in May is the equivalent of 2.3 FTE staff. As demonstrated in the third paragraph of this response, we find such an analysis to be false and misleading. Again, the auditor chooses to ignore the wide variety of activities officers undertake which the Humane Society does not charge as field hours.

**Page 32: Service Requests (Confined Strays)**

The auditor requested and was provided full statistics for the year 2000. During 2000, impounds of confined strays were grouped under service requests, rather than complaints. Few activities are more inherent to a successful animal control program than impounding confined strays. Therefore, at the beginning of 2001, the method of grouping calls was amended. Impounds of confined strays are no longer reported as service calls. They are now reported as complaints.

Changing confined strays to complaints rather than service calls (using the same 1300 number the auditor quotes at the top of page 32) has the following effect on Table 1 on page 32:

**Summary of Telephone Calls to Humane Society**

From Incorporated Pierce County Received in 2001

	<u>Calls Received</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Animal Control Complaints	<del>5107</del> 6407	<del>64%</del> 80%
Service Requests	<del>2867</del> 1567	<del>36%</del> 20%
Total	7974	100%

The Humane Society apologizes for any confusion caused by grouping confined strays with service calls. We're certain the auditor would not advocate an animal control program, which did not include the pickup of confined strays.

**Page 32, Last Paragraph:**

The number of calls closed with "Unable to Complete" in 2000 was 163, as stated by the auditor. The auditor states the number of old calls pending in June 2001 was much higher. The number was much higher than what? We can only surmise the auditor is comparing June 2001 to June 2000. Unfortunately, since the auditor did not request data on outstanding calls in June 2000, we have no idea how such a conclusion could have been drawn.

**Page 34, Paragraph Three:**

As mentioned above (Table 1) the Humane Society now includes confined strays as complaints. The statement that the Humane Society acts promptly on service requests, many of which include fees, is misleading. Like most law enforcement agencies, we place a very high priority on assisting other law enforcement agencies such as the Sheriff Department. We also consider the pickup of confined strays to be important. The sooner they get to the shelter, the quicker the owner can be reunited with a lost pet. The pickup of a dead animal in the roadway or at a vet clinic receives a low priority.

Page 35, 3<sup>rd</sup> Paragraph: Of course the Humane Society places a higher priority on aggressive strays than it does on roaming strays. We believe any credible animal control agency would consider a response to a complaint of aggression more important than a leash law violation.

**Page 36: Field Services Activity Priorities**

At the bottom of page 36 the auditor makes the following statement: "Most of the priorities fall into what the Humane Society considers service requests, not complaints." The table on the previous page of this response demonstrates that 80% of our work is based on complaints, not service calls. Of the seven priorities listed as emergent, four are categorized as complaints and three as service calls. The emergency priorities listed as complaints include animals endangering the health or safety of the community, animal cruelty and neglect, female in season and animal on school grounds.

**Summary**

The Humane Society regrets lengthening the audit process to prepare this response, but felt it necessary to respond to Appendix 1. The contents of this previously un-disclosed appendix, and the manner in which it came to our attention, are shocking to the Humane Society. Like the body of the audit, it unfortunately has little information, which will help the County and the Humane Society develop a mutually beneficial animal control program. The people and animals of Pierce County deserve a quality animal control program. The Humane Society will help the County work toward such a program, whether the Humane Society serves as the contractor or the County takes the program in house.

As noted in the body of the response, the Humane Society questioned the auditor's analysis of truck Sheets. According to the auditor, officers spent 407 hours in the field in Pierce County in May 2001. Since the auditor did not provide substantiating data, we did our own analysis, shown below. It indicates that after subtracting time spent on breaks and lunches, officers delivered a total of 433.86 service hours to Pierce County residents in May 2001.

### Pierce County Field Time Analysis From Truck Sheets

Officer	Date	Humane Soc. Analysis	Reported by Officer	Difference
Aarhaus	6-May	0.5	0.5	0
	13-May	2.2	4	-1.8
	20-May	0.4	2	-1.6
	27-May	2	2	0
	Total	5.1	8.5	-3.4
Baker	1-May	0.85	0.5	0.35
	2-May	4.45	5.25	-0.8
	6-May	2.25	2	0.25
	7-May	5	5.25	-0.25
	8-May	5	4.25	0.75
	9-May	4.15	4	0.15
	13-May	0.9	0.5	0.4
	14-May	3.1	2.75	0.35
	15-May	4.5	4.75	-0.25
	30-May	1.4	1	0.4
	Total	31.6	30.25	1.35
Carr	1-May	1.6	0.3	1.3
	2-May	1.64	1.16	0.48
	3-May	1.22	1.2	0.02
	4-May	1.55	1.55	0
	5-May	4.99	4	0.99
	8-May	1.25	1	0.25
	9-May	5.17	5	0.17
	9-May	4.81	5	-0.19
	11-May	2.47	2	0.47
	12-May	4.3	4.3	0
	15-May	3.98	4	-0.02
	16-May	0.55	0.55	0
	18-May	0.85	0.25	0.6
	19-May	0.33	1	-0.67
	22-May	2.92	2	0.92
	23-May	1.09	1.09	0
	24-May	2.6	2.15	0.45
	25-May	1.97	2	-0.03
	26-May	2.54	3	-0.46
	29-May	4	4.3	-0.3
30-May	2.34	2.45	-0.11	
31-May	1.75	1.1	0.65	
Total	53.92	49.4	4.52	

Officer	Date	Humane Soc. Analysis	Reported by Officer	Difference
Grafstrom	3-May	1.6	1.25	0.35
	4-May	2.11	2.26	-0.15
	6-May	0.55	1.34	-0.79
	7-May	1.88	2.43	-0.55
	10-May	3.03	3.22	-0.19
	11-May	3.92	4.2	-0.28
	12-May	1.9	3.06	-1.16
	13-May	2.27	2.18	0.09
	14-May	1.88	1.5	0.38
	17-May	1.49	1.47	0.02
	18-May	1.3	1.39	-0.09
	20-May	1.29	2.15	-0.86
	21-May	2.62	1.57	1.05
	24-May	2.8	2.37	0.43
	26-May	3.86	3.36	0.5
	27-May	1.05	1.45	-0.4
	28-May	2.06	2.06	0
	31-May	1.34	2.48	-1.14
Total		36.95	39.74	-2.79
Hunt	1-May	4.3	6	-1.7
	2-May	3.6	3.45	0.15
	5-May	5.25	5.3	-0.05
	7-May	6	6	0
	8-May	5.85	5.45	0.4
	9-May	4.4	4.5	-0.1
	12-May	4.65	5	-0.35
	14-Apr	5.41	5.5	-0.09
	15-May	5.85	6.5	-0.65
	16-May	3.68	3.45	0.23
	19-May	4.05	4	0.05
	20-May	1.65	2	-0.35
	21-May	4.55	4.5	0.05
	22-May	5.95	5.5	0.45
	23-May	4.7	4.5	0.2
	26-May	4.05	5.5	-1.45
	28-May	4	4	0
	29-May	5.65	5.5	0.15
30-May	4	3.5	0.5	
Total		87.59	90.15	-2.56

Officer	Date	Humane Soc. Analysis	Reported by Officer	Difference
Kimball	1-May	1.74	1.5	0.24
	3-May	2.8	1	1.8
	4-May	4.6	4.25	0.35
	5-May	4.15	4	0.15
	8-May	5.5	5	0.5
	9-May	4.3	4	0.3
	10-May	5.63	6	-0.37
	11-May	3.73	3	0.73
	12-May	2.63	2	0.63
	16-May	7.45	8	-0.55
	17-May	2.4	3	-0.6
	18-May	4.94	5	-0.06
	19-May	3.25	2.5	0.75
	29-May	1.1	1.63	-0.53
	30-May	4.02	4.02	0
Total		58.24	54.9	3.34
Larrison	7-May	0.37	0.37	0
	11-May	1.15	1	0.15
	21-May	1.99	4.1	-2.11
	Total	3.51	5.47	-1.96
Littlemore	3-May	3.97	4.15	-0.18
	4-May	5.18	5.65	-0.47
	10-May	5.75	5.75	0
	11-May	4.39	4.2	0.19
	24-May	3.37	4.45	-1.08
	25-May	5.65	6.7	-1.05
	26-May	3.06	3.4	-0.34
	31-May	3.75	3.65	0.1
Total	35.12	37.95	-2.83	
Nicholson	14-May	3.99	4.01	-0.02
	15-May	3.51	3.3	0.21
	16-May	2	2	0
	17-May	3.25	3	0.25
	18-May	1.75	1.75	0
	21-May	5.35	4.5	0.85
	22-May	3.32	4.45	-1.13
	23-May	3.47	3.05	0.42
	24-May	3.84	4	-0.16
	25-May	2.39	3.2	-0.81
	29-May	3.46	5	-1.54
Total	36.33	38.26	-1.93	

Officer	Date	Humane Soc. Analysis	Reported by Officer	Difference
O'Donnell	1-May	3.15	1.4	1.75
	2-May	3.95	3.55	0.4
	3-May	2.52	2.12	0.4
	8-May	2.2	2.2	0
	9-May	4.45	4.45	0
	10-May	5.28	5.5	-0.22
	11-May	1.45	1.45	0
	15-May	3.82	3.42	0.4
	17-May	3.35	3.35	0
	18-May	2.35	2.35	0
	24-May	2.3	2.4	-0.1
	25-May	7	7	0
	29-May	5.1	5.1	0
	31-May	5.1	5.1	0
Total		52.02	49.39	2.63
Osmon	2-May	0.85	1	-0.15
	9-May	0.23	0.3	-0.07
	10-May	1.9	1.3	0.6
	30-May	1.1	1	0.1
Total		4.08	3.6	0.48
Pennington	8-May	0.68	0.5	0.18
	9-May	4.2	3.5	0.7
	15-May	4.76	4.9	-0.14
	16-May	2.1	1.5	0.6
	18-May	6.12	5.5	0.62
	19-May	0.37	0	0.37
	22-May	3.75	4	-0.25
	23-May	5.12	4	1.12
	24-May	1.25	0.42	0.83
26-May	1.05	1.5	-0.45	
Total		29.4	25.82	3.58
Grand Total		433.86	433.43	0.43