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## Regional Animal Control Study

## Executive Summary

This summary provides an overview and short list of recommendations developed during the analysis of the condition of Animal Control services in the WestCOG region along with potential financial and implementation steps for each recommendation.

## 1. Sub Regional Animal Control

The study recommends that the municipalities of WestCOG establish a sub-regional approach to sheltering companion animals, allowing for potential sharing of animal control resources and facilities.

The study suggests one configuration based on the condition of a few of the existing shelters in good physical condition and the potential of one new facility, all of which have significant excess capacity. This represents the first and most critical step in attempts to regionalize animal control amongst the WestCOG communities but is only one potential scenario. It will be the responsibility of WestCOG and its individual municipalities to determine whether and how best to configure sub-regions.

Financials. Maintenance of shelter facilities represents an existing ongoing cost for each municipality. Many of the shelters should be replaced, the cost of which is considerable. Selecting those shelters that are relatively new and in good condition represents the best/least cost approach. Consolidating sheltering will enable the abandonment of substandard facilities and a higher utilization of those that remain serviceable. Until the sub-regional configuration is determined projecting costs associated with consolidation with any accuracy is problematic.

Implementation. Sub-regionalization will require leadership from WestCOG in concert with the various municipalities. This is clearly a political process whose eventual outcome cannot be accurately predicted.

## 2. Update State Regulations

The study recommends that the State of Connecticut update its regulations regarding the operation and physical characteristics of all animal shelters. Animal Control responses cite adherence to Chapter 435 - "Dogs and other companion Animals. Kennels and Pet Shops." This chapter dates from the 1960's. The Animal Welfare industry has advanced in the ensuing 50+/- years. Currently, the State of Connecticut Department of Agriculture, Animal Control Division is charged with performing annual inspections of public impound facilities via their "Dog Pound Report." These inspections, however, do not actually occur annually. They are based on the standards established in Chapter 435; Section 22-344-80.

The study advocates an approach more in line with modern guidelines established in 2010 by the Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV). Other states have enacted more recent legislation, also worthy of consideration ie. Virginia \& North Carolina.

Financials. The immediate costs associated with updating State Regulation should be minimal. They would include staff and COG member time to coordinate with legislators. Communities would then be more accountable to bring aged facilities up to the updated minimum standards.

Implementation. To implement, WestCOG and ACOs representing the region should consider what modifications to State policy along with the ASV standards should be considered for update. This model language would then be brought before the COG for consideration into their annual legislative agenda.

## 3. Adopt Industry Guidelines

It is recommended WestCOG's animal control operations universally adopt the Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) guidelines as the primary means of setting standards that will bring all facilities to a minimum level of competent operation, sanitation, and animal support. Within WestCOG some facilities meet at least minimal ASV standards while others do not, refer to appendix C for details on specific facilities.

Financials. The costs associated with adopting the ASV Guidelines should be minimal outside of bringing aged facilities up to at least minimum standards. Staffing resources will be required to review ASV guidelines to establish new municipal standards.

Implementation. The implementation would be gradual. The first step would be to develop municipal standards utilizing ASV Guidelines or accept them universally. This could be done through a regional committee of ACO's. Developing standards applicable across multiple municipalities would streamline any shared operations. ACOs would then develop a schedule to enact the new standards within their community.

## 4. Animal Control Ordinances

This study recommends unifying animal control ordinances, so all WestCOG municipalities observe the same (or at least similar versions of) laws regarding companion animals. While Chapter 435 addresses licensing, leash laws, rabies vaccination, barking (noise), etc., review of coordination of each municipality's ordinances would assist in creating uniformity.

Financials. The cost of unifying guidelines is minimal save for staff time necessary for the creation and review of existing policies with ACO and municipal staff. Changes in policy may lead to other strategies listed within this report that have associated costs.

Implementation. Establishing uniform animal related laws for all the municipalities of WestCOG requires review by the leadership of participating municipalities and their development of consensus -clearly a politically based approach with normal costs associated with the development of local ordinances.

## 5. Uniform Microchipping

The study recommends that Animal Control uniformly microchip all strays at intake into shelters.
Financials. Microchipping costs for implementation would have to consider the microchips, surgically implanting microchips, and purchasing microchip readers. Cost savings with microchipping would certainly be realized in saved ACO time. The study identifies several
approaches to microchipping with differing costs. Until the sub-regional configuration is established, however, it is not possible to provide accurate estimates.

Implementation. Implementing microchipping will depend upon the system(s) adopted and should be thoroughly researched by WestCOG to determine by consensus what best serves the needs of the entire region.

## 6. Personal Computer (PC) Based Management

The study recommends equipping each Animal Control Department with uniform data management and bookkeeping. Animal related data should be linked with all ACO's in Connecticut as well as Connecticut Humane Society, if possible.

Financials. The cost. The study recommends several software programs. Until the subregional configuration is established, however, it is not possible to establish accurate estimates.

Implementation. A uniform system:

1. Makes APCP reporting consistent and reliable
2. Enables better cost analysis and projection

Further, software is available to:

1. Enable facial recognition for lost and found animals - ie: "Finding Rover"
2. Establish a database of individuals convicted of animal neglect or cruelty
3. Track expenses per animal for bill of costs when taking a case to court
4. Establish consistency/accuracy of health and bite records

## 7. Call Center(s)

Assuming a sub-regional sheltering approach is adopted, the study recommends the subregions may each become a call center assisting in the dispatch of ACO's in participating municipalities. Another approach would be a single centralized call center, but this would likely be less responsive to each individual municipality.

Financials. Cost will be determined by the system(s) determined by consensus. Configuration of the sub-regions will affect staffing and cost; indeterminate until the sub-regions are established and consensus regarding the implementation of call center(s) is achieved.

Implementation. Call centers associated with the three proposed regional shelters require setup, a dispatching program, phones, and staffing. The cost will vary depending upon each shelter's specific situation and how information is communicated to each participating Animal Control department. This should be analyzed and included when setting up the operating budget for each sub- regional shelter, requiring input and consensus from each community.

## 8. Wildlife

The study recommends that Animal Control Officers utilize call centers to direct nuisance wildlife calls to a list of State Licensed Nuisance Wildlife Control Operators (NWCO) that citizens may contact to gain relief from nuisance wildlife situations. "Sec. 26-47-1. Licensed nuisance wildlife control operators" outlines requirements for licensure to address wildlife issues. However wildlife
calls include some nuance when determining the appropriate response. Some factors include:

- NWCOs do not typically address injured, sick, or orphaned wildlife.
- Rabies and rabid animals are managed through police and ACOs as defined in section "22-359 control of rabies quarantine regulations."

Financials. Cost is indeterminate. There is little, consistent data regarding the incidence of Animal Control's response to wildlife calls. Should this recommendation be accepted, time spent by ACO's can be directed elsewhere, which represents a cost savings.

Implementation. This is another issue that will be politically driven. Determination to abandon this practice would be by ordinance or overall agreement within WestCOG.

## 9. Regional Coordination with Animal Welfare Groups

WestCOG should establish a unified, ongoing, working relationship with the available animal welfare groups though its Animal Control system.

Financials. Financial impact of this recommendation would be minimal. ACO's would simply maintain an operating arrangement with Humane Societies to assist in placing animals not retrieved.

Implementation. Adopt a universal policy for all Animal Control in WestCOG.

## 10. CT Animal Control Professionals Network

The study recommends the creation of an Animal Control Officer Network to allow for the exchange of best practices, and exposure to modern advances in the industry.

Financials. Similar organizations in other states can provide guidance and budgetary information. This is traditionally overseen by the member ACOs. WestCOG staff time would be necessary to establish an email list serve, perform initial outreach and coordination.

Implementation. WestCOG should help organize, and its ACO's participate in, an annual conference, hopefully extending to the entire state. Exposure to the ever-improving world of animal welfare, especially from the perspective of Animal Control will benefit not only the participants but also their communities.

The Complete Study Follows

## Regional Animal Control Study

Recommendations \& Implementation Plan

## Introduction

In most states - counties, and cities (of sufficient population) are the political jurisdictions responsible to provide Regional Animal Control Services. Most of the municipalities within Connecticut handle animal control independently within each municipal jurisdiction as there is no county level form of government. This WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study aims to evaluate existing conditions, explore regional options, and provide recommendations for the consideration of WestCOG's municipal leadership. While the primary goal of the study is to identify financial efficiency (cost reduction); viability, service quality, and humaneness/animal welfare are also considered.

The impetus and funding for this study is tied to Connecticut's Office of Policy and Management's (OPM) Regional Services Grant, which provides funding for Councils of Governments (COG) to perform planning and delivery of regional services within their respective regions. Western Connecticut Council of Governments (WestCOG) was charged to investigate and develop regional services for its partner municipalities. WestCOG's council members requested that staff solicit proposals to develop a regional study of animal control services to accomplish the following:

1. Evaluate existing animal control operations (facilities \& services) in the study area.
2. Determine achievable economies of scale and service improvements through adjustments to existing operations, shared approaches, and any other applicable strategies.
3. Create a shortlist of realistic and feasible improvement scenarios for presentation to and discussion with the municipalities involved.
4. Develop implementation plans for the municipalities involved. The plans will identify a range of expected costs, timelines, necessary legal/contractual arrangements, critical steps/paths, and assignment of responsibility for implementation.

Funding restrictions for this project limited Shelter Surveys and Preliminary Needs Assessment Studies to 10 Animal Control Facilities within the Region. Selection of facilities was done to represent various geographies, municipal demographics, and pressing demands (such as municipalities with new facilities or considering the construction of a new facility). Despite the restricted site assessments and site surveys, data was collected for all communities and recommendations were developed to be relevant for all municipalities within the Region.

Municipalities selected for site visits are Bethel, Danbury, Greenwich, New Milford (also serves Brookfield, Bridgewater, Sherman, New Fairfield ii, Roxbury iii), Newtown, Norwalk, Stamford, Weston, Westport, and Wilton.

## Regional Animal Control Study Committee

A committee representing Animal Control Officers (ACO's) and municipal leadership within the Region was developed to oversee the Study's Progression as well as select the consultant for the project. Regional Animal Control Study committee members include:

- Allyson Halm - Animal Control Officer of New Canaan
- Curtis Read - First Selectman of Bridgewater
- Chris Muir - Animal Control Officer of Wilton
- Elisa Etcheto - Executive Assistant for the City of Danbury
- Mike Towle - Deputy Director at WestCOG

During the selection process, the Regional Animal Control Study Committee Selected Rauhaus Freedenfeld \& Associates PLLC (RF\&A) and their associate consultant, DWG Architects, PLLC dba/shelterplanners.com.

## Rauhaus Freedenfeld \& Associates, Architects (RF\&A) LLC

This report was researched and prepared by the team of Rauhaus Freedenfeld \& Associates, Architects (RF\&A) and DWG Architects, PLLC dba/ shelterplanners.com. Both firms are experienced in the planning and designing of animal shelters. RF\&A specializes in the programming and design of animal shelters. Shelterplanners.com specializes in analyzing animal sheltering needs and prepares studies and Needs Assessments in support of both public and private concerns anticipating changes in animal welfare in their communities.

## How to Use this Report

The report is broken down into four sections.
Background. Provides context for the recommendations found within the plan and serves as a summary of the collected data, Preliminary Needs Assessments, and Shelter Surveys. This information is explained in detail within Appendices.

Facility Recommendations. Provides recommendations for the modification, maintenance, placement, and sharing of Animal Control facilities within the Region. Information regarding for cost of replacement of facilities is included in Appendix C.

Operations Recommendations. Provides recommendations for how Animal Control services beyond facilities, such as record keeping, response protocols, and policies.

Study Conclusion. A summary on the main themes of the provided recommendations, as well as recommended next steps.

## The Appendices

The four attached appendices provide immense detail from the data collection process, preliminary needs assessments, and shelter surveys that lay the groundwork for this Recommendations and Implementation Plan. Their content includes:

Appendix A - Connecticut Animal Population Control Program (8 Pages). A summary of 21 years (1997-2008) of CT Department of Agriculture's statewide statistics regarding animals impounded, adopted, redeemed, and euthanized in public facilities.

Appendix B - Data Submission (104 Pages). Includes a region wide matrix, developed from survey questionnaires as well as individual data profiles for each municipalityi. The matrix and data profile offers the raw data on population, sheltering, calls, staffing, cost and protocols.

Appendix C - Preliminary Needs Assessment Studies (101 Pages). Individual Needs Assessment Studies were developed for the following facilities: Bethel, Danbury, Greenwich, New Milford (also serves Brookfield, Bridgewater, Sherman, New Fairfieldii, Roxburyiii), Newtown, Norwalk, Stamford, Weston, Westport, Wilton. Each study provides a summary on sheltering statistics, operations cost, shelter programs, staffing, protocols and recommendations regarding the need for abandonment or potential renovation and suitability for future use.

Appendix D - Shelter Surveys (50 Pages). Individual Shelter Surveys were performed for the following facilities: Bethel, Danbury, Greenwich, New Milford (also serves Brookfield, Bridgewater, Sherman, New Fairfield ii, Roxbury iii), Newtown, Norwalk, Stamford, Weston, Westport, Wilton. The Shelter Survey provides a property image, floor plan, images, and a grade for the various features within each facility.

## Background

The Connecticut Animal Population Control Project (APCP) has published statistics from 1997 to 2018 analyzing the impact of efforts to control the (companion) animal population. We began our study with our own analysis of the 21 years of data. Our purpose was to employ the APCP statistics as a backdrop against which we could measure the municipalities of WestCOG's experiences. Our analysis of the APCP statistics can be found in Appendix A.

To develop the necessary data to (1) compare the experience of each WestCOG municipality to statewide trends and (2) create a profile of each we created a seven-item list of requested submissions from each jurisdiction. The list, entitled "WestCOG Shelter Matrix Overview 2019, Requested Submissions from Each Jurisdiction" can be found as part of the resulting "Data Submission", Appendix B.

The data collected is presented in two ways; (1) by comparing equivalent data points for all 18 municipalities and (2) with individual "Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles" that include an Existing Conditions Report; Length of Stay (LOS) calculations based on 2019 statistics; three (3) year impound history from APCP reports; three (3) year call history from APCP reports and, finally, responses to our online "Programming Questionnaire" focused on "mission", services provided, staffing and volunteers and ancillary support spaces. All can be found in Appendix B.

We developed "Preliminary Needs Assessment" studies of ten (10) municipal intake facilities (hereinafter - shelters) based on initial review of the data received. (Appendix C)

And finally, we visited and surveyed the same ten (10) shelters, developing individual reports for each. (Appendix D)

Both the shelter surveys and the Needs Assessment studies provide valuable insight into similarities and differences among the shelters studied, as follows:
o Shelter Similarities:

- Significant Excess Capacity
- Low intake as a percentage of human population
- High percentage of live release - Mainly via Return to Owner (RTO)
- Call histories illustrate significance of role in animal welfare as "community service" in all issues related to animals and wildlife
- Relatively low cost per capita for Animal Control Operations
o Shelter Differences:
- Building Ages
- Physical Conditions
- Suitability for continued use
- Inclusion of Programs and Protocols
- Some adhere to State mandates
- Some go beyond State mandates

There is a great deal of information presented in the Needs Assessments. The data and background methodology for each is fully developed there and cannot be effectively summarized beyond the "Similarities" and "Differences" we outlined above. We encourage stakeholders to gain a full understanding of the nuances of each assessment by reading through the narratives and becoming familiar with the exhibits included with each.

## Facilities Recommendations

## Universal Standards

We found physical conditions in the ten shelters we surveyed varied widely. Some were decades old, in very poor condition and in need of renovation or replacement, while others more recently constructed were in very good condition. Refer to Appendix C for details.

The State of Connecticut Department of Agriculture, Animal Control Division, performs inspections of public impound facilities recorded via their "Dog Pound Report" that is supposed to be conducted annually. Via the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) we obtained what copies were available for WestCOG municipalities. The reports reveal that inspections have not been conducted on an annual basis, or at least, the reports are not available. We learned via phone conversation with the department that "pound inspections are not a high priority". We also learned the standards upon which judgement of their condition is based date from the 1960's (CT Chapter 435; Section 22-344-80) and are thus inferior in some aspects to more rigorous
standards found in states that have more recently enacted animal welfare legislation regulating shelter operations and their physical condition.

It appears clear, WestCOG municipalities (\& others across the state) are operating their facilities with less than optimal oversight or guidance from the Department of Agriculture.

In 2010, The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) published their "Guidelines for Standards of Care in Animal Shelters" - available at www.sheltervet.org. The Guidelines have become the industry standard. They cover both operations as well as the physical facility. They are open and flexible, prioritizing recommended policies so they can be adopted by any operating shelter. Built in is methodology for making systematic improvements over time to elevate a shelter's operating protocols as well as its physical plant.

We recommend the State of Connecticut update its regulations regarding the operation and physical characteristics of all animal shelters operating within the State, both public and private. Virginia and North Carolina, for instance, have more recent, long standing legislation that could become positive models for Connecticut.

Short of achieving that goal we recommend WestCOG's animal control operations universally adopt the ASV guidelines as the primary means of setting standards that will bring all facilities to a minimum level of competent operation, sanitation, and animal support. This can be implemented gradually over time. Costs associated with adopting these Guidelines should be minimal outside of bringing aged facilities up to at least minimum standards.

## Universal Standards

While we did not visit every facility in WestCOG's municipalities the combination of our ten surveys and Needs Assessment Studies leads to the conclusion that (1) all substandard facilities should be either renovated or replaced and (2) WestCOG's municipalities should use that need to consider a sub-regional approach to public animal sheltering. Indeed, we recommend this option as potentially the most cost-effective means of sheltering animals in acceptable conditions.

In our listing of Shelter Similarities in the Background section above, we noted "Significant Excess Capacity". Review of the sizing capacity included in our ten Needs Assessments clearly illustrates this fact. Overall, the percentage of animals entering WestCOG's facilities represents only $0.23 \%$ of the human population. We normally see shelters serving animals representing 2$4 \%$ of the human population. The APCP program has been very effective in reducing the companion animal population in Connecticut and, while outside the scope of our study, it is reasonable to assume that private, non-profit animal welfare groups such as the Connecticut Humane Society are sheltering a significant number of animals annually, likely bringing the animal to population percentage closer to the 2-4\%.

The result is every shelter we analyzed can accommodate multiples of the animals currently being housed. In addition, the vast majority of animals, especially dogs, are returned to their owners (RTO). Generally, a high level of RTO indicates short stays in the shelter. The combination creates open animal housing units in every shelter.

Renovation and/or replacement of these facilities is costly. Operating shelters is also costly. The following facilities within WestCOG are both sufficiently new and have capacity for increased intake: Danbury, Greenwich, and Newtown. These should be considered as potential sub-regional shelters.

Danbury, for instance, with twenty kennels can accommodate as many as 540 dogs per year it only serves 133 (Refer to the Danbury Preliminary Needs Assessment Exhibit A). Greenwich and Newtown are similar. Please refer to their Needs Assessment Studies for details.

Two others might also be considered; however, significant cost would be incurred with both either by need (or desire) for replacement: New Milford and Stamford.

New Milford's facility currently acts as a sub-regional shelter for Bridgewater, Brookfield, New Fairfield, New Milford, and Sherman. It also supports the town of Roxbury, which is not part of WestCOG. APCP reports include this group as "Region 2". New Fairfield has recently departed as a participant, but the others remain. The New Milford facility is in very poor condition, and we recommend its replacement in its Preliminary Needs Assessment.

The New Milford Shelter Survey lists its existing size as 1,530 gross square feet. Our Needs Assessment study for Region 2 in the "2019 Existing Condition" (Exhibit B) analysis, updates that square footage to more modern standards suggesting 2,510 square feet which our methodology recommends for the number of animals housed for the average, available LOS currently experienced which is 46 days for dogs and 243 for cats. Our normal basis for determining shelter size is only 14 days for both species and often 21 for cats.

The significant excess capacity of the shelter can be observed in the red notation at the bottom of the analysis showing that the 18 kennels available for dogs creates the ability to house 460 dogs per year at 14 days average LOS. The four cages available for cats creates the ability to house 105 per year at 14 days average LOS.

The Construction Cost Calculation of that analysis shows the cost of building a new facility of 18 kennels and 4 cat cages ranging between $\$ 400$ and $\$ 450 /$ square foot or $\$ 1,004,000$ to $\$ 1,129,500$. Turning to the preceding Exhibit A - "Sizing Capacity Analysis Determining Minimum Housing Need" suggests the need for only 6 kennels and one cat cage with a resulting shelter of 815 square feet at a cost of between $\$ 326,000$ and $\$ 366,750$.

Somewhere in between these two shelter sizes is a proper size and configuration that will meet the sheltering need for Region 2.

Stamford is considering building a new shelter. Once again, our Preliminary Needs Assessment Study provides analysis that suggests a much smaller shelter than they currently have will meet the 14-day recommended average LOS. Exhibit A - "Sizing Capacity analysis Determining Minimum Housing Need" shows that only 8 dog kennels and 5 cat cages projecting a shelter size of 1,325 square feet at a cost of between $\$ 530,000$ and $\$ 596,250$ would meet the housing need. Exhibit B, replacing the current shelter shows 25 kennels and 15 cat cages at 4,100 square feet costing between $\$ 1,640,000$ and $\$ 1,845,000$.

The replacement shelter would offer the ability to house 630 dogs per year for 14 days average LOS and 380 cats per year for 14 days average LOS. Depending upon which other municipalities near Stamford desire to participate in a sub-regional sheltering approach, a building somewhere in between these two scenarios would meet the sheltering need.

## Analyzing the Proposed Sub-Regions

Our proposal for the sub-regional breakdown and the shelters represented is but one possible configuration. We suggest it based upon selection of the shelters that are in the best condition and because one municipality (Stamford) plans to build a new facility. With Those selections, proximity of municipalities to them suggested their inclusion in one or another sub-region. Many scenarios are possible and must ultimately be taken up by the municipalities, debated, and consensus gained before determining the most positive, practical approach.

Greenwich is unlikely to effectively serve as a sub-regional shelter. Its shelter is in good condition, however, and can continue on its own long into the future given its excess capacity.

The cost of replacing New Milford's facility, even at the lowest projected, is costly.
Danbury might serve as the new Region 2 facility which could include Danbury, New Fairfield, Sherman, New Milford, Bridgewater \& Brookfield. Danbury's capacity for dogs at 14 days average LOS is 530 . The combination of dog intake for all the potential participants is only 388 and for cats 11. Danbury's Shelter Survey notes no cat cages so some accommodation would be necessary to house cats. 11 per year is minimal so potentially space can be found in the existing shelter to house them at minimal cost.

Newtown could serve as - Region 3 - which could include Newtown, Bethel, Ridgefield and Redding along with (out of WestCOG but part of current Region 2) Roxbury. Newtown's capacity for dogs at 14 days average LOS is 455 and for cats is 360 . The combination of dog intake for all the potential participants is only 187 and for cats 76 . While we don't have figures specific to Roxbury it is reasonable to assume its contribution can be easily accommodated given the overall capacity.

Stamford could become - Region 4 - which could include Stamford, Darien, New Canaan and Norwalk and because Stamford is already in the process of designing a new animal shelter, this could easily be adapted to serve the adjacent communities of Westport, Weston \& Wilton. With both political and private sector support already in place, this is a perfect opportunity to immediately achieve a substantial number of the goals defined in this study. Stamford is also reasonably centrally located to the other possible Region 4 communities to efficiently serve them..

The new sub-regional shelter would need to accommodate approximately 500 dogs per year at the 14-day average LOS and approximately 125 cats. Preliminary calculations of shelter size suggest a facility of some 2,700-3,000 square feet at a cost range of between \$1,080,000 and \$1,350,000.

## Sub-Region Implementation

This will require leadership from WestCOG in concert with the various municipalities.
Region 2 may offer positive insight into the details of their operation and bases for engaging the participating municipalities. They may also be able to illuminate difficulties.

Multiple issues will need to be addressed to develop a working relationship between participating municipalities such as:

1. Agreement to participate \& designation of shelter operator
2. Contractual relationships between operator and participating municipalities
3. Establishing budget(s) and equitable assignment of ongoing cost of operations
4. Staffing
5. Establishing protocols and procedures
6. Communicating with citizens of participating jurisdictions for open access

Other than the cost of building the new Region 4 shelter, implementation costs should be minimal especially if a uniform approach to the items listed is achieved. It is difficult to predict a potential cash savings to each jurisdiction, but the savings in time spent by Animal Control Officers (ACO's) cleaning, feeding, and maintaining individual shelters would most certainly be reduced, freeing them to attend to their normal duties. The following diagram illustrates our proposed sub-regional approach:


Except for the need to construct a new shelter for newly formed Region 4, implementation can be accomplished as soon as consensus is achieved for each of the sub-regional groups. This may be uniform throughout WestCOG or specific to each sub-region, although developing a uniform model would streamline the process.

## Travel Time to Sub-Regional Shelters

While we understand driving distance and time for both ACO's and town residents looking to deliver and retrieve pets is a consideration in moving to a sub-regional sheltering approach, the combined jurisdictions of WestCOG handled only 1,440 total animals of which only 1,400 were dogs \& cats in 2019-894 of the total were served by the combination of our proposed subregional shelters as follows:

| Danbury | 140 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Greenwich (solo) | 128 |
| Region 2 | 150 |
| Newtown | 152 |
| Stamford | $\underline{324}$ |
|  | $894=62 \%$ |

1,400 averages only 27 per week for all 18 municipalities or 1.5 per jurisdiction per week.
Given $62 \%$ of the animals served are already arriving at the proposed sub-regional shelters even fewer trips will be made to take animals to a shelter or to retrieve them.

Effective use of microchipping (recommended later in this report) should further reduce the number of dogs taken to shelters, offering the opportunity to return stray dogs directly to their owners.

## Full Consolidation of Sheltering

One possible consideration would be to develop a shelter in a central location that would serve the entirety of WestCOG. While we are not recommending this approach, the exercise demonstrates the scope of the sheltering need for all 18 communities.

In the cost analysis of this study, we will reference the experience of four counties in North Carolina, all of which we have worked with to develop animal shelters and therefore have ready access to the details of their situations. All four support a single animal control shelter and all four serve nearly as many or more animals per capita than does the combination of municipalities of WestCOG. These counties are also larger in area than the entirety of WestCOG which is approximately 331 square miles:
County $\quad$ Population $\quad$ Area $\quad$ Animals
Caldwell County, NC $\quad 81,856 \quad 474$ sq. miles 1,255 animals -2019

Catawba County, NC Henderson County, NC Pitt County, NC

We developed a preliminary, analysis assuming a single shelter for the entirety of WestCOG and projected sheltering need based on the 2019 total of 1,440 animals that were sheltered. This projected the need for only 6,410 square feet of a single new shelter that would provide 14 days average Length of Stay (LOS) for dogs and expanded to 21 Days Average LOS for cats ( 14 days LOS would reduce the projected size) with the following result:

WestCOG Animal Shelter Planning Stastics shelterplanners.com

| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals 0.23\% | Canines 80\% | Felines 17\% | Small others 2\% | Large others 1\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 622,156 | 1,440 | 1,159 | 241 | 28 | 12 |  |
| 2029 | 622,156 | 1,440 | 1,159 | 241 |  |  |  |
| 2039 | 622,156 | 1,440 | 1,159 | 241 |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | Canines 76\% | Felines 24\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Animals |  |  | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces |  |  | 58 | 44 | 14 | 44 | 125 | 5,500 |
|  |  |  | 14 |  |  | 65 | 910 |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 16,060 | 5,110 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |
| @ .23\% of Populaton |  |  |  | 1,159 | 241 | SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) |  |  | 14 | 21 | 6,410 | \$ 400 | \$ 2,564,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 6,410 | \$ 450 | \$ 2,884,500 |

Aside from the increased driving times for nearly every Animal Control Officer and citizens as well, this scenario is quite efficient as the highest projected cost at $\$ 2,884,500$ is only $\$ 4.64$ per capita for all of WestCOG. Assuming the shelter is built to last 40 years that becomes $\$ 4.64 \div$ $40=\$ 0.12$ per capita per year. A single shelter would also be very efficient from an operating perspective as staffing, building utilities, maintenance etc. are all minimized.

The shelters in each of the North Carolina counties listed above are significantly larger, ranging from about 9,000 square feet for Caldwell County to 18,000 square feet in Catawba County. In each of those counties, Animal Control Officers drive daily to pick up animals and make service calls throughout their respective counties.

As we stated, we are not recommending this approach given the available capacity and good condition of the shelters we have suggested might serve as sub-regional centers, except for the Stamford/Norwalk potential for building anew.

The population of our suggested Region 4 participants is 295,775 . The cost per capita to construct a new shelter for Region 4 at a maximum projected cost of $\$ 1,350,000$ is only $\$ 4.56$ per capita or $\$ 0.11$ per year over 40 years. We believe these scenarios show the sub-regional approach represents the most cost efficient for the all the municipalities of WestCOG in terms of sheltering animals.

## Disposition of Remaining, Existing Shelters

The State of Connecticut State Response Framework (SRF), version 4.2, dated July 2019 includes support of "service animals and family pets" in the document's Section 1.9 Current Framework Initiatives under which is established "Mass Care Working Group, ESF 6".

Depending upon the condition of each shelter and each municipality's willingness to renovate and maintain theirs, those that qualify can become part of the regions' Emergency Management System in support of companion animals. Involvement should be coordinated through the Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DEMHS) and other State Agencies involved in the SRF.

## Operations Recommendations

Each jurisdiction's Animal Control department is organized independently. Based on data received and conversations with various departments it is clear there is wide variety in the operational aspects among the WestCOG municipalities. The following represent suggestions aimed at creating some uniformity within the region.

## Animal Control Ordinances

While covered in CT Chapter 435 there may be differences in municipality ordinances. Consider unifying animal control ordinances so all WestCOG municipalities observe the same (or at least similar versions of) laws regarding companion animals such as licensing, leash laws, rabies vaccination, barking (noise).

## Uniform Microchipping

Microchipping is a valuable method of keeping track of stray companion animals especially given strays know no jurisdictional boundaries. Animal Control should uniformly microchip all strays at intake to shelters.

Included in a uniform application of microchipping and its related database is the ability to arm every Animal Control Department and every ACO with microchip readers. This enables the ability for officers to return habitual strays directly to owners, avoiding the need to transport many of the wayward animals to a shelter.

## Personal Computer (PC) Based Management

Our questionnaires assumed data like that submitted for the annual reports to the Animal Population Control Program (APCP) would be readily available within each Animal Control Department. We found this was not the case as some rely entirely on paper records. In our
attempts to collect similar information from each municipality it became clear the only uniform records available were from the state APCP program; and even they are incomplete. Three years of data including shelter intake and dispositions along with call histories were available and are indeed incorporated in the Data Submission portion of this report (Appendix B).

We recommend equipping each Animal Control Department with uniform data management and bookkeeping. Animal related data should be linked with all ACO's in Connecticut as well as Connecticut Humane. A uniform system:

1. Makes APCP reporting consistent and reliable
2. Enables better cost analysis and projection

Further, software is available to:

1. Enable facial recognition for lost and found animals - ie: "Finding Rover"
2. Establish a database of individuals convicted of animal neglect or cruelty
3. Track expenses per animal for bill of costs when taking a case to court
4. Establish consistency/accuracy of health and bite records

## Call Center(s)

Assuming a sub-regional sheltering approach is adopted, each can become a call center assisting in the dispatch of ACO's in participating municipalities.

The system can become an information center as well as a uniform means of dispatching ACO's for stray pick-up as well as follow up for "Complaints". Perusal of the APCP report histories for each municipality shows a uniformly low level of "Animal Bites" and "Summons/Infractions" compared to overall "Complaints Investigated".

In discussions with various ACO's we found a significant portion of their activities revolve around a do-it all service role in each community as they respond to calls from citizens. The call center service can efficiently support ACO's and minimize their time spent dealing with phone calls as the center can prioritize and potentially offer solutions to citizens without dispatching officers.

Over time, the combination of reduced time maintaining shelters as well as time spent responding to calls that can be resolved by discussion rather than dispatch can lead to a reduction in the number of ACO's required to provide service to their communities.

## Wildlife

Many of the calls requiring response include issues with wildlife - snakes in the house, raccoons in the trash etc. This varies from municipality to municipality, but we received no consistent data on the number of calls and/or complaints related to ACO's responding to and resolving issues with wildlife.

Relocation of rabies-vector species (raccoon, skunk, and fox) is prohibited by the public under Connecticut Statues Section 26-47(b) and 26-57.

In 1985, the Connecticut State Legislature established a license for Nuisance Wildlife Control Operators (NWCO's). This is administered through the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP). These private NWCO's are the proper resource for picking up and relocating rabies-vector animals and are available to provide service for any wildlifecaused problems where citizens are unable or unwilling to resolve situations for themselves.

Despite their ombudsman-like role in WestCOG's municipalities, Animal Control Officers should not be responding to and resolving wildlife issues. Instead, the Call Centers should have available a list of NWCO's that citizens may contact to gain relief from nuisance wildlife situations.

WestCOG should develop a uniform policy regarding ACO's and wildlife issues.

## Coordinating with Non-Profit Animal Welfare

The Connecticut Humane Society (and others) provides sheltering and humane animal care throughout the state. While analysis of their operations is not part of our study we contacted them to generally understand their view of the overall condition of animal sheltering and welfare.

Included in our questionnaires was a request that each Animal Control department include in their responses their involvement (if any) with private, non-profit humane groups. Some are intimately involved; some not at all, and some provided no response. We have no data to share in support of our recommendations on this topic.

In the Data Submission (Appendix B) portion of our study we include for each jurisdiction an "Existing Conditions Report" that calculates the "Save Rate" for dogs and cats separately. This is based on their submitted data regarding intake and dispositions of the animals served. Generally, the record is good in every case, especially for dogs. Not every municipality takes in cats so there is less consistency there.

With the sub-regional approach, engagement with the Connecticut Humane Society (and others) can become organized and uniform. This resource is available to provide long term solutions for the animals that cannot be returned to their owners as these groups are dedicated to finding homes for every animal they serve. WestCOG should establish a unified, ongoing, working relationship with the available animal welfare groups though its Animal Control system.

## CT Animal Control Professionals Network

Connecticut requires ACO's maintain proficiency via annual learning. This is true in other states as well. Many have developed annual meetings (conferences) of their Animal Control Departments, open to all ACO's. These serve as opportunities for meeting annual education requirements as well as bringing awareness of up-to-date practices in Animal Control along with the opportunity to socialize and strengthen bonds via mutual understanding. The National Animal Care Association also holds annual conventions for similar purposes.

WestCOG should help organize, and its ACO's participate in, an annual conference, hopefully extending to the entire state. Exposure to the ever-improving world of animal welfare, especially
from the perspective of Animal Control will benefit not only the participants but also their communities.

This may also include a list serve where ACO professional can pose questions to their fellow members.

## Costs \& Implementation

Costs to implement microchipping and PC based management and bookkeeping will depend upon the system adopted and should be thoroughly researched by WestCOG to determine by consensus what best serves the needs of the entire region.

Generally, microchips cost \$7-\$10 per animal with some number of readers included based on the number of microchips purchased. Additional readers can be purchased for $+/-\$ 150$ a piece but WestCOG should be able to negotiate for lower cost based on volume.

Microchipping is currently considered to be a surgical procedure that must be accomplished by a veterinarian and prices for this service vary widely from typically \$15-\$50 for each chip implant. The regional sheltering approach should make this a more concentrated effort and, by volume, should keep the costs as low as possible.

There exist companies like "PetPoint Data Management System" (ww.petpoint.com) which offer a combination of microchipping and shelter software. Competitors like "Shelter Buddy", "Sheltermanager" etc. etc. offer similar programs. The website sourceforge.net/software/product/PetPoint/alternatives lists numerous companies/software with some pricing. These programs, however, are likely more than WestCOG animal control needs as they are designed to support more robust, larger mission sheltering needs.
"GovPilot" is a government software suite that contains a package for Animal Control. This system, or another like it, may be a more reasonable solution form the perspective of Animal Control and provides other important resources and programs that would be valuable to WestCOG municipalities. In this case, microchipping may not be part of the services offered. If so, that function would need to be achieved separately.

The real cost savings associated with both microchipping and improved digital record keeping will be in ACO time which is addressed in the next section of the report.

Call centers associated with the proposed regional shelters require set-up, a dispatching program, phones, and staffing. The cost will vary depending upon the final configuration of each sub-region and its shelter's specific situation and how information is communicated to each participating Animal Control department. This should be analyzed and included when setting up the operating budget for each sub-regional shelter, requiring input and consensus from each community.

Establishing uniform animal related laws for all the municipalities of WestCOG requires review by the leadership of participating municipalities and their development of consensus -clearly a politically based approach with normal costs associated with the development of local ordinances.

## Cost of Operations

In 2006 The International City/County Management Association (ICMA) published "Animal Control Management - A Guide for Local Governments". The publication cites, "adequate funding of an animal care and control program costs at least $\$ 4$ per citizen annually" (based on year 2001). When we subject this estimate to inflation over the past 19 years that minimum increases to $\$ 5.94$ per capita.

To our knowledge there is no national database of Animal Control operating costs. For background, we reviewed operational costs for several jurisdictions with whom we have worked and are familiar. Defining costs on a per capita basis is a good way of comparing one with another and certainly with the WestCOG jurisdictions. These are all derived from published budgets for 2019. Our findings follow:

| Year | Jurisdiction | State | Population | Animal Control <br> Budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cost per <br> Capita |  |  |  |
|  | Representative Animal Control Services Budgets Include Shelter Operation |  |  |  |


| 2019 | Pitt County | NC | 180,742 | \$ | 1,103,000 | \$ | 6.10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | Caldwell County | NC | 81,856 | \$ | 520,526 | \$ | 6.36 |
| 2019 | Catawba County | NC | 159,551 | \$ | 1,006,261 | \$ | 6.31 |
| 2019 | Henderson County | NC | 117417 | \$ | 680,107 | \$ | 5.79 |
| 2019 | Pocatello (+Bannock Co.) | ID | 82,839 | \$ | 1,072,707 | \$ | 12.95 |
| 2019 | Jefferson City (+Cole Co.) | MO | 75,990 | \$ | 652,516 | \$ | 8.59 |
| 2019 | Bloomington (+Monroe Co.) | IN | 137,974 | \$ | 1,752,671 | \$ | 12.70 |
|  | NC Counties |  |  |  |  | \$ | 6.14 |
|  | Cities + Counties |  |  |  |  | \$ | 11.41 |
|  | WestCog Average |  |  |  |  | \$ | 5.18 |

Based on data included in Appendix B, the average cost of $\$ 5.18$ per capita for the WestCOG jurisdictions is below the average found in our findings by almost $\$ 1.00$ when compared to North Carolina Counties and much lower when viewed against the three in other states. It is also below the $\$ 5.94$ minimum cited above in the ICMA publication. The following list identifies the reported Animal Control cost for each WestCOG municipality - Note: Region 2 does not include Animal Control costs of its individual participants:

| WestCOG Animal Control Cost per Capita - 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | WestCOG | Animals | \% Region |  | Annual | Anml. Cntrl. |  |
|  | Jurisdiction | Served | Total |  | Cost | Cost/Capita |  |
| 1 | Bethel | 78 | 5.42\% | \$ | 67,000 | \$ | 3.52 |
| 2 | Bridgewater | 0 | 0.00\% | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 3 | Brookfield | 0 | 0.00\% | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 4 | Danbury | 140 | 9.72\% | \$ | 289,304 | \$ | 3.16 |
| 5 | Darien | 20 | 1.39\% | \$ | 77,581 | \$ | 3.56 |
| 6 | Greenwich | 128 | 8.89\% | \$ | 298,396 | \$ | 4.76 |
| 7 | New Canaan | 39 | 2.71\% | \$ | 106,158 | \$ | 5.30 |
| 8 | New Fairfield | 0 | 0.00\% | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 9 | New Milford | 150 | 10.42\% | \$ | 376,553 | \$ | 5.48 |
| (Region 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Newtown | 152 | 10.56\% | \$ | 236,560 | \$ | 8.48 |
| 11 | Norwalk | 106 | 7.36\% | \$ | 265,908 | \$ | 2.99 |
| 12 | Redding | 34 | 2.36\% | \$ | 60,667 | \$ | 6.61 |
| 13 | Ridgefield * | 18 | 1.25\% | \$ | 135,000 | \$ | 5.29 |
| 14 | Sherman | 0 | 0.00\% | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 15 | Stamford | 324 | 22.50\% | \$ | 421,825 | \$ | 3.25 |
| 16 | Weston | 35 | 2.43\% | \$ | 86,640 | \$ | 8.45 |
| 17 | Westport | 150 | 10.42\% | \$ | 155,998 | \$ | 5.57 |
| 18 | Wilton | 66 | 4.58\% | \$ | 110,404 | \$ | 5.81 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Region Totals | 1,440 | 100\% | \$ | 2,687,994 | \$ | 5.18 |

Of significant concern to the WestCOG Animal Control Study is the ratio of "Salary related" to "operational" costs. Analysis of the WestCOG jurisdictions shows that an average of 86.5\% of costs support salaries and salary related items such as medical benefits, FICA etc. Only 13.5\% on average is devoted to operations:

|  | Animal Control Overall, Salary \& Operational Costs <br> Total Cost <br> Salary Related <br> \% <br> Operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Bethel* | \$ | 67,000 | \$ | 57,955 | 86.5\% | \$ | 9,045 | 13.5\% |
| 2 | Bridgewater |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Brookfield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Danbury | \$ | 289,304 | \$ | 233,956 | 80.9\% | \$ | 55,348 | 19.1\% |
| 5 | Darien* | \$ | 77,581 | \$ | 67,108 | 86.5\% | \$ | 10,473 | 13.5\% |
| 6 | Greenwich | \$ | 298,396 | \$ | 256,406 | 85.9\% | \$ | 41,990 | 14.1\% |
| 7 | New Canaan | \$ | 106,158 | \$ | 102,795 | 96.8\% | \$ | 3,363 | 3.2\% |
| 8 | New Fairfield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | New Milford (Region 2) | \$ | 376,553 | \$ | 305,301 | 81.1\% | \$ | 71,252 | 18.9\% |
| 10 | Newtown | \$ | 236,560 | \$ | 200,966 | 85.0\% | \$ | 35,594 | 15.0\% |
| 11 | Norwalk | \$ | 265,908 | \$ | 250,348 | 94.1\% | \$ | 15,560 | 5.9\% |
| 12 | Redding | \$ | 60,667 | \$ | 60,000 | 98.9\% | \$ | 667 | 1.1\% |
| 13 | Ridgefield * | \$ | 135,000 | \$ | 116,775 | 86.5\% | \$ | 18,225 | 13.5\% |
| 14 | Sherman |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Stamford | \$ | 421,825 | \$ | 362,125 | 85.8\% | \$ | 59,700 | 14.2\% |
| 16 | Weston | \$ | 89,457 | \$ | 74,157 | 82.9\% | \$ | 15,300 | 17.1\% |
| 17 | Westport | \$ | 150,755 | \$ | 130,105 | 86.3\% | \$ | 20,650 | 13.7\% |
| 18 | Wilton | \$ | 109,454 | \$ | 104,663 | 95.6\% | \$ | 4,791 | 4.4\% |
|  | Totals | \$ | 2,684,618 | \$ | 2,322,660 | 86.5\% | \$ | 361,958 | 13.5\% |

These data make clear - the greatest opportunity for cost savings falls in the salary category. The APCP data of call histories for all jurisdictions, as well as comments received by several respondents to our survey questions, show that most of the time spent by Animal Control Officers is related to "service" calls in their respective towns. Those calls range from requests for general information to issues related to "animal nuisance", cruelty to animals, dog laws in general, leash law violations, lost/found animals, pet adoptions and miscellaneous investigations. By their nature these are issues requiring a local, not regional response.

Because of this, WestCOG faces the prospect that potential cost savings realizable through regionalization is minimal.

We offer a few suggestions as follows:

1. Consider bringing cost per capita to a more uniform rate, consistent with best practices. This will require internal analysis by each municipality to assess their individual programs considering consensus practices developed for Animal Control within the WestCOG region.
2. Consider potential cost reductions by:
a. Sub-regionalizing shelter operations as recommended for efficiency - not ACO's. This has been covered previously. Some jurisdictions may find the cost of sheltering increases while others may see diminished costs.
b. Redefine Animal Control's role with wildlife - Call Centers should direct all calls regarding wildlife to Nuisance Wildlife Control Operators (NWCO's), saving ACO's time.

Efficiency of ACO's role can reduce the number of officers over time, and thus cost - focus attention \& effort on the community service aspect of their work as opposed to wildlife rescue, cleaning kennels, or manually keeping records that should be database driven.

## Study Conclusion

We began our analysis and recommendations with the concept of sub-regionalizing the sheltering of animals within WestCOG. Our proposal takes advantage of the significant excess capacity and good condition of the shelters we are recommending by considering them as subreginal centers, except for proposed Region 4. We demonstrated that proposed Region 4's development of a new shelter represents a minimal capital expense when viewed from a per capita perspective, and Stamford is already pursuing developing a new facility. There is little or no capital expense employing Danbury and Newtown's existing shelters to cover Regions 2 \& 3. All in all, this approach appears to be the most cost-effective means of regionalizing WestCOG's Animal Control system.

If the various municipalities of WestCOG can agree to regionalize Animal Control on this basis there will be cost savings because sheltering will be concentrated and more efficient, freeing most of the current ACO's to focus on their service role in their communities. As pointed out, the incidence of travel to take strays to sub-regional shelters is minimal to begin with and can be further minimized by implementing universal microchipping.

WestCOG's primary reason for engaging this study was to find ways to save money through regionalization. We have demonstrated through the data that the cost of Animal Control (on average) is below what other counties and/or communities in other states currently experience and less than that identified by ICMA. In some cases that cost is well below what should be expected.

We also demonstrated through the data the largest portion of the cost of Animal Control is in salaries and salary related expenditures. Short of removing Animal Control Officers from the system, the opportunity for taking steps to maximize savings is minimal. ACO's acting as ombudsmen for their communities in all things animal related means their main activity is local and not able to be regionalized effectively. We point out here, Connecticut has minimum requirements for animal control officers based upon population.

While we have provided some insight into costs and potential savings, so much of the regionalization of the Animal Control System in WestCOG requires regional and municipal leadership and determination to adopt a regional approach, an inherently political process.

Without understanding what decisions the various municipalities will make regarding subregionalizing sheltering, adopting uniform laws, uniform digital systems and reporting, or microchipping etc. it is not possible to accurately predict the resulting costs or cost savings.

WestCOG, however, also included in its charge - "While the primary goal of the project is financial efficiency (cost reduction), viability, service quality, and humaneness/animal welfare are important and should also be evaluated in the analysis of existing operations, facilities and services and the development of future scenarios."

We have made recommendations addressing these categories as well and believe their adoption will result in meeting these stated goals.

## END of STUDY

## Appendices follow
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Statistics collected by the Dept.
of Agriculture over 21 years
provide a window into trends in
four categories for dogs \& cats:

- Animals Impounded
- Animals Adopted
- Animals Redeemed
- Animals Euthanized

These are statewide data and a
useful background against
which we can examine the
experience of WestCOG's
jurisdictions.

This view analyzes the
data by percentages.
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WestCOG jurisdictions fall within two Connecticut Counties;
Litchfield County and Fairfield County, with jurisdictions in both
Counties not included under the WestCOG umbrella. The APCP Low-Income Sterilization Reports are organized by County and Jurisdiction. As a result we could only isolate those WestCOG jurisdictions that recorded Vouchers issued and sterilizations accomplished rather than relying on the overall County data. The APCP Report also presents a Five-Year Report from FY 2014 to FY2018. This includes all "Municipal Impound Pets, Feral cats and Pets from Low-Income residents". We do not include this report because it adds animals not necessarily impounded by jurisdictions. Instead, we are requesting data sent to the Department of Agriculture APCP by the WestCOG jurisdictions for years 2015 to 2019. That data will provide us a view of the past five years that will assist in predicting future trends; most importantly what numbers of
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## Notes Associated with Data Collection: Matrix Overview \& Jurisdiction Profiles

1. Each jurisdiction was sent a copy of the "WestCOG Shelter Matrix Overview-2019 Requested Submissions from Each Jurisdiction ", included in this package. The initial email containing the document was sent on November 6, 2020 to the primary contacts furnished by Mike Towle of WestCOG.
2. This Data Collection package includes data submitted from the various jurisdictions of WestCOG. "Region 2" data, as recognized in the APCP reports, which includes Bridgewater, Brookfield, New Fairfield, New Millford, Sherman and Roxbury (a non-member of WestCOG) is included under New Milford as the intake facility for the region is located in New Milford.
3. Other than the individual jurisdictions served by Region 2 we received submittals from all other jurisdictions except Ridgefield. They declined to participate so we have used averages from the data submitted by others to estimate Ridgefield's numbers.
4. Except for Ridgefield and individual jurisdictions of Region 2, we received data via our online questionnaires which supplied a majority of the statistical data contained in the Data Matrix and Jurisdiction Profiles. Our request for 5 years of data jurisdictions submitted to the Connecticut APCP Program yielded only 2 full responses. As a result, we obtained that information from the program itself for three years, 2017, 2018 \& 2019. Using these data enabled direct comparison between jurisdictions. The data included 3 years of "Call History" as well as 3 years of "Impound History" both of which are included in graphs associated with each jurisdictional profile. This is not the data being collected via WestCOG's initiated survey which, to date, has not been completed by all jurisdictions.
5. The "WestCOG Animal Control Programs" data come from submissions or our online "Programming Questionnaire".
6. The "WestCOG Animal Control Protocols" data come from individual submissions in a variety of formats as this was not part included our formal questionnaires. These data are derived from individual submissions from each jurisdiction including such overview comments like "per state requirements". Responses did not all address our list of "Protocols".


## WestCOG Shelter Matrix Overview - 2019 Requested Submissions from Each Jurisdiction

In order for us to "evaluate opportunities for efficiencies and improvement in animal control through the coordination of operations, sharing of facilities and services, technology and other means . . ." we need to collect data from all 18 WestCOG jurisdictions so that we can develop an understanding of the existing conditions of each and thus the overall region.

The list of requested submission material follows:

1. Data submitted to the Connecticut Department of Agriculture (CTDA) for the APCP Program for 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 \& 2019
2. From the www.shelterplanners.com website -"Free Report" Tab
A. Complete the "Statistical Questionnaire" using 2019 statistics *

Note: "Animals per Year Served" must = "Canines + Felines + Other Large + Other Small" - (No Wildlife or Feral Cats)
B. Complete the "Programming Questionnaire" using 2019 Information ${ }^{\circ}$ - (See link @ side of Statistical Form)
*- If your jurisdiction does not have an impoundment facility, fill it out but note where you send (impound) your animals
${ }^{\circ}$ - Complete this questionnaire based on what existed in 2019. Overlook the words "want" and "plan" or see them as "have"
3. Submit Wildlife and Feral Cat Statistics (separately)

Number of Intakes for 2019
Outcomes for 2019
4. Submit your Annual, Line Item Operating Costs for 2019 (Actual Costs, not Budget)
5. Submit Written Shelter Operating Protocols (If a prticular protocol does not exist, so state)
Intake procedures
Isolation protocols
Required Observation Time (pre adoption housing)
Innoculation Protocols
Minimum Legal Stray Holding Duration
Animal ID protocols
Shelter Cleaning procedures
Adoption procedures
Spay/Neuter
Protocols not listed that are part of your operation
6. Submit a Written Description of your Interaction with Local, Private Humane Societies, SPCA's etc. \& name which one(s)
7. Please Provide your suggested goals and/or concerns with WestCOG'a persuit of a regional approach to animal control/welfare.

Should you have any questions or need assistance in locating online questionnaires contact Bill Daggett - 434-242-5811

Online questionnaires will be automatically submitted. Submit all other information to: bdaggett@dwgarchitects.com Please be sure to identify your jurisdiction wth your submissions


| WestCOG Population \& Intake - 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | WestCOG | Human | Animal \% of | Estimated | Dog | Cat | Other | Other |
|  | Jurisdiction | Population | Population | Households | Intake | Intake | Small | Large |
| 1 | Bethel | 19,049 | 0.41\% | 6,858 | 49 | 20 | 9 | 0 |
| 2 | Bridgewater | 1,675 | 0.00\% | 646 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Brookfield | 17,771 | 0.00\% | 6,348 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Danbury | 91,529 | 0.15\% | 32,859 | 133 | 5 | 0 | 2 |
| 5 | Darien | 21,783 | 0.09\% | 7,323 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Greenwich | 62,657 | 0.20\% | 23,822 | 96 | 32 | 3 | 0 |
| 7 | New Canaan | 20,047 | 0.19\% | 7,050 | 34 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | New Fairfield | 14,218 | 0.00\% | 4,726 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | New Milford | 29,061 | 0.22\% | 10,965 | 140 | 6 | 0 | 4 |
|  | (Region 2) | 68,771 |  | 24,956 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Newtown | 27,889 | 0.55\% | 9,276 | 87 | 55 | 4 | 2 |
| 11 | Norwalk | 88,814 | 0.12\% | 36,742 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Redding | 9,172 | 0.37\% | 3,475 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Ridgefield* | 25,533 | 0.07\% | 9,108 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | Sherman | 3,671 | 0.00\% | 1,423 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | Stamford | 129,638 | 0.25\% | 54,513 | 204 | 109 | 11 | 1 |
| 16 | Weston | 10,259 | 0.34\% | 3,366 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | Westport | 28,015 | 0.54\% | 10,162 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | Wilton | 19,002 | 0.35\% | 6,383 | 54 | 8 | 1 | 3 |
|  | RegionTotals | 622,156 | 0.23\% | 187,115 | 1,159 | 241 | 28 | 12 |
|  | Regional Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dogs | 80.49\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cats | 16.74\% |  |  | Participant | in "Region |  |  |
|  | Other Small | 1.94\% |  | *Ridgefield D | a not sub | itted - Esti | mates only |  |
|  | Other Large | 0.83\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| WestCOG Cost \& Staffing - 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | WestCOG | Animals | \% Region |  | Annual | Anml. Cntrl. | Total | Total Vol's |
|  | Jurisdiction | Served | Total |  | Cost | Cost/Capita |  |  |
| 1 | Bethel+ | 78 | 5.42\% | \$ | 101,000 | \$ 5.30 | 2 | 0 |
| 2 | Bridgewater | 0 | 0.00\% | \$ | - | \$ | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Brookfield | 0 | 0.00\% | \$ | - | \$ | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Danbury | 140 | 9.72\% | \$ | 310,000 | \$ 3.39 | 4 | 9 |
| 5 | Darien | 20 | 1.39\% | \$ | 77,581 | \$ 3.56 | 1 | 0 |
| 6 | Greenwich | 128 | 8.89\% | \$ | 298,396 | \$ 4.76 | 3 | 3 |
| 7 | New Canaan | 39 | 2.71\% | \$ | 106,158 | \$ 5.30 | 1 | 0 |
| 8 | New Fairfield | 0 | 0.00\% | \$ | - | \$ | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | New Milford | 150 | 10.42\% | \$ | 371,852 | \$ 5.41 | 0 | 0 |
|  | (Region 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Newtown | 152 | 10.56\% | \$ | 239,474 | \$ 8.59 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Norwalk | 106 | 7.36\% | \$ | 265,908 | \$ 2.99 | 3 | 0 |
| 12 | Redding | 34 | 2.36\% | \$ | 60,667 | \$ 6.61 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Ridgefield * | 18 | 1.25\% | \$ | 135,000 | \$ 5.29 | 1 | 0 |
| 14 | Sherman | 0 | 0.00\% | \$ | - | \$ | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | Stamford | 324 | 22.50\% | \$ | 421,825 | \$ 3.25 | 6 | 31 |
| 16 | Weston | 35 | 2.43\% | \$ | 86,640 | \$ 8.45 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | Westport | 150 | 10.42\% | \$ | 155,998 | \$ 5.57 | 2 | 11 |
|  | Wilton | 66 | 4.58\% | \$ | 110,404 | \$ 5.81 | 2 | 0 |
| 18 | Region Totals | 1,440 | 100\% | \$ | 2,740,903 | \$ 5.31 | 25 | 54 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Average |  |  |
|  | Average Cost/Capita | \$ 5.31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Average Animals/Empl. | 1.39 |  |  |  | Participants in | "Region 2 |  |
|  | Average Animals/Vol. | 3.18 |  |  | gefield Data n | ot submitted - | Estimates |  |


| WestCOG Animal Control Programs - 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | WestCOG | Safety \& | Spay/ | Vet | Pet | Comm./ | Euth. | Crem. | Hum. Soc. |
|  | Jurisdiction | ID | Neuter | Services | Training | Education | Service | Service | Relations |
| 1 | Bethel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 | Bridgewater | See New Milford (Region 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Brookfield | See New Milford (Region 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Danbury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Darien | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Greenwich | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 | New Canaan | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8 | New Fairfield | See New Milford (Region 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | New Milford | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | (Region 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Newtown | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Norwalk | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 12 | Redding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Ridgefield* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | Sherman | See New Milford (Region 2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Stamford | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 16 | Weston | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 17 | Westport | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 18 | Wilton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Totals | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NOTES: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | = YES | *Ridgefield Data not submitted - Estimates only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | = NO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Bethel

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


## Bethel Police Department <br> Existing Conditions Report

Population
Population Households

| Population projection 2019* | 19,049 | 7,063 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Population projection 2029* | 19,601 |  |
| Population projection 2039* | 20,169 |  |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire

Bethel Police Department


| Bethel Conn. <br> Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 7,063 | 2019 | 19,049 |
| 7,083 | 2020 | 19,103 |
| 7,104 | 2021 | 19,158 |
|  |  |  |
| 7,124 | 2022 | 19,213 |
| 7,144 | 2023 | 19,268 |
| 7,165 | 2024 | 19,323 |
| 7,185 | 2025 | 19,378 |
| 7,206 | 2026 | 19,434 |
| 7,226 | 2027 | 19,489 |
| 7,247 | 2028 | 19,545 |
| 7,268 | 2029 | 19,601 |
| 7,289 | 2030 | 19,657 |
| 7,309 | 2031 | 19,713 |
| 7,330 | 2032 | 19,770 |
| 7,351 | 2033 | 19,826 |
| 7,372 | 2034 | 19,883 |
| 7,393 | 2035 | 19,940 |
| 7,415 | 2036 | 19,997 |
| 7,436 | 2037 | 20,054 |
| 7,457 | 2038 | 20,111 |
| 7,478 | 2039 | 20,169 |
| 7,500 | 2040 | 20,226 |
| 7,521 | 2041 | 20,284 |
|  |  |  |
| Annual $\%$ |  |  |
| $00286 /$ Pear |  |  |
| Households to Population |  |  |
| 36004 |  |  |

Bethel Conn. Animal Shelter Planning Statistics
shelterplanners.com


2 kennels to service 49 dogs.Capacity is at least $\mathbf{2 8 0}$ dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cages -Capacity = 52

## Bethel Animal Impound Report History



## Bethel Animal APCP Call History



1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".

## Animal Control Mission: Municipal animal shelter, impound of strays, DOA and quarantines.

2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.

No
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.

No
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.

No
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe. No Euthanasia Cremations, Yes
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.

Full Time-1 ACO Part Time-1 part time kennel hand
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?

## No

10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?

Yes, Covered
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

## No

12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

Yes
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations. None

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Danbury

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


## Danbury Animal Control <br> Existing Conditions Report

## Population

|  | Population | Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Households |  |
| Population projection 2019* | 91,529 | 32,859 |
| Population projection 2029* | 98,064 | 35,205 |
| Population projection 2039* | 105,065 | 37,718 |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire



| Danbury Conn. <br> Households Projected |  | Population served |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32,859 | 2019 | 91,529 |
| 33,086 | 2020 | 92,162 |
| 33,315 | 2021 | 92,800 |
| 33,546 | 2022 | 93,442 |
| 33,778 | 2023 | 94,089 |
| 34,012 | 2024 | 94,740 |
| 34,247 | 2025 | 95,396 |
| 34,484 | 2026 | 96,056 |
| 34,723 | 2027 | 96,720 |
| 34,963 | 2028 | 97,390 |
| 35,205 | 2029 | 98,064 |
| 35,448 | 2030 | 98,742 |
| 35,694 | 2031 | 99,426 |
| 35,941 | 2032 | 100,114 |
| 36,190 | 2033 | 100,806 |
| 36,440 | 2034 | 101,504 |
| 36,692 | 2035 | 102,206 |
| 36,946 | 2036 | 102,914 |
| 37,202 | 2037 | 103,626 |
| 37,459 | 2038 | 104,343 |
| 37,718 | 2039 | 105,065 |
| 37,979 | 2040 | 105,792 |
| 38,242 | 2041 | 106,524 |
| Annual \% Pop. Increase |  |  |
| Households to Population |  |  |



## Danbury Animal Control Report History

| $\begin{array}{ll} \stackrel{n}{c} & 140 \\ \stackrel{10}{c} & 120 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| . |  | T | - |
| ¢ 100 |  |  | - |
| \% 80 | $\square$ |  |  |
| $\cdots 60$ | - |  |  |
| ¢ 40 | - |  |  |
| $\text { 흩 } \quad 20$ | - |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lr}\frac{E}{5} & 20 \\ \frac{2}{2} & 0\end{array}$ |  | T | - |
| 20 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| * Intake | 127 | 140 | 122 |
| Redeemed | 103 | 118 | 105 |
| - Adopted | 21 | 19 | 14 |
| ¥ Euthanized | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| - DOA | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## Danbury Animal APCP Call History



1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its
"mission".
Animal Control - To provide a superior quality of life for the people of Danbury by providing the best possible animal control
services. In partnership with the community, we will work to eliminate animal cruelty through education and enforcement.
Respect, partnership, and high ethical standards shall form the foundations for delivering our services.
2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many
N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.
No
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.
No - Wish to microchip, no resources
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.
No
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.
No
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.

Full Time: 1 ACO, 1 Assistant ACO, 1 Clerk/Typist - Part Time: 1 Kennel Assistant
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?

8 Volunteer walkers; 1 Volunteer Trainer
10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?

Yes - Covered
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

No
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

No
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations.

Would like to microchip- no resources. Community education through our Facebook page

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Darien

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


## Darien Animal Control Organization

Existing Conditions Report

## Population

## shelterplanners.com

|  | Population | Population | Households |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population projection 2019* | 21,783 | 7,323 |  |
| Population projection 2029* | 23,089 | 7,763 |  |
| Population projection 2039* | 24,473 | 8,228 |  |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire

1. Organization
2. Are your answers from 1 year or 3 years averaged?
3. How many animals per year does your shelter serve?
4. How many total kennel runs and/or "spots" do you have?
5. How many total feline cages and/or "spots" do you have?
6. How many canines did you serve?
7. How many felines did you serve?
8. How many "other" small animals did you serve?
9. How many "other" large animals did you serve?
10. How many canines were "returned to owners" (RTO)
11. How many felines were "returned to owners" (RTO)?
12. How many canines were adopted?
13. How many felines were adopted?
14. How many canines were transferred to other facilities?
15. How many felines were transferred to other facilities?
16. How many canines were you forced to euthanize?
17. How many felines were you forced to euthanize?
18. How many canines remained in the shelter at the end of the year?
19. How many felines remained in the shelter at the end of the year?
20. How many canines died in the shelter or were lost?
21. How many felines died in the shelter?
22. How many days do you consider to be the optimum length of stay for canines?
23. How many days do you consider to be the optimum length of stay for felines?

Darien Animal Control Organization
(\% of Total) ..... 120
. ..... 0
5. How many total feline cages and/or "spots" do you have?
6. How many canines did you serve?
8. How many "other" small animals did you serve?
9. How many "other" large animals did you serve?
10. How many canines were "returned to owers" (RTO)?
12. How many canines were adopted?
13. How many felines were adopted?
14. How many canines were transferred to other facilities?
15. How many felines were transferred to other facilities?
16. How many canines were you forced to euthanize?
18. How many canines remained in the shelter at the end of the year?
21. How many felines died in the shelter?
23. How many days do you consider to be the optimum length of stay for felines?
Existing canine LOS
Existing feline LOS

| Comparison of Your Shelter's experience to National Averages |  | Your | Experience | Calculated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Shelter \%'s | Averages* | Save Rate |
| Percentage of Relinquished Animals by Households |  | 0.09\% | 3-4\% |  |
|  |  | 0.09\% | Pop/HH |  |
| Canines |  | 100.0\% | 55\% |  |
| Felines |  | 0.0\% | 45\% |  |
| Individual shelter statistics are included as submitted on our shelterplanners.com website questionnaire | Canines RTO | 95.0\% | 20-30\% | 100.0\% |
|  | Canines Adopted | 0.0\% | 40-60\% |  |
|  | Canines Transferred | 5.0\% |  |  |
| Census calculations are developed based upon an approximation of your service area in the city, county or region listed on our questionnaire | Canines Remaining in Shelter Canines that Died Naturally or were Lost Canines Euthanized | 0.0\% |  |  |
|  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |
|  |  | 0.0\% | 10-40\% |  |
| * "Experience Averages" are taken from a variety of sources including statistics from operating shelters we have designed as well as from various state reporting websites for animal shelters and animal control facilities | Felines RTO | \#DIV/0! | 10-20\% | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Felines Adopted | \#DIV/0! | 10-40\% |  |
|  | Felines Transferred | \#DIV/0! |  |  |
|  | Felines Remaining in Shelter | \#DIV/0! |  |  |
|  | Felines that Died Naturally | 0.0\% |  |  |
|  | Felines Euthanized | \#DIV/0! | 40-80\% |  |


| Darien Conn. <br> Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 7,323 | 2019 | 21,783 |
| 7,366 | 2020 | 21,910 |
| 7,409 | 2021 | 22,038 |
| 7,453 | 2022 | 22,167 |
| 7,496 | 2023 | 22,296 |
| 7,540 | 2024 | 22,427 |
| 7,584 | 2025 | 22,558 |
| 7,628 | 2026 | 22,689 |
| 7,673 | 2027 | 22,822 |
| 7,717 | 2028 | 22,955 |
| 7,763 | 2029 | 23,089 |
| 7,808 | 2030 | 23,224 |
| 7,853 | 2031 | 23,360 |
| 7,899 | 2032 | 23,496 |
| 7,945 | 2033 | 23,633 |
| 7,992 | 2034 | 23,771 |
| 8,039 | 2035 | 23,910 |
| 8,085 | 2036 | 24,050 |
| 8,133 | 2037 | 24,190 |
| 8,180 | 2038 | 24,331 |
| 8,228 | 2039 | 24,473 |
| 8,276 | 2040 | 24,616 |
| 8,326 | 2041 | 24,764 |
|  |  |  |
| Annual $\%$ Pop. Increase |  |  |
| $00584 /$ Year |  |  |
| Households to Population |  |  |
| 0.3362 |  |  |



A single kennel provides up to 18 days average LOS

## Darien Animal Control Report History



## Darien Animal APCP Call History



1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".

## Animsl Control Mission Statement: I don't have one. Our system works well as is.

2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.

No
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.

No
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.

No
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.

No
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.

1 Municipal Animal Control Officer Describe your organization's part time staff, by position.: We do not have any.
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?

No
10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?

No
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

No
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

No
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations

We use a local Veterinarian Hospital to hold stray dogs. It has worked out very well for many years.

## WESTCOG

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Greenwich

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


## Greenwich Animal Control <br> Existing Conditions Report

## Population

|  | Population | Population Households |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Population projection 2019* | 62,657 |  |
| Population projection 2029* | 23,822 |  |
| Population projection 2039* | 63,502 | 24,143 |
| 24,358 | 24,469 |  |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire

1. Organization
2. Are your answers from 1 year or 3 years averaged?
3. How many animals per year does your shelter serve?

Greenwich Animal Control
4. How many total kennel runs and/or "spots" do you have? Organization
5. How many total feline cages and/or "spots" do you have?
6. How many canines did you serve?
7. How many felines did you serve?

How many "other" small animals did you serve?
9. How many "other" large animals did you serve?
10. How many canines were "returned to owners" (RTO)
(\% of Total)
1
11. How many felines were "returned to owners" (RTO)?
12. How many canines were adopted?
13. How many felines were adopted?
4. How many canines were transferred to other facilities?
15. How many felines were transferred to other facilities?
16. How many canines were you forced to euthanize?
. How many felines were you forced to euthanize?
8. How many canines remained in the shelter at the end of the year?
25.0\% 3
2.3\%
0.0\%
0
100.0\% 96
6.3\%
81.3\%
19. How many felines remained in the shelter at the end of the year?
0.0\%

26
6.3\%
$2.1 \%$
7 NIC
6.3\%
0.0\%

103
20. How many canines died in the shelter or were lost?
0.0\%

Outcomes
21. How many felines died in the shelter?
22. How many days do you consider to be the optimum length of stay for canines?
23. How many days do you consider to be the optimum length of stay for felines?


| Greenwich Conn. <br> Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23,822 | 2019 | 62,657 |
| 23,854 | 2020 | 62,741 |
| 23,886 | 2021 | 62,825 |
| 23,918 | 2022 | 62,909 |
| 23,950 | 2023 | 62,994 |
| 23,982 | 2024 | 63,078 |
| 24,014 | 2025 | 63,162 |
| 24,047 | 2026 | 63,247 |
| 24,079 | 2027 | 63,332 |
| 24,111 | 2028 | 63,417 |
| 24,143 | 2029 | 63,502 |
| 24,176 | 2030 | 63,587 |
| 24,208 | 2031 | 63,672 |
| 24,241 | 2032 | 63,757 |
| 24,273 | 2033 | 63,843 |
| 24,306 | 2034 | 63,928 |
| 24,338 | 2035 | 64,014 |
| 24,371 | 2036 | 64,100 |
| 24,403 | 2037 | 64,186 |
| 24,436 | 2038 | 64,272 |
| 24,469 | 2039 | 64,358 |
| 24,502 | 2040 | 64,444 |
| 24,534 | 2041 | 64,530 |
| Annual \% Pop. Increase |  |  |
| $00134 / \mathrm{Year}$ |  |  |
| Households to Population |  |  |
| 0.3802 |  |  |


| Greenwich Animal Shelter Planning Statistics |  |  |  |  | shelterplanners.com |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals $0.20 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 75 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Felines } \\ & 25 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Small others } \\ 2 \% \end{gathered}$ | Large others |  |
| 2019 | 62,657 | 128 | 96 | 32 | 3 |  |  |
| 2029 | 63,502 | 130 | 97 | 32 | 3 |  |  |
| 2039 | 64,358 | 131 | 99 | 33 | 3 |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 41 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Felines } \\ & 59 \% \end{aligned}$ | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
|  |  | Animals |  |  | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces |  |  | 27 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 125 | 1,375 |
|  |  |  | 16 |  |  | 65 | 1,040 |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 4,015 | 5,840 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |
| @ . $20 \%$ of Populaton |  |  |  | 96 | 32 | SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |
| Available | Length of Stay | (LOS) | 42 | 183 | 2,415 | \$ 400 | \$ 966,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2,415 | \$ 450 | \$ 1,086,750 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only 4 kennels to service 96 dogs. Capacity is at least 280 dogs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Greenwich Animal Control Report History



Greenwich Animal APCP Call History


1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".

Animal Control Mission: To promote, educate and reinforce responsible pet ownership.
2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.

No
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.

Yes
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.

No
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.

No
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.
(2) full time Animal control Officers (the ACO's only work 8 days out of the month together) as we operate 7 days a week, 365
days yr. (1) full time kennel maintainer M-F
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?

Pilot program of 3 people. Non operating as of March due to covid-19
10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?

No
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

No
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

No
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations.

Would love to have a low-cost spay neuter program in Greenwich for peoples pets and that includes rabbits. Love to see a low-cost spay \& neuter regional mobile unit or local vets willing to participate in a voucher program, for those pets that are already in homes and are not on state assistance. Low-cost spay \& neuter for rabbits too!
A shared ACO and Animal welfare shelter list for convicted animal cruelty/neglect name database. DO not adopt list.
Wildlife fund-for wildlife rehabilitators and feral cat low-cost spay and neuter Concerns - reducing and combining Animal Control Department into regional department.

## WESTCOG

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## New Canaan

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


# New Canaan Animal Control Organization Existing Conditions Report 

## Population

| Population projection 2019* | 20,047 | 7,051 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Population projection 2029* | 20,404 |  |
| Population projection 2039* | 20,768 |  |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire

1. Organization
2. Are your answers from 1 year or 3 years averaged?
3. How many animals per year does your shelter serve?
4. How many total kennel runs and/or "spots" do you have?
5. How many total feline cages and/or "spots" do you have?
6. How many canines did you serve?

How many felines did you serve?
How many "other" small animals did you serve?
How many "other" large animals did you serve?
. How many canines were "returned to owners" (RTO)

1. How many felines were "returned to owners" (RTO)?
2. How many canines were adopted?
3. How many felines were adopted?
. How many canines were transferred to other facilities?
. How many felines were transferred to other facilities?
. How many canines were you forced to euthanize?
. How many felines were you forced to euthanize?
4. How many canines remained in the shelter at the end of the year?
5. How many felines remained in the shelter at the end of the year?
6. How many canines died in the shelter or were lost?
7. How many felines died in the shelter or were DOA?
8. How many days do you consider to be the optimum length of stay for canines?
9. How many days do you consider to be the optimum length of stay for felines?

## New Canaan Animal

## Control

(\% of Total) 1

| Existing canine LOSExisting feline LOS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Your Experience Calculated |  |  |  |  |
| Comparison of Your Shelter's experience to National Averages Shelter \%'s Averages* Save Rate |  |  |  |  |
|  | ge of Relinquished Animals by population | 0.19\% | 3-4\% |  |
| Percentage of Relinquished Animals by Households0.19\% Pop/I |  |  |  |  |
| Canines $\quad 87.2 \%$ 55\% |  |  |  |  |
| Felines 12.8\% 45\% |  |  |  |  |
| Individual shelter statistics are included as submitted on our shelterplanners.com website questionnaire | Canines RTO | 94.1\% | 20-30\% | 100.0\% |
|  | Canines Adopted | 5.9\% | 40-60\% |  |
|  | Canines Transferred | 0.0\% |  |  |
| Census calculations are developed based upon an approximation of your service area in the city, county or region listed on our questionnaire | Canines Remaining in Shelter Canines that Died Naturally or were Lost Canines Euthanized | 0.0\% |  |  |
|  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |
|  |  | 0.0\% | 10-40\% |  |
|  | Felines RTO | 0.0\% | 10-20\% | 0.0\% |
| * "Experience Averages" are taken from a variety of sources including statistics from operating shelters we have designed as well as from various state reporting websites for animal shelters and animal control facilities | Felines Adopted | 0.0\% | 10-40\% |  |
|  | Felines Transferred | 0.0\% |  |  |
|  | Felines Remaining in Shelter | 0.0\% |  |  |
|  | Felines that Died Naturally | 11.8\% |  |  |
|  | Felines Euthanized | 20.0\% | 40-80\% |  |

New Canaan Conn.

| Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7,051 | 2019 | 20,047 |
| 7,063 | 2020 | 20,082 |
| 7,075 | 2021 | 20,118 |
|  |  |  |
| 7,088 | 2022 | 20,154 |
| 7,101 | 2023 | 20,189 |
| 7,113 | 2024 | 20,225 |
| 7,126 | 2025 | 20,261 |
| 7,138 | 2026 | 20,296 |
| 7,151 | 2027 | 20,332 |
| 7,164 | 2028 | 20,368 |
| 7,176 | 2029 | 20,404 |
| 7,189 | 2030 | 20,440 |
| 7,202 | 2031 | 20,476 |
| 7,214 | 2032 | 20,513 |
| 7,227 | 2033 | 20,549 |
| 7,240 | 2034 | 20,585 |
| 7,253 | 2035 | 20,622 |
| 7,265 | 2036 | 20,658 |
| 7,278 | 2037 | 20,695 |
| 7,291 | 2038 | 20,731 |
| 7,304 | 2039 | 20,768 |
| 7,317 | 2040 | 20,805 |
| 7,330 | 2041 | 20,841 |
|  |  |  |

Annual \% Pop. Increase
.001768/Year
Households to Population 0.3517

| New Canaan Animal Shelter Planning Statistics |  |  |  |  |  | shelterp | lan | ners.com |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population Census Est. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Animals } \\ 0.19 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canines } \\ & 87 \% \end{aligned}$ | Felines 13\% | Small others | Large others |  |  |
| 2019 | 20,047 | 39 | 34 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2029 | 20,404 | 40 | 35 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2039 | 20,768 | 40 | 35 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 40 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 60 \% \end{gathered}$ | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |  |
|  |  | Animals |  |  | SF/Animal |  | otal SF |
| Programmed Spaces |  |  | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 125 |  | 250 |
|  |  | Days/Year |  |  |  |  |  | 195 |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 730 |  | Projected Shelter Size |  |  | 445 |
|  |  |  | 1,095 |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| @ X\% of Populaton |  |  |  | 34 | 5 | SF | Cost/SF |  | st. Cost |
| Available | Length of Stay | (LOS) |  | 21 | 219 | 445 | \$ 400 | \$ | 178,000 |
|  |  |  | 445 |  |  | \$ 450 | \$ | 200,250 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only 2 kennels to service 34 dogs. Capacity is at least 52 dogs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cages - Capacity = 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

New Canaan Animal Impound Report History


New Canaan Animal APCP Call History

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 400 |  |  |  |
| ¢ 350 |  |  |  |
| \% Complaints 300 |  |  |  |
| 4 Investigated 25 |  |  |  |
| $\cdots$ is 20 to 86 |  |  |  |
| ¢ fold Bites \& 200 |  |  |  |
| E Summons/ 150 |  |  |  |
| $\sum 100$ |  |  |  |
| 2. 50 |  |  |  |
|  | , | $\square$ | - |
|  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| m Complaints Investigated | 443 | 417 | 345 |
| \# Animal Bites | 17 | 21 | 16 |
| - Summons/Infractions | 18 | 11 | 4 |

1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".

## Animal Control - To promote the health, safety and welfare for people pets and wildlife of New Canaan

2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.

No
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.

Yes
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.

No
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.

## No Euthanasia, Crematory or Veterinary Services

7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.

1 MACO
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?

N/A
10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?

No
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

Yes
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

No
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations.

N/A

## WESTCOG

## WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

# New Milford/Region 2 

Includes: Bridgewater, Brookfield, New Fairfield, New Milford, Sherman \& Roxbury (not WestCOG) New Fairfield dropped out in 2020

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
3. 3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
4. Programming Questionnaire Responses


## New Milford Animal Control <br> Existing Conditions Report (Region 2)

Includes: Bridgewater, Brookfield,New Fairfield, New Milford,Sherman, Roxbury
Population
shelterplanne
.com
Population Households

| Population projection 2019* |  | 24,956 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Population projection 2029* | Note: New Fairfield Dropped out in 2020 | 57,771 | 21,273 |
| Population projection 2039* |  | 59,856 |  |

*Population increases projected per WikipediaS Census estimate basis:
Responses to Statisical Questionnaire


| New Millford Conn. <br> Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10,965 | 2019 | 29,061 |
| 11,006 | 2020 | 29,170 |
| 11,047 | 2021 | 29,280 |
| 11,089 | 2022 | 29,390 |
| 11,131 | 2023 | 29,501 |
| 11,173 | 2024 | 29,612 |
| 11,215 | 2025 | 29,724 |
| 11,257 | 2026 | 29,835 |
| 11,299 | 2027 | 29,948 |
| 11,342 | 2028 | 30,060 |
| 11,384 | 2029 | 30,174 |
| 11,427 | 2030 | 30,287 |
| 11,470 | 2031 | 30,401 |
| 11,514 | 2032 | 30,516 |
| 11,557 | 2033 | 30,630 |
| 11,600 | 2034 | 30,746 |
| 11,644 | 2035 | 30,861 |
| 11,688 | 2036 | 30,978 |
| 11,732 | 2037 | 31,094 |
| 11,776 | 2038 | 31,211 |
| 11,820 | 2039 | 31,329 |
| 11,865 | 2040 | 31,447 |
| 11,909 | 2041 | 31,565 |
|  |  |  |
| Annual Pop. Increase |  |  |
| $003764 /$ Year |  |  |
| Households to Population |  |  |
| 0.3773 |  |  |



Households
Projected
Population served
24,956 $2019 \quad$ 68,771

Includes Roxbury - Not in WestCOG

21,273 $2029 \quad 57,131$
New Fairfield dropped out in 2020
$22,276 \quad 2039 \quad 59,856$

| New Milford Animal Shelter Planning Statistics (Region 2) |  |  |  |  | shelterplanners.com |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population Census Est. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Animals } \\ 0.22 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 96 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 4\% | Small others $3 \%$ | Large others |  |
| 2019 | 68,771 | 150 | 144 | 6 | 4 |  |  |
| 2029 | 57,131 | 125 | 120 | 5 | 3 |  |  |
| 2039 | 59,856 | 131 | 125 | 5 | 3 |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canines } \\ & 82 \% \end{aligned}$ | Felines 18\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
|  |  | Animals |  |  | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces |  |  | 22 | 18 | 4 | 18 | 125 | 2,250 |
|  |  |  | 4 |  |  | 65 | 260 |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 6,570 | 1,460 |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |
| @ . $22 \%$ of Populaton |  |  | 144 | 6 | SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) |  |  | 46 | 243 | 2,510 | \$ 400 | \$ 1,004,000 |
|  |  |  | 2,510 |  | \$ 450 | \$ 1,129,500 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

18 kennels to service 144 dogs.Capacity is at least 460 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cage -Capacity = 105

## Region 2 Animal Impound Report History

Bridgewater, Brookfield, New Fairfield, New Milford, Sherman + Roxbury


## Region 2 Animal APCP Call History

Bridgewater, Brookfield, New Fairfield, New Milford, Sherman + Roxbury


1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".

## Animal Control: To enforce CT Animal Control Statutes, educate the public, and adopt animals.

2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.

No
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.

No
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.

Yes
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.

No
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

Yes
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.
1 full time Animal Control Officer 3 full time Assistant Animal Control Officers
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?

No
10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?

Yes - Covered
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

No
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

Yes
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations.

Animals that must be euthanized are taken to a veterinarian. Veterinarian arranges cremation.

## WESTCOG

WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Newtown

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


# Newtown Animal Control <br> Existing Conditions Report 

## Population

|  | Population | Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Population projection 2019* | 27,889 | 9,276 |
| Population projection 2029* | 29,611 | 9,849 |
| Population projection 2039* | 31,440 | 10,457 |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire



Newtown Conn.

| Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 9,276 | 2019 | 27,889 |
| 9,332 | 2020 | 28,057 |
| 9,388 | 2021 | 28,225 |
| 9,444 | 2022 | 28,395 |
| 9,501 | 2023 | 28,566 |
| 9,558 | 2024 | 28,737 |
| 9,615 | 2025 | 28,910 |
| 9,673 | 2026 | 29,084 |
| 9,731 | 2027 | 29,258 |
| 9,790 | 2028 | 29,434 |
| 9,849 | 2029 | 29,611 |
| 9,908 | 2030 | 29,789 |
| 9,967 | 2031 | 29,968 |
| 10,027 | 2032 | 30,148 |
| 10,088 | 2033 | 30,329 |
| 10,148 | 2034 | 30,512 |
| 10,209 | 2035 | 30,695 |
| 10,271 | 2036 | 30,880 |
| 10,332 | 2037 | 31,065 |
| 10,394 | 2038 | 31,252 |
| 10,457 | 2039 | 31,440 |
| 10,520 | 2040 | 31,629 |
| 10,583 | 2041 | 31,819 |

Annual \% Pop. Increase .00601/Year

Households to Population 0.3326

| Newtown Animal Shelter Planning Statistics |  |  |  |  | shelterplanners.com |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals 0.57\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 55 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 35\% | Small others 2.5\% | Large others 1.3\% |  |
| 2019 | 27,889 | 158 | 87 | 55 | 4 | 2 |  |
| 2029 | 29,611 | 168 | 92 | 75 | 4 | 2 |  |
| 2039 | 31,440 | 178 | 62 | 80 | 5 | 2 |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 64 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Felines } \\ & 36 \% \end{aligned}$ | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
|  |  | Animals |  |  | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces |  |  | 28 | 18 | 10 | 18 | 125 | 2,250 |
|  |  |  | 10 |  |  | 65 | 650 |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 6,570 | 3,650 |  |  | 2,900 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |
| @ .57\% of Populaton |  |  |  | 87 | 55 | SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) |  |  | 76 | 66 | 2,900 | \$ 400 | \$ 1,160,000 |
|  |  |  | 2,900 |  | \$ 450 | \$ 1,305,000 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only 4 kennels to service 87 dogs.Capacity is at least 455 dogs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Newtown Animal Impound Report History



Newtown Animal APCP Call History


1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".

Animal Control mission.: To provide the resources, programs, and to educate the public. To help lost, injured, and distressed animals, both wild and domestic. To ensure the safety of the public and to enforce animal laws. Also to give unwanted animals a second chance and place them into suitable homes. We work with dogs that have behavioral issues to get them adoptable.
Describe your organization's full-time staffing, by position.: I run the facility. I manage and give my staff direction. I make sure all of the animals are taken care of. I train my staff for their duties.
2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.

Yes
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.

## Yes

5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.

## Yes

6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.

No
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.

## 1 full-time ACO 4 part time ACO 3 part time kennel staff

9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?

We had a reading program where seniors and children would come in and read to our dogs and cats. Due to COVID, instead of the kids coming in we are having them make homemade dog treats, homemade cat nip toys, and also homemade pill pockets for the cats and dogs. We hand out children's coloring books about dogs' behavior and information about Rabies. Our seniors come and visit with dog treats. We had a dog walking volunteer program. We also have a community service program which includes making outdoor feral cat shelters and bird houses.
10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?
Yes
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

Yes
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

Yes
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations.

None

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Norwalk

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


# Norwalk Animal Control <br> Existing Conditions Report 

## Population

|  | Population | Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Population projection 2019* | 88,814 | 36,742 |
| Population projection 2029* | 92,174 | 38,132 |
| Population projection 2039* | 95,661 | 39,575 |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire



| Norwalk Conn. <br> Households Projected |  | Population served |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36,742 | 2019 | 88,814 |
| 36,879 | 2020 | 89,144 |
| 37,016 | 2021 | 89,476 |
| 37,154 | 2022 | 89,809 |
| 37,292 | 2023 | 90,143 |
| 37,431 | 2024 | 90,478 |
| 37,570 | 2025 | 90,815 |
| 37,710 | 2026 | 91,153 |
| 37,850 | 2027 | 91,492 |
| 37,991 | 2028 | 91,832 |
| 38,132 | 2029 | 92,174 |
| 38,274 | 2030 | 92,517 |
| 38,417 | 2031 | 92,861 |
| 38,559 | 2032 | 93,206 |
| 38,703 | 2033 | 93,553 |
| 38,847 | 2034 | 93,901 |
| 38,991 | 2035 | 94,250 |
| 39,136 | 2036 | 94,601 |
| 39,282 | 2037 | 94,953 |
| 39,428 | 2038 | 95,306 |
| 39,575 | 2039 | 95,661 |
| 39,722 | 2040 | 96,016 |
| 39,870 | 2041 | 96,374 |
| Annual \% Pop. Increase |  |  |
| Households to Population |  |  |


| Norwalk Animal Shelter Planning Statistics |  |  |  |  |  | shelter | lanners.com |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals 0.12\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canines } \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | Felines 0\% | Small others | Large others |  |
| 2019 | 88,814 | 106 | 106 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 2029 | 92,174 | 110 | 61 | 50 |  |  |  |
| 2039 | 95,661 | 114 | 63 | 51 |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canines } \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Felines } \\ & 0 \% \end{aligned}$ | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces |  |  | 19 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 125 | 2,375 |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 6,935 | 0 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |
| @ .12\% of Populaton |  |  |  | 106 | 0 | SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) |  |  | 65 | \#DIV/0! | 2,375 | \$ 400 | \$ 950,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2,375 | \$ 450 | \$ 1,068,750 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

4 kennels to service 106 dogs. Capacity is at least 480 dogs

## Norwalk Animal Impound Report History



Norwalk Animal APCP Call History


1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".
Animal Control; Public safety for the Citizens of Norwalk CT and the humane protection of the animals that live in Norwalk.
2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.
No
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.
No
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.
No
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.
No
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?
No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.
(1) MACO Dog Warden- Ensures that CT State \& City of Norwalk animal Ordinances are enforced and supervision of Animal Control Shelter services. (2) ACO Dog Warden- Ensures that CT State \& City of Norwalk animal Ordinances are enforced. (3) Kennel Manager- Supervises day to day operation of Animal Control Shelter. No Part Time Staff
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?
Volunteer Program-(Disaster Animal Rescue Team) assists Norwalk Animal Control during emergency events.
10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?
Yes, Covered
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.
No
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?
No
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations.
None

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Redding

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


# Redding Animal Control <br> Existing Conditions Report 

## Population

|  | Population | Population | Households |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population projection 2019* |  | 9,172 | 3,475 |  |
| Population projection 2029* |  | 9,712 | 3,680 |  |
| Population projection 2039* |  | 10,284 | 3,897 |  |

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire



Redding, Conn.

| Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 3,475 | 2019 | 9,172 |
| 3,495 | 2020 | 9,225 |
| 3,515 | 2021 | 9,278 |
| 3,535 | 2022 | 9,331 |
| 3,556 | 2023 | 9,384 |
| 3,576 | 2024 | 9,438 |
| 3,597 | 2025 | 9,492 |
| 3,617 | 2026 | 9,547 |
| 3,638 | 2027 | 9,602 |
| 3,659 | 2028 | 9,657 |
| 3,680 | 2029 | 9,712 |
| 3,701 | 2030 | 9,768 |
| 3,722 | 2031 | 9,824 |
| 3,744 | 2032 | 9,880 |
| 3,765 | 2033 | 9,937 |
| 3,787 | 2034 | 9,994 |
| 3,809 | 2035 | 10,052 |
| 3,830 | 2036 | 10,109 |
| 3,852 | 2037 | 10,167 |
| 3,875 | 2038 | 10,226 |
| 3,897 | 2039 | 10,284 |
| 3,919 | 2040 | 10,343 |
| 3,942 | 2041 | 10,403 |

Annual \% Pop. Increase
.00574/Year
Households to Population 0.3789

| Redding Animal Shelter Planning Statistics |  |  |  |  |  | shelterp | $l a n$ | ners.com |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals 0.37\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canines } \\ & 97 \% \end{aligned}$ | Felines 3\% | Small others | Large others |  |  |
| 2019 | 9,172 | 34 | 33 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2029 | 9,712 | 36 | 20 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2039 | 10,284 | 38 | 37 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 83 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 17 \% \end{gathered}$ | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |  |
|  |  | Animals |  |  | SF/Animal |  | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces |  |  | 12 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 125 |  | 1,250 |
|  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 65 |  | 130 |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 3,650 | 730 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| @ . $37 \%$ of Populaton |  |  |  | 33 | 1 | SF | Cost/SF |  | st. Cost |
| Available | Length of Stay | (LOS) | 111 | 730 | 1,380 | \$ 400 | \$ | 552,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1,380 | \$ 450 |  | 621,000 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only 2 kennels to service 33 dogs. Capacity is at least 260 dogs Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cages - Capacity = 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Redding Animal Control Report History


## Redding Animal APCP Call History



1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".

## Animal Control: Law enforcement and public safety

2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.

No
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.

No
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.

No
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.

No
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.

Full time Animal control Operator
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties? None
10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?

Yes - Covered
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

No
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

## No

13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations.

We have no plans on expanding our level of services. We currently share a facility located in a neighboring town at very little cost to the Town of Redding. We only pay for the daily sheltering of the animal we impound.

## WESTCOG

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Ridgefield

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses

Note: Ridgefield did not submit data - Statistics are estimates based on APCP 2019 Report Data


## Ridgefield Animal Control

Existing Conditions Report (Data not submitted so all = estimates)

|  | Population | Population |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 25,553 | 9,115 |  |
| Population projection 2019* | 26,668 | 9,512 |  |
| Population projection 2029* | 27,832 | 9,928 |  |
| Population projection 2039* |  | 2 |  |

*Population increases projected per wikipedia Census estimate basis:
Responses to Statisical Questionnaire


| Ridgefield Conn. <br> Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9,115 | 2019 | 25,553 |
| 9,154 | 2020 | 25,662 |
| 9,193 | 2021 | 25,772 |
| 9,232 | 2022 | 25,883 |
| 9,272 | 2023 | 25,993 |
| 9,311 | 2024 | 26,105 |
| 9,351 | 2025 | 26,216 |
| 9,391 | 2026 | 26,328 |
| 9,432 | 2027 | 26,441 |
| 9,472 | 2028 | 26,554 |
| 9,512 | 2029 | 26,668 |
| 9,553 | 2030 | 26,782 |
| 9,594 | 2031 | 26,897 |
| 9,635 | 2032 | 27,012 |
| 9,676 | 2033 | 27,127 |
| 9,718 | 2034 | 27,244 |
| 9,759 | 2035 | 27,360 |
| 9,801 | 2036 | 27,477 |
| 9,843 | 2037 | 27,595 |
| 9,885 | 2038 | 27,713 |
| 9,928 | 2039 | 27,832 |
| 9,970 | 2040 | 27,951 |
| 10,013 | 2041 | 28,070 |
|  |  |  |
| Annual 9 Pop. Increase |  |  |
| $004208 / Y e a r$ |  |  |
| Households to Population |  |  |
| 0.3567 |  |  |


| Ridgefield Animal Shelter Planning Statistics |  |  |  |  |  | shelterp | lanners.com |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals 0.07\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines+ } \\ \text { 100\% } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | Small others | Large others |  |
| 2019 | 25,553 | 18 | 18 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 2029 | 26,668 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 2039 | 27,832 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canines } \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | Felines 0\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
|  |  | Animals |  |  | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces* |  |  | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 125 | 500 |
|  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 65 |  |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 1,460 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |
| @ .07\% of Populaton |  |  |  | 18 | 0 | SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |
| Available | Length of Stay | (LOS) | 81 | \#DIV/0! | 500 | \$ 400 | \$ 200,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 500 | \$ 450 | \$ 225,000 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 kennels to service 106 dogs. Capacity is at least 102 dogs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| + Dog numbers assumed from 2019 APCP Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Kennel number estimated - No data submitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Ridgefield Animal Control Report History


Ridgefield Animal APCP Call History


# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Stamford

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


# Stamford Animal Control <br> Existing Conditions Report 

## Population

Population Households

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Population projection 2019* | 129,638 |
| Population projection 2029* | 137,143 |
| Population projection 2039* | 145,083 |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:
Responses to Statisical Questionnaire


| Stamford Conn. <br> Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 54,513 | 2019 | 129,638 |
| 54,820 | 2020 | 130,370 |
| 55,130 | 2021 | 131,105 |
| 55,441 | 2022 | 131,845 |
| 55,754 | 2023 | 132,589 |
| 56,069 | 2024 | 133,338 |
| 56,385 | 2025 | 134,090 |
| 56,703 | 2026 | 134,847 |
| 57,023 | 2027 | 135,608 |
| 57,345 | 2028 | 136,373 |
| 57,669 | 2029 | 137,143 |
| 57,994 | 2030 | 137,917 |
| 58,321 | 2031 | 138,695 |
| 58,651 | 2032 | 139,478 |
| 58,982 | 2033 | 140,265 |
| 59,314 | 2034 | 141,057 |
| 59,649 | 2035 | 141,853 |
| 59,986 | 2036 | 142,654 |
| 60,324 | 2037 | 143,459 |
| 60,665 | 2038 | 144,268 |
| 61,007 | 2039 | 145,083 |
| 61,352 | 2040 | 145,901 |
| 61,698 | 2041 | 146,725 |
| Annual Pop. Increase |  |  |
| $005647 / Y e a r$ |  |  |
| Households to Population |  |  |
| 0.4205 |  |  |


| Stamford Animal Shelter Planning Statistics |  |  |  |  | shelterplanners.com |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals 0.25\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 63 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines $34 \%$ | Small others $3 \%$ | Large others $0.3 \%$ |  |
| 2019 | 129,638 | 324 | 204 | 109 | 11 | 1 |  |
| 2029 | 137,143 | 343 | 216 | 115 | 12 | 1 |  |
| 2039 | 145,083 | 363 | 228 | 122 | 12 | 1 |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 63 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 38 \% \end{gathered}$ | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
|  |  | Animals |  |  | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces |  |  | 40 | 25 | 15 | 25 | 125 | 3,125 |
|  |  |  | 15 |  |  | 65 | 975 |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 9,125 | 5,475 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |
| @ . $25 \%$ of Populaton |  |  |  | 204 | 109 | SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) |  |  | 45 | 50 | 4,100 | \$ 400 | \$ 1,640,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4,100 | \$ 450 | \$ 1,845,000 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 kennels | to service 204 | dogs. Capa | is at leas | dogs |  |  |  |
| Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 5 cages - Capacity = 380 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Stamford Animal Impound Report History



Stamford Animal APCP Call History



# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Weston

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


# Weston Animal Control <br> Existing Conditions Report 

## Population

|  | Population | Population | Households |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population projection 2019* | 10,259 | 3,366 |  |
| Population projection 2029* | 10,379 | 3,405 |  |
| Population projection 2039* | 10,500 | 3,445 |  |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire



| Weston Conn. <br> Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3,366 | 2019 | 10,259 |
| 3,370 | 2020 | 10,271 |
| 3,373 | 2021 | 10,283 |
| 3,377 | 2022 | 10,295 |
| 3,381 | 2023 | 10,307 |
| 3,385 | 2024 | 10,319 |
| 3,389 | 2025 | 10,331 |
| 3,393 | 2026 | 10,343 |
| 3,397 | 2027 | 10,355 |
| 3,401 | 2028 | 10,367 |
| 3,405 | 2029 | 10,379 |
| 3,409 | 2030 | 10,391 |
| 3,413 | 2031 | 10,403 |
| 3,417 | 2032 | 10,415 |
| 3,421 | 2033 | 10,427 |
| 3,425 | 2034 | 10,439 |
| 3,429 | 2035 | 10,451 |
| 3,433 | 2036 | 10,464 |
| 3,437 | 2037 | 10,476 |
| 3,441 | 2038 | 10,488 |
| 3,445 | 2039 | 10,500 |
| 3,449 | 2040 | 10,512 |
| 3,453 | 2041 | 10,524 |

Annual \% Pop. Increase .001162/Year

Households to Population 0.32807


Weston Animal impound Report History


## Weston APCP Call Report History



1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".

## Animal Control Mission: We are responsible for all Domestic and Wildlife safety and control

2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.

No
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.

No
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.

No
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.

No
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe.

1 Full Time \& 1 Part Time: There is a job description written. He works about 10 days per month now. He used to work every night, weekend and holidays plus my Vacation and sick time.
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?

## No

10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?

No
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

Yes
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

No
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations.

Protect our Dogs when they are found roaming around Town

## WESTCOG

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Westport

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


## Westport Animal Control

## Existing Conditions Report

## Population

|  | Population | Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Households |  |  |
| Population projection 2019* | 28,015 |  |
| Population projection 2029* | 29,340 | 10,162 |
| Population projection 2039* | 30,728 | 11,146 |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire



| Westport Conn Households Projected |  | Population served |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10,162 | 2019 | 28,015 |
| 10,209 | 2020 | 28,145 |
| 10,256 | 2021 | 28,275 |
| 10,304 | 2022 | 28,406 |
| 10,351 | 2023 | 28,538 |
| 10,399 | 2024 | 28,670 |
| 10,448 | 2025 | 28,803 |
| 10,496 | 2026 | 28,936 |
| 10,545 | 2027 | 29,070 |
| 10,593 | 2028 | 29,205 |
| 10,643 | 2029 | 29,340 |
| 10,692 | 2030 | 29,476 |
| 10,741 | 2031 | 29,612 |
| 10,791 | 2032 | 29,750 |
| 10,841 | 2033 | 29,887 |
| 10,891 | 2034 | 30,026 |
| 10,942 | 2035 | 30,165 |
| 10,992 | 2036 | 30,305 |
| 11,043 | 2037 | 30,445 |
| 11,094 | 2038 | 30,586 |
| 11,146 | 2039 | 30,728 |
| 11,198 | 2040 | 30,870 |
| 11,249 | 2041 | 31,013 |
| Annual \% Pop. Increase .004632/Year |  |  |
| Households to Population |  |  |




## Westport Animal APCP Call History

| 1000 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $900$ |  |  |  |
| 800 |  |  |  |
| ¢ |  |  |  |
| Complaints 600 |  |  |  |
| Investigated 500 |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\square}{\text { a }}$ is 90 to 110500 |  |  |  |
| fold Bites \& 400 |  |  |  |
| Summons/ 300 |  |  |  |
| $z$ infractions 200 |  |  |  |
| 100 |  |  |  |
| 0 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| - Complaints Investigated | 0 | 0 | 997 |
| * Animal Bites | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| - Summons/Infractions | 0 | 0 | 9 |

1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission".
Animal Control As being the Animal Control Officer it is my duties to perform and enforce all Ct. State Statutes and town of
Westport Municipal Ordinances related to animals. Also to provide for the public's safety in regards to dogs, cats, and other
domestic animals, sick or injured wildlife. Intake of impounded animals. Adoption of abandoned animals and medical care.
2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many
N/A
3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include.

Yes - No description given
4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe.

No
5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe.

Yes
6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe.

No
7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate?

No
8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe. Westport Animal Control has one full time officer and one full time assistant animal control officer - (2).

No Part Time
Employees
9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties?

Westport Animal Control is very fortunate to have a group named WASA. Westport Animal Shelter Advocates which has staff of eleven (11) who volunteer with the needs of walking our shelter dogs and also help with funding the medical care of our animals.
10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large?

No
11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe.

Yes
12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)?

No
13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations.

None

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Jurisdiction Animal Control Profiles

## Wilton

1. Existing Conditions Report
2. 2019 Statistics - LOS Calculations
3.3 Year Impound History - From APCP Reports
4.3 Year Call History - From APCP Reports
3. Programming Questionnaire Responses


# Wilton Animal Control <br> Existing Conditions Report 

## Population

|  | Population | Population | Households |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population projection 2019* | 19,002 | 6,383 |  |
| Population projection 2029* | 19,793 | 6,649 |  |
| Population projection 2039* | 20,617 | 6,925 |  |

*Population increases projected per Wikipedia Census estimate basis:

## Responses to Statisical Questionnaire



Wilton Conn.

| Households <br> Projected | Population <br> served |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6,383 | 2019 | 19,002 |
| 6,409 | 2020 | 19,080 |
| 6,435 | 2021 | 19,158 |
| 6,461 | 2022 | 19,236 |
| 6,488 | 2023 | 19,315 |
| 6,514 | 2024 | 19,393 |
| 6,541 | 2025 | 19,473 |
| 6,568 | 2026 | 19,552 |
| 6,595 | 2027 | 19,632 |
| 6,622 | 2028 | 19,712 |
| 6,649 | 2029 | 19,793 |
| 6,676 | 2030 | 19,874 |
| 6,703 | 2031 | 19,955 |
| 6,730 | 2032 | 20,037 |
| 6,758 | 2033 | 20,119 |
| 6,786 | 2034 | 20,201 |
| 6,813 | 2035 | 20,283 |
| 6,841 | 2036 | 20,366 |
| 6,869 | 2037 | 20,450 |
| 6,897 | 2038 | 20,533 |
| 6,925 | 2039 | 20,617 |
| 6,954 | 2040 | 20,701 |
| 6,995 | 2041 | 20,826 |

Annual \% Pop. Increase
.004087/Year
Households to Population
0.335904


2 kennels to service 54 dogs.Capacity is at least $\mathbf{2 6 0}$ dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cage -Capacity = 260

## Wilton Animal Impound Report History



Wilton Animal APCP Call History


| 1. Is your organization a Humane Society/SPCA or an Animal Control department? Please include the organization name and describe its "mission". |
| :---: |
| Animal Control - Wilton Animal Control is a division of the Wilton Police Department that enforces State Laws in regards to domestic pets and wildlife. We also are tasked with enforcing both Wilton Dog Ordinances (10C-2 Running at large \& 10C-9 |
| Removal of Dog Waste). Animal Control investigates reports of animal bites, roaming dogs, animal cruelty, excessive barking complaints, sick or injured domestic pets, and sick or injured wildlife. We enforce rabies control by quarantining biting animals pursuant to State Law and investigate reports of potentially rabid wildlife. We house and care for homeless and abandoned domestic pets and find suitable homes for them. |
| 2. If you are a Humane Society/SPCA do you collaborate with local Animal Control? If so, do you allocate space for ACO's? How many N/A |
| 3. Do you intend to offer in-house veterinary services? If so, please describe what services you wish to include. No |
| 4. Do you intend to offer pet safety and/or identification services? Please describe. No |
| 5. Do you intend to offer pet education or training services. Please describe. No |
| 6. Do you intend to provide euthanasia and/or crematory services? Please describe. No |
| 7. Do you intend to provide community meeting space? If so, how many people do you wish to accommodate? No |
| 8. What are your full and part time staff positions? Please describe. |
| 1 full time ACO. - 1 part time ACO who is retiring 12/31/2020 |
| 9. Do you involve volunteers in any aspect of your operation? If so, how many and what are their duties? <br> None |
| 10. Do you intend to include a covered or uncovered Salley-Port? If so, how large? <br> Yes, Covered |
| 11. Do you intend to include a "dog park"? Please describe. No |
| 12. Do you plan to include a communal cat room (s)? |
| No |
| 13. Please provide any further comments to aid us in understanding your intentions and/or operations. None |

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

# Preliminary Needs Assessment Submission March 8, 2021 

Appendix C


## WestCOG - Preliminary Needs Assessments Preface

Preliminary Needs Assessment studies (NAS) cover Animal Control operations for the following ten jurisdictions within the WestCOG area:

| Bethel | Danbury |
| :--- | :--- |
| Greenwich | New Milford (Region 2) |
| Newtown | Norwalk |
| Stamford | Weston |
| Westport | Wilton |

All were visited and surveyed on February 11 \& 12, 2021. Reports developed from those surveys are referenced in the NAS narratives. Refer to the survey reports for greater detail.

All ten NAS have a great deal in common which is reflected in their obvious similarities:

- All exhibit a similar profile in terms of declining impounds over time. This equates to the Connecticut Animal Population Control Program's (APCP) 21-year trends as shown in the following graph:

- The shelters (impound facilities) all have significant excess capacity.
- All experience a very low level of intake as a percentage of human population with the average at $.23 \%$. National average is between $3 \& 4 \%$. This is addressed in each NAS
- All display a high level of live release, mostly via return to owner (RTO)
- All display Animal Control Call Histories that are significantly greater than Bite or Summons outcomes. This coupled with minimal intake points to "community service" as Animal Control's most time-consuming effort

Our Data Collection was accomplished via a seven question "Requested Submissions" document. Many of the WestCOG Animal Control units submitted no response to several of the questions. To obtain relevant, comparable data we contacted the Connecticut Dept. of Agriculture's APCP program and received submitted data for the jurisdictions for three years. We cover various lack of responses in our NAS studies for the ten jurisdictions.

# Western Connecticut Council of Governments 

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For
Bethel Animal Control


Mission: Municipal animal shelter, impound of strays, DOA and quarantines.


## PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for Bethel, Connecticut analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the community's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the Bethel Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Bethel's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Bethel's Intake trends follow the APCP's historical downward movement over the past twenty years.

Bethel Animal Control services community strays for both dogs and cats along with owner surrendered animals. Accepting Owner surrenders is not common practice in the jurisdictions that are part of WestCOG. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity.

The 78-80 total animals served in 2019 represent only $0.41 \%$ of Bethel's population, estimated at 19,049 . This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced "live release" rates of $100 \%$ for dogs and $25 \%$ for cats. The majority of live release, especially for dogs, is via return to owner (RTO). 43 of the 49 dogs served were RTO with 6 adopted. 3 cats were RTO, 2 adopted, 3 euthanized with 12 unaccounted for;
assumed to have remained in the facility or died by end of year 2019. Other small animals are statistically insignificant and not included here.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units $\times 365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay (LOS) = Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as 1-2 days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Bethel facility are based on serving +/- 80 dogs \& cats on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days. Doing so demonstrates the need for only 2 dog kennels and 1 cat cage to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 15 days for dogs and 18 for cats from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 11 dog kennels and 2 cat cages calculates an average LOS for dogs of 82 days with 37 for cats; which representing the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit $B$ projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 1,505 square feet at a cost range of between $\$ 602,000$ and \$677,250.

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, Bethel's existing shelter fails to meet minimums:

- Primary enclosures (kennels \& cages) were observed to be in "fair" condition with dog kennels as chain link, not recommended;
- Kennel floors are sealed concrete only, with unsealed areas and open joints at CMU walls;
- Kennel drainage was observed to be in "poor" condition and noted as "not recommended" because "trench" type drains do not support sanitary conditions;
- Natural Light, daylighting is listed as "almost none";
- Temperature Control is listed as "Minimally operational" with no air conditioning;
- Ventilation consists of "Thru-wall Fans", condition unknown;
- Sound Control is listed as "Poor".

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 280 per year. For cats, on the same basis, the capacity is 52 per year. Bethel actually reported 2 fewer kennels and 4 fewer cat cages than were observed at the shelter. While relatively insignificant this further reinforces our view of excess capacity.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years reduces from an initial 82 days to 77 . For cats the reduction is from 37 days to 34 . All are significantly greater than the assumed 14 days average LOS.

## OPERATIONS

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture’s "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


As with the Intake History, Complaints Investigated show a steady decline over the three year period. The disparity between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal
number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In Bethel's case the Complaints are 19 to 125 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Bethel's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is below WestCOG's average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 67,000$ (estimate) reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 3.52$, fourth lowest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Bethel Animal Control did responded to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services. They stated via our Programming Questionnaire they offer only Cremation Services. They did not list any affiliation with any private Humane Society.

Bethel issued four APCP Sterilization Vouchers in 2018. Two were utilized. Statistics for 2019 were not available.

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were not directly addressed. In this case we can assume Bethel Animal Control follows State Regulations as covered in Connecticut Chapter 435 Dogs and Other Companion Animals, Kennels and Pet Shops and Chapter 955 Cruelty to Animals.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 11 dog kennels and 2 cat cages Bethel's need calculates as follows:

$$
13 \times 15=195 \text { minutes/day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=3.25 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires one staff member a total of 22.75 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the future. With one Animal Control Officer and one part time Kennel Staff on weekends, cleaning and feeding are fully supported.

## CONCLUSION

Bethel's facility physically fails to meet the standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV. The building is $50+$ years old, well past its useful life. It appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. Bethel's animal shelter should be replaced or, at a minimum, renovated to meet minimum standards. Because of the minimum number of animals it serves, Bethel should, as an alternative, consider joining with adjacent communities in the development of a subregional shelter.

# END OF PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT 

Exhibits Follow

## Bethel Conn. Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

## shelterplanners.com

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.41 \%$ | Canines <br> $63 \%$ | Felines <br> $26 \%$ | Small others <br> $12 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 19,049 | 78 | 49 | 20 | 9 | 0 |
| 2029 | 19,601 | 80 | 50 | 21 | 9 |  |
| 2039 | 20,169 | 83 | 52 | 21 | 10 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | Canines 67\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 33 \% \end{gathered}$ | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 125 | 250 |
|  |  |  |  | 1 | 65 | 65 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  | 315 |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 730 | 365 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

@ . $41 \%$ of Populaton
Available Length of Stay (LOS)

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 49 | 20 |
| 15 | 18 |


| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 315 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$$ |
|  | 126,000 |  |  |
| 315 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$$ |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only
2 kennels to service 49 dogs. Capacity is at least 280 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cages - Capacity = 52

## Bethel Conn. Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.41 \%$ | Canines <br> $63 \%$ | Felines <br> $26 \%$ | Small others <br> $12 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 19,049 | 78 | 49 | 20 | 9 | 0 |
| 2029 | 19,601 | 80 | 50 | 21 | 9 |  |
| 2039 | 20,169 | 83 | 52 | 21 | 10 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces Available | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canines } \\ & 85 \% \end{aligned}$ | Felines 15\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 13 | 11 | 2 | 11 | 125 | 1,375 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 65 | 130 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  | 1,505 |
| Available Animal Care Days |  | 4,015 | 730 |  |  |  | (Shelter Capacity)

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

@ . $41 \%$ of Populaton
Available Length of Stay (LOS)

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |  |
| 1,505 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$$ | 602,000 |
| 1,505 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$$ | 677,250 |

2 kennels to service 49 dogs. Capacity is at least 280 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cages - Capacity = 52

## Bethel Conn. Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.41 \%$ | Canines <br> $63 \%$ | Felines <br> $26 \%$ | Small others <br> $12 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 19,049 | 78 | 49 | 20 | 9 | 0 |
| 2029 | 19,601 | 80 | 50 | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 9 |  |
| 2039 | 20,169 | 83 | 52 | 21 | 10 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 85 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 15\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 13 | 11 | 2 | 11 | 125 | 1,375 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 65 | 130 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  | 1,505 |
| Available Animal Care Days |  | 4,015 | 730 |  |  |  | (Shelter Capacity)

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

@ . $41 \%$ of Populaton
Available Length of Stay (LOS)

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |  |
| 1,505 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$$ | 602,000 |
| 1,505 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$$ | 677,250 |

2 kennels to service 49 dogs. Capacity is at least 280 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cages - Capacity = 52

Bethel Conn. Animal Shelter Planning Statistics


2 kennels to service 49 dogs. Capacity is at least 280 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cages - Capacity = 52

# Western Connecticut Council of Governments 

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For

## Danbury Animal Control



Mission Statement: To provide a superior quality of life for the people of Danbury by providing the best possible animal control services. In partnership with the community, we will work to eliminate animal cruelty through education and enforcement. Respect, partnership, and high ethical standards shall from the foundations for delivering our services.


## PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for Danbury, Connecticut analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the community's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the Danbury Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Danbury's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Danbury's Intake trends are relatively static over the past three years with intake descending slightly. This is in keeping with the APCP's historical downward movement over the past twenty years.

Danbury Animal Control accepts community strays for dogs with cats appearing to be accepted but not housed as they report no housing for cats. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity for dogs.

They directly reported 140 total animals served in 2019 despite the 122 listed in the chart above. This represents only $0.15 \%$ of Danbury's population, estimated at 91,529. This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced "live release" rates of $100 \%$ for dogs and $0 \%$ for cats as all were euthanized. The majority of live release for dogs, is via return to owner (RTO). 127 of the 133 dogs served were RTO with 13 adopted. These total to 140 which is 7 more than total intake. We assume the 7 additional were remaining in the shelter at EOY 2019/2020. Other Large animals (2) are statistically insignificant and not included here.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units $\times 365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay $($ LOS $)=$ Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as 1-2 days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Danbury facility are based on serving +/- 133 dogs on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days. Doing so demonstrates the need for only 5 dog kennels to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 14 days for dogs from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 20 dog kennels calculates an average LOS for dogs of 55 days; representing the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit B projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 2,500 square feet at a cost range of between $\$ 1,000,000$ and $\$ 1,125,000$. W

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, Danbury's existing shelter meets minimum requirements:

- Primary enclosures (kennels) were observed to be in "Good" condition with dog kennels as Stainless Steel Bar \& Panel Gates with CMU dividers;
- Kennel floors are resinous epoxy providing a solid, washable, waterproof surface:
- Kennel drainage was observed to be "Trench Drain at Aisle. While in "good" condition trench drains are more difficult to clean and not as sanitary as floor drains in each kennel;
- Natural Light, daylighting is accomplished via clerestory windows in good condition;
- Temperature Control is listed as "Operational" with no air conditioning \& condition unknown;
- Ventilation is part of the HVAC system and kennels are not separated from the remainer of the building;
- Sound Control is listed as "Fair" with minimal sound absorption in the kennels.

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 540 per year. Danbury actually reported 4 fewer kennels than were observed at the shelter. While relatively insignificant this further reinforces our view of excess capacity.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years reduces from an initial 55 days to 48. This remains significantly greater than the assumed 14 days average LOS.

## OPERATIONS

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


As with the Intake History, Complaints Investigated show a decline over the three year period. The disparity between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In Danbury's case the Complaints are 15 to 24 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Danbury's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is below WestCOG's average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 308,000$ reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 3.37$, second lowest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Danbury Animal Control responded to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services. They listed only a wish to microchip but complained of insufficient resources. They listed inclusion of volunteers, with 8 "walkers" and one ""trainer" suggesting they do, in a way, offer Pet Training. They would also like to offer Community Pet Education via their Facebook page.

Danbury issued four APCP Sterilization Vouchers in 2018. Two were utilized. Statistics for 2019 were not available.

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were not directly addressed. In this case we can assume Danbury Animal Control follows State Regulations as covered in Connecticut Chapter 435 Dogs and Other Companion Animals. Kennels and Pet Shops and Chapter 955 Cruelty to Animals.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 20 dog kennels Danbury's need calculates as follows:

$$
20 \times 15=300 \text { minutes } / \text { day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=5 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires one staff member a total of 35 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the future. With Two full time Animal Control Officers and one part time Kennel Assistant cleaning and feeding appear to be fully supported.

## CONCLUSION

With some minor issues noted, Danbury's facility physically meets all standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV and appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. The building is only 1 year old and is in good condition. Given this, its low cost of operations and its significant excess capacity suggests there is no need to consider replacing the existing facility. This shelter could serve as a regional shelter for adjacent communities.

# END OF PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT 

Exhibits Follow



| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.15 \%$ | Canines <br> $95 \%$ | Felines <br> $4 \%$ | Small others | Large others <br> $1 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 91,529 | 140 | 133 | 5 | 2 |  |
| 2029 | 98,064 | 150 | 142 | 5 | 2 |  |
| 2039 | 105,065 | 161 | 153 | 6 | 2 |  |



## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

@ .15\% of Populaton
Available Length of Stay (LOS

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 2,500 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$ 1,000,000$ |
| 2,500 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,125,000$ |

5 kennels to service 133 dogs. Capacity is at least 540 dogs

## Danbury Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

## shelterplanners.com



## Danbury Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

## shelterplanners.com

| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals $0.15 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 95 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 4 \% \end{gathered}$ | Small others | Large others 1\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 91,529 | 140 | 133 | 5 |  | 2 |  |
| 2029 | 98,064 | 150 | 142 | 5 |  | 2 |  |
| 2039 | 105,065 | 161 | 153 | 6 |  | 2 |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces <br> Available | Canines 100\% | Felines 0\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| Programm | ed Spaces | 20 | 20 | 0 | Animals 20 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { SF/Animal } \\ 125 \\ 65 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total SF } \\ 2,500 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  | 2,500 |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 7,300 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |
| @ .15\% of Populaton |  |  | 153 | 6 | SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay |  | OS) | 48 | 0 | 2,500 | \$ 400 | \$ 1,000,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2,500 | \$ 450 | \$ 1,125,000 |

# Western Connecticut Council of Governments 

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For

## Greenwich Animal Control



Mission: To promote, educate and reinforce responsible pet ownership.

## PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for Greenwich, Connecticut analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the community's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the Bethel Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Greenwich's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Greenwich's Intake trends follow the APCP's historical downward movement over the past twenty years.

Greenwich Animal Control services community strays for both dogs and cats. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity.

The directly reported 128 total animals served in 2019, which is 18 less than reported to APCP represent only $0.2 \%$ of Greenwich's population, estimated at 62,657 . This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on the 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced "live release" rates of $100 \%$ for dogs and $93.8 \%$ for cats. All of live release for dogs is via return to owner (RTO). 96 of the 96 dogs served were RTO with 5 reported adopted. This makes for a total of 103. We assume the 7 additional
were from BOY 2019/2020 and ultimately adopted. 2 of the 32 cats served were RTO, 26 adopted, 2 were trqnsferred to other facilities and 2 were. Other small animals are statistically insignificant and not included here.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units $\times 365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay (LOS) = Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as $1-2$ days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Greenwich facility are based on serving +/125 dogs \& cats on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days. Doing so demonstrates the need for only 4 dog kennels and 2 cat cage to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 15 days for dogs and 23 for cats from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 11 dog kennels and 16 cat cages calculates an average LOS for dogs of 42 days with 183 for cats; representing the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit B projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 2,415 square feet at a cost range of between $\$ 966,000$ and $\$ 1,086,750$.

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, Greenwich's existing shelter meets minimum requirements:

- Primary enclosures (kennels \& cages) were observed to be in "Good" condition with dog kennels as Stainless Steel Bar \& Panel Gates and dividers;
- Kennel floors are resinous epoxy providing a solid, washable, waterproof surface:
- Kennel drainage was observed to be "Trench Drain at back of each kennel. Listed as "adequate". We assume individual floor drains of trench type in each kennel;
- Natural Light, is listed as "poor" as there are no windows in kennels or cage wards;
- Temperature Control is listed as "Operational" with no air conditioning \& condition unknown;
- Ventilation is separate for the kennels, listed as "operational with condition unknown;
- Sound Control is listed as "good" with treatment in the kennels.

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 280 per year. For cats, on the same basis, the capacity is 430 per year. Greenwich actually reported 8 more cat cages than were observed at the shelter. Despite this reducing the cat capacity based on "reported conditions" our view of excess capacity remains as the number of cats that can be accommodated is 215 rather than 430, with only 32 taken in in 2019.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years reduces from an initial 42 days to 41 . For cats the reduction is from 183 days to 178 . All are significantly greater than the assumed 14 days average LOS.

OPERATIONS
The Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2 019/2020 as follows:


Unlike the Intake History, Complaints Investigated show a steady increase over the three year period. The disparity between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In Greenwich's case the Complaints are 20 to 66 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Greenwich's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is below the WestCOG average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 298,396$ reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 4.76$, sixth lowest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Greenwich Animal Control responded to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services. They include Safety \& Identificaiton and offer Spay/Neuter services. They also listed affiliation with private Humane Societies. Greenwich also employs the services of volunteers to aid in shelter operation.

Greenwich issued one APCP Sterilzation Vouchers in 2018. One was utilized. Statistics for 2019 were not available.

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were also directly addressed. Greenwich includes Intake and Officer Impounding protocols, 10 days of Isolation for sick animals and State mandated 7 days for Minimum Stray Hold prior to adoption. They have Shelter Cleaning as well as Adoption Protocols along with unique protocols such as Building Emergency Evacuation.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 11 dog kennels and 16 cat cages Greenwich's need calculates as follows:

$$
36 \times 15=540 \text { minutes } / \text { day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=9 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires staffing to cover a total of 63 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the
future. At an assumed 35 hours per week of work time for a full time employee this requires 2 staff dedicated to feeding and cleaning.
Greenwich has 2 full time Animal Control Officers who only work 8 days each month (together). There is also 1 full time Kennel Maintainer. This is probably sufficient given the small number of animals the shelter serves versus its maximuim capacity. If the number of animals it serves increases significantly the need for increased staffing will become evident.

## CONCLUSION

With some minor issues noted, Greenwich's facility physically meets all standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV and appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. The building is approximately 15 years old and observed to be in good condition. Given this, its low cost of operations and its significant excess capacity suggests there is no need to consider replacing the existing facility. The Greenwich shleter could serve as a regional animal shelter for adjacent communities.

END OF PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT
Exhibits Follow

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.20 \%$ | Canines <br> $75 \%$ | Felines <br> $25 \%$ | Small others <br> $2 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 , 6 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | 3 |
| 2029 | 63,502 | 130 | 97 | 32 | 3 |
| 2039 | 64,358 | 131 | 99 | 33 | 3 |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | Canines 67\% | Felines 33\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 6 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 125 | 500 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 65 | 130 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 1,460 | 730 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Length of Stay Calculations
Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ .20\% of Populaton | 96 | 32 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 15 | 23 |


| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 630 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$$ |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only
4 kennels to service 96 dogs. Capacity is at least 280 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 2 cages - Capacity = 430

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.20 \%$ | Canines <br> $75 \%$ | Felines <br> $25 \%$ | Small others <br> $2 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 , 6 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | 3 |  |
| 2029 | 63,502 | 130 | 97 | 32 | 3 |  |
| 2039 | 64,358 | 131 | 99 | 33 | 3 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 41 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 59\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 27 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 125 | 1,375 |
|  |  |  |  | 16 | 65 | 1,040 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 4,015 | 5,840 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ .20\% of Populaton | 96 | 32 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 42 | 183 |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |  |  |
| 2,415 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$$ |  |  |
| 2,415 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,086,750$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

4 kennels to service 96 dogs. Capacity is at least 280 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 2 cages - Capacity $=430$

## Greenwich Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.20 \%$ | Canines <br> $75 \%$ | Felines <br> $25 \%$ | Small others <br> $2 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 62,657 | 128 | 96 | 32 | 3 |  |
| 2029 | $\mathbf{6 3 , 5 0 2}$ | 130 | 97 | 32 | 3 |  |
| 2039 | 64,358 | 131 | 99 | 33 | 3 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 41 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 59\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 27 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 125 | 1,375 |
|  |  |  |  | 16 | 65 | 1,040 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 4,015 | 5,840 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ .20\% of Populaton | 97 | 32 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 41 | 180 |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 2,415 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$$ |
| 2,415 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,086,750$ |

4 kennels to service 96 dogs. Capacity is at least 280 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 2 cages - Capacity $=430$

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.20 \%$ | Canines <br> $75 \%$ | Felines <br> $25 \%$ | Small others <br> $2 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 62,657 | 128 | 96 | 32 | 3 |  |
| 2029 | 63,502 | 130 | 97 | 32 | 3 |  |
| 2039 | 64,358 | 131 | 99 | 33 | 3 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | Canines 41\% | Felines 59\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 27 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 125 | 1,375 |
|  |  |  |  | 16 | 65 | 1,040 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 4,015 | 5,840 |  |  | 2,415 |
|  |  | 4,015 | 5,840 |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ .20\% of Populaton | 99 | 33 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 41 | 178 |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 2,415 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$$ |
| 2,415 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,086,750$ |
|  |  |  |  |

4 kennels to service 96 dogs. Capacity is at least 280 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 2 cages - Capacity $=430$

# Western Connecticut Council of Governments 

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For

## Region 2 - New Milford Animal Control



Mission: To enforce Connecticut Animal Control Statutes, educate the public and adopt animals.


## PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for New Milford, Connecticut (serving Bridgewater, Brookfield, New Fairfield, Sherman \& Roxbury and identified by APCP as "Region 2") analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the Region 2's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the New Milford - Region 2 Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Region 2's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Region 2's Intake trends follow the APCP's historical downward movement over the past twenty years.

Region 2's Animal Control services community strays for both dogs and cats. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity.

The directly reported 150 total animals served in 2019, which is 4 more than reported to APCP represent only $0.22 \%$ of Region 2's population, estimated at 68,771 . This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on the 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced "live release" rates of $96.4 \%$ for dogs and $83.3 \%$ for cats. The majority of live release for dogs is via return to owner (RTO). 114 of the 140 dogs served were RTO with 21
reported adopted and 6 were euthanized. This is one more than the total so we assume one was at the EOY 2019/2020. None of the 6 cats served were RTO, 5 wereadopted and 1 was euthanized. Other small animals are statistically insignificant and not included here.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units x $365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay (LOS) = Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as 1-2 days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Region 2 facility are based on serving +/- 150 dogs \& cats on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days. Doing so demonstrates the need for only 6 dog kennels and 1 cat cage to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 15 days for dogs and 61 for cats from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 18 dog kennels and 4 cat cages calculates an average LOS for dogs of 46 days with 243 for cats; representing the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity. Region 2 over reported 2 cat cages which is insignificant to our estimate of its capcity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit B projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 2,510 square feet at a cost range of between $\$ 1,004,000$ and \$1,129,500.

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, this shelter fails to meet minimum requirements:

- Primary enclosures (kennels \& cages) were observed to be in "fair" condition with dog kennels as chain link, not recommended and cat cages as Stainless Steel;
- Kennel floors are unsealed concrete listed in "Poor" condition:
- Kennel drainage was observed to be in "poor" condition and noted as "not recommended" because "trench" type drains do not support sanitary conditions;
- Natural Light, is listed as "fair" as there are small, clerestory windows in kennels;
- Temperature Control is listed as "Operational" with unit heaters, no air conditioning \& condition unknown;
- Ventilation - None observed.
- Sound Control - None provided.

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 460 per year. For cats, on the same basis, the capacity is 105 per year. Region 2 over reported by 2 cat cages. This represents a minimal decrease and does not alter our view of the shelter's excess capacity.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years increases from an initial 46 days to 52 . For cats the increase is from 243 days to 280. The increases are the result of New Fairfield opting out of participation in the Region 2 program. In July of 2020 New Fairfield hired a new shelter director and is now operating on its own. All the LOS numbers are significantly greater than the assumed 14 days average LOS.

## OPERATIONS

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Like the Intake History, Complaints Investigated show a steady, small decline over the three year period. The disparity between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In Region 2's case the Complaints are 17 to 20 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Region 2's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is above the WestCOG average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 371,852$ reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 5.41$, sixth highest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Region 2 responded to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services. They include Pet Training and Community Education services. They also listed affiliation with private Humane Societies.

Region 2 issued two APCP Sterilization Vouchers in 2018. Two were utilized. Statistics for 2019 were not available.

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were also directly addressed. Region 2 employs veterinarians for Euthanization and Cremation. In general Region 2 follows State Regulations as covered in Connecticut Chapter 435 - Dogs and Other Companion Animals, Kennels and Pet Shops and Chapter 955 - Cruelty to Animals.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 18 dog kennels and 4 cat cages Region 2's need calculates as follows:

$$
22 \times 15=330 \text { minutes/day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=5.5 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires staffing to cover a total of 38.5 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the future. At an assumed 35 hours per week of work time for a full time employee this requires 1.1 staff dedicated to feeding and cleaning.

Region has 1 full time Animal Control Officer and 3 full time Assistant ACO's. This is sufficient given the small number of animals the shelter serves.

## CONCLUSION

Region 2's facility physically fails to meet the standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV. The building is $50+$ years old, well past its useful life. It appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. Region 2's animal shelter should be replaced especially since it serves several communities as a regional shelter.

END OF PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Exhibits Follow

## New Milford Animal Shelter Planning Statistics (Region 2)

## shelterplanners.com

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.22 \%$ | Canines <br> $96 \%$ | Felines <br> $4 \%$ | Small others <br> $3 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 , 7 7 1}$ | 150 | 144 | $\mathbf{6}$ | 4 |  |
| 2029 | 57,131 | 125 | 120 | 5 | 3 |  |
| 2039 | 59,856 | 131 | 125 | 5 | 3 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | Canines 86\% | Felines14\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 7 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 125 | 750 |
|  |  |  |  | 1 | 65 | 65 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 2,190 | 365 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations

Based on 2019 Census Data
@ .22\% of Populaton
Available Length of Stay (LOS)

| 144 | 6 | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SF |  |  |  | t. Cost |
| 15 | 61 | 815 | \$ | 400 | \$ | 326,000 |
|  |  | 815 | \$ | 450 | \$ | 366,750 |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only 18 kennels to service 144 dogs. Capacity is at least 460 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cage - Capacity = 105

## New Milford Animal Shelter Planning Statistics (Region 2)

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.22 \%$ | Canines <br> $96 \%$ | Felines <br> $4 \%$ | Small others <br> $3 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 68,771 | 150 | 144 | 6 | 4 |  |
| 2029 | 57,131 | 125 | 120 | 5 | 3 |  |
| 2039 | 59,856 | 131 | 125 | 5 | 3 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces Available | Canines 82\% | Felines 18\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 22 | 18 | 4 | 18 | 125 | 2,250 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 65 | 260 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 6,570 | 1,460 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations

Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ .22\% of Populaton | 144 | 6 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 46 | 243 |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |  |  |
| 2,510 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$ 1,004,000$ |  |  |
| 2,510 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,129,500$ |  |  | 18 kennels to service 144 dogs. Capacity is at least 460 dogs

Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cage - Capacity = 105

## New Milford Animal Shelter Planning Statistics (Region 2)

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.22 \%$ | Canines <br> $96 \%$ | Felines <br> $4 \%$ | Small others <br> $3 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 68,771 | 150 | 144 | 6 | 4 |  |
| 2029 | 57,131 | 125 | 120 | 5 | 3 |  |
| 2039 | 59,856 | 131 | 125 | 5 | 3 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces Available | Canines 82\% | Felines 18\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 22 | 18 | 4 | 18 | 125 | 2,250 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 65 | 260 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 6,570 | 1,460 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ .22\% of Populaton | 120 | 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 55 | 293 |

Animal Reduction due to Fairfield dropping out after 2019

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |  |  |
| 2,510 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$ 1,004,000$ |  |  |
| 2,510 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,129,500$ |  |  | 18 kennels to service 144 dogs. Capacity is at least 460 dogs

Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cage - Capacity = 105

## New Milford Animal Shelter Planning Statistics (Region 2)

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.22 \%$ | Canines <br> $96 \%$ | Felines <br> $4 \%$ | Small others <br> $3 \%$ | Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 68,771 | 150 | 144 | 6 | 4 |  |
| 2029 | 57,131 | 125 | 120 | 5 | 3 |  |
| 2039 | 59,856 | 131 | 125 | 5 | 3 |  |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | Canines 82\% | Felines 18\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 22 | 18 | 4 | 18 | 125 | 2,250 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 65 | 260 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 6,570 | 1,460 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations

Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ .22\% of Populaton | 125 | 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 52 | 280 |

Animal Reduction due to Fairfield dropping out after 2019
Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 2,510 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$ 1,004,000$ |
| 2,510 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,129,500$ | 18 kennels to service 144 dogs. Capacity is at least 460 dogs

Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cage - Capacity = 105

## Western Connecticut Council of Governments

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For

## Newtown Animal Control



Mission: To provide the resources, programs, and to educate the public. To help lost, injured, and distressed animals, both wild and domestic. To ensure the safety of the public and to enforce animal laws. Also, to give unwanted animals a second chance and place them into suitable homes. We work with dogs that have behavioral issues to get them adoptable.


## PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for Newtown, Connecticut analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the community's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the Newtown Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Newtown's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Newtown's Intake trends appears to follow the APCP's historical downward movement over the past twenty years. 2019 direct report from Newtown shows greater intake.

Newtown Animal Control services community strays for both dogs and cats. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity.

The directly reported 152 total animals served in 2019, which is 49 more than reported to APCP represent only $0.55 \%$ of Newtown's population, estimated at 27,889 . This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on the 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced "live release" rates of $100 \%$ for dogs and $74.5 \%$ for cats. All of live release for dogs is via return to owner (RTO). 66 of the 87 dogs served were RTO with 21 reported adopted. 3 of the 55 cats served were RTO, 38 adopted, and 5 were euthanized. 9 are
unaccounted for and assumed to remain in the shelter at EOY 2019/2020 Other large and small animals are statistically insignificant and not included here.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units $\times 365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay (LOS) $=$ Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as 1-2 days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Newtown facility are based on serving +/- 158 dogs \& cats on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days, demonstrating the need for only 4 dog kennels and 3 cat cages to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 17 days for dogs and 20 for cats from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 18 dog kennels and 10 cat cages calculates an average LOS for dogs of 76 days with 66 for cats; which is the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit B projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 2,900 square feet at a cost range of between $\$ 1,160,000$ and \$1,305,000.

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, Newtown's existing shelter meets minimum requirements:

- Primary enclosures (kennels \& cages) were observed to be in "Good" condition with dog kennels as Stainless Steel Bar \& Panel Gates and dividers;
- Kennel floors are resinous epoxy providing a solid, washable, waterproof surface:
- Kennel drainage was observed to be "Trench Drain at the aisle was observed and listed as "Adequate" although individual kennel drains are more sanitary;
- Natural Light, is listed as "fair" with minimal window windows in kennels or cage wards;
- Temperature Control is listed as "Operationa and relatively newl" with air conditioning \& condition unknown;
- Ventilation is separate for the kennels, listed as condition unknown;
- Sound Control is listed as "adequate" with acoustical tile treatment in the kennels.

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 455 per year. For cats, on the same basis, the capacity is 260 per year. Newtown over reported 2 cat cages. This is insignificant to our study and does not alter our view of the shelter's excess capacity.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years reduces from an initial 76 days to 67 . For cats the reduction is from 66 days to 59 . All are significantly greater than the assumed 14 days average LOS.

## OPERATIONS

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Like the Intake History, Complaints Investigated show a decline over the three year period. The disparity between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In Newtown's case the Complaints are 36 to 80 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Newtown's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is well above the WestCOG average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 239,474$ reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 8.59$, highest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Newtown Animal Control responded to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services. They include Safety \& Identificaiton, Spay/Neuter services, Veterinarian services, Pet Training and Community Education. Newtown engages with numerous volunteers (we assumed at least 10) in a variety of programs. COVID-19 has changed their approach as volunteers must work from home.

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were not directly addressed. We can assume Newtown Animal Control follows State Regulations as covered in Connecticut Chapter 435 - Dogs and Other Companion Animals, Kennels and Pet Shops and Chapter 955 - Cruelty to Animals.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 18 dog kennels and 10 cat cages Newtown's need calculates as follows:

$$
28 \times 15=420 \text { minutes } / \text { day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=7 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires staffing to cover a total of 49 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the future. At an assumed 35 hours per week of work time for a full time employee this requires 1.4 staff dedicated to feeding and cleaning.

Newtown has 1 full time Animal Control Officer, 4 part time ACO's and 3 part time Kennel Staff. This is probably sufficient given the small number of animals the shelter serves versus its maximuim capacity. If the number of animals it serves increases significantly the need for increased staffing will become evident.

## CONCLUSION

With some minor issues noted, Newtown's facility physically meets all standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV and appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. The building is approximately 10 years old and observed to be in good condition. Given this and its significant excess capacity suggests there is no need to consider replacing the existing facility. The Newtown shelter could serve as a regional animal shelter fro adjacent communities.

END OF PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT
Exhibits Follow

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.57 \%$ | Canines <br> $55 \%$ | Felines <br> $35 \%$ | Small others <br> $2.5 \%$ | Large others <br> $1.3 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 27,889 | 158 | 87 | 55 | 4 | 2 |
| 2029 | 29,611 | 168 | 92 | 75 | 4 | 2 |
| 2039 | 31,440 | 178 | 62 | 80 | 5 | 2 |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Canines 57\% | Felines 43\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Animals |  | Total SF |  |
| Programmed Spaces $\quad 7$ | 4 | 3 | $4$ | $125$ |  | Total 500 |
|  |  |  | 3 | 65 |  | 195 |
| Days/Year | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  | 695 |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) | 1,460 | 1,095 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| @ X\% of Populaton | 87 | 55 | SF | Cost/SF |  | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 17 | 20 | 695 | \$ 400 | \$ | 278,000 |
|  |  |  | 695 | \$ 450 | \$ | 312,750 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this | Iter requir |  |  |  |  |  |

4 kennels to service 87 dogs. Capacity is at least 455 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 3 cages - Capacity = 260

Newtown Animal Shelter Planning Statistics shelterplanners.com

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.57 \%$ | Canines <br> $55 \%$ | Felines <br> $35 \%$ | Small others <br> $2.5 \%$ | Large others <br> $1.3 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 27,889 | 158 | 87 | 55 | 4 | 2 |
| 2029 | 29,611 | 168 | 92 | 75 | 4 | 2 |
| 2039 | 31,440 | 178 | 62 | 80 | 5 | 2 |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces Available | Canines 64\% | Felines36\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 28 | 18 | 10 | 18 | 125 | 2,250 |
|  |  |  |  | 10 | 65 | 650 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  | 2,900 |
|  |  | 6,570 | 3,650 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  |  |  |  |  |



4 kennels to service 39 dogs. Capacity is at least 455 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 2 cages - Capacity = $\mathbf{2 6 0}$

## Newtown Animal Shelter Planning Statistics <br> shelterplanners.com

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.57 \%$ | Canines <br> $55 \%$ | Felines <br> $35 \%$ | Small others <br> $2.5 \%$ | Large others <br> $1.3 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 27,889 | 158 | 87 | 55 | 4 | 2 |
| 2029 | 29,611 | 168 | 92 | 58 | 4 | 2 |
| 2039 | 31,440 | 178 | 98 | 62 | 5 | 2 |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 64 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 36\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 28 | 18 | 10 | 18 | 125 | 2,250 |
|  |  |  |  | 10 | 65 | 650 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 6,570 | 3,650 | Proje | Shelter Size | 900 |
| Available Animal Care <br> (Shelter Capacity) |  | 6,570 | 3,650 |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ X\% of Populaton | 92 | 58 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 71 | 63 |


| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 2,900 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$ 1,160,000$ |
| 2,900 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,305,000$ |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only
4 kennels to service 87 dogs. Capacity is at least 455 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 2 cages - Capacity $=\mathbf{2 6 0}$

## Newtown Animal Shelter Planning Statistics <br> shelterplanners.com

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.57 \%$ | Canines <br> $55 \%$ | Felines <br> $35 \%$ | Small others <br> $2.5 \%$ | Large others <br> $1.3 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 27,889 | 158 | 87 | 55 | 4 | 2 |
| 2029 | 29,611 | 168 | 92 | 58 | 4 | 2 |
| 2039 | 31,440 | 178 | 98 | 62 | 5 | 2 |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces Available | Canines 64\% | Felines 36\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 28 | 18 | 10 | 18 | 125 | 2,250 |
|  |  |  |  | 10 | 65 | 650 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 6,570 | 3,650 |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ X\% of Populaton | 98 | 62 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 67 | 59 |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 2,900 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$ 1,160,000$ |
| 2,900 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,305,000$ |

4 kennels to service 87 dogs. Capacity is at least 455 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 2 cages - Capacity $=\mathbf{2 6 0}$

# Western Connecticut Council of Governments 

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For

## Norwalk Animal Control



Mission: Public safety for the Citizens of Norwalk CT and the humane protection of the animals that live in Norwalk


## PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for Norwalk, Connecticut analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the community's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the Norwalk Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Norwalk's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Norwalk's Intake trends follow the APCP's historical downward movement over the past twenty years. Direct reporting for 2019 was for a total of 106, 2 less than reported to the APCP.

Norwalk Animal Control services community strays for both dogs but not cats. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity.

The directly reported 106 total animals (dogs) served in 2019 represent only $0.12 \%$ of Norwalk's population, estimated at 88,814 . This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on the 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced a "live release" rate of $94,3 \%$ for dogs. The majority of live release for dogs is via return to owner (RTO). 72 of the 106 dogs served were RTO with 28 reported adopted and 6 that were euthanized. Norwalk did not server an other large and small animals.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units x $365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay (LOS) $=$ Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as 1-2 days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Norwalk facility are based on serving +/- 106 dogs on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days, demonstrating the need for only 4 dog kennels to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 14 days for dogs from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 19 dog kennels calculates an average LOS for dogs of 65 days, which is the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit B projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 2,375 square feet at a cost range of between $\$ 950,000$ and \$1,068,750.

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, Norwalk's existing shelter fails to meet minimum standards:

- Primary enclosures (kennels) were observed to be in "fair" condition with dog kennels as chain link, not recommended;
- Kennel floors are sealed concrete only, listed in "Fair" condition;
- Kennel drainage was observed to be in "fair" condition and noted as "not recommended" because "trench" type drains do not support sanitary conditions;
- Natural Light, daylighting is listed as "Poor";
- Temperature Control is listed as Forced Air HVAC with air conditioning and overall condition unknnown;
- Ventilation is via the HVAC system, condition unknown;
- Sound Control is listed as acoustic tile with condition not addressed.

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 480 per year. Norwalk actually reported 1 fewer kennels than was observed at the shelter. This is insignificant and reinforces our view of overall excess capacity.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years reduces from an initial 65 days to 61 .

## OPERATIONS

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Like the Intake History, Complaints Investigated show a decline over the three year period. The disparity between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In Norwalk's case the Complaints are 22 to 24 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Norwalk's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is well below the WestCOG average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 265,908$ reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 2.99$, lowest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Norwalk Animal Control responded to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services. They include only Safety \& Identificaiton. Norwalk engages with privat Humane Societies. Norwalk has a Volunteer Disaster Animal Rescue Team which assists Norwalk Annimal Control during emergency events.

Norwalk issued thirteen APCP Steriilzation Vouchers in 2018. Eight were utilized. Statistics for 2019 were not available.

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were directly addressed. Norwalk increases the State mandated protocols in its shelter operation in terms of holding time prior to availability for adoption by one day and increases to 10 days a known sick animal in isolation. They include Animal ID, Shelter Cleaning, Adoption and Spay Neuter protocols.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 18 dog kennels and 10 cat cages Newtown's need calculates as follows:

$$
19 \times 15=95 \text { minutes/day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=1.6 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires staffing to cover a total of 11.2 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the future. At an assumed 35 hours per week of work time for a full time employee this requires only one staff member dedicated to feeding and cleaning.

Norwalk has 1 full time MACO Dog Warden, 1 ACO Dog Warden and 1 Kennel Manager. This is sufficient given the small number of animals the shelter serves versus its maximuim capacity. If the number of animals it serves increases significantly the need for increased staffing will become evident.

## CONCLUSION

Norwalk's facility physically fails to meet the standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV. The building is 40+ years old, past its useful life. It appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. Norwalks's animal shelter should be replaced or, at a minimum, renovated to meet minimum standards. Because of the number of animals it serves and the facility's marginal condition, Norwalk should, as an alternative, consider joining with adjacent communities in the development of a sub-regional shelter.

END OF PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT
Exhibits Follow

## Norwalk Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

shelterplanners.com


4 kennels to service 106 dogs. Capacity is at least 480 dogs




# Western Connecticut Council of Governments 

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For

## Stamford Animal Control



Mission: Our mission is to provide public safety to the City of Stamford by enforcing City \& State animal control laws.

## PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for Stamford, Connecticut analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the community's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the Stamford Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Stamford's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Stamford's Intake trends slightly follow the APCP's historical downward movement over the past twenty years. Direct reporting for 2019 was for a total of 317, 7 less than reported to the APCP.

Stamford Animal Control services community strays for both dogs and cats. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity.

The directly reported 324 total animals served in 2019 represent only $0.25 \%$ of Stamford's population, estimated at 129,638. This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on the 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced a "live release" rate of $98.5 \%$ for dogs and $76.1 \%$ for cats. The majority of live release for dogs is via return to owner (RTO). 144 of the 204 dogs served were RTO with 36 reported
adopted, 21 transferred to other facilities and 1 was euthanized. Stamford served other animals; 11 small and 1 large, insignificant to the totals and not included in this study.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units $\times 365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay (LOS) = Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as 1-2 days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Stamford facility are based on serving +/- 106 dogs on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days, demonstrating the need for only 8 dog kennels and 5 cat cages to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 14 days for dogs and 17 for cats from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 25 dog kennels and 15 cat cages calculates an average LOS for dogs of 45 days and for cats 50 days, which is the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit B projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 4,100 square feet at a cost range of between $\$ 1,640,000$ and \$1,845,000.

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, Stamford's existing shelter fails to meet minimums:

- Primary enclosures (kennels \& cages) were observed to be in "fair" condition with dog kennels as chain link, not recommended. Cat cages, also listed as being in "fair" condition are laminate 3-compartment;
- Kennel floors are sealed concrete only, with unsealed areas and open joints at CMU walls;
- Kennel drainage was observed to be in "poor" condition and noted as "not recommended" because "trench" type drains do not support sanitary conditions;
- Natural Light, daylighting is listed as "fair" with small clerestory windows in kennel run ward;
- Temperature Control is listed as Forced Air heat with air conditioning and overall condition unknown;
- Ventilation consists of "Thru-wall Fans", condition unknown;
- Sound Control is listed as "Poor" with open styrofoam at the ceiling.

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 630 per year and on the same basis, 380 for cats. Stamford actually reported 5 fewer kennels than were observed at the shelter. While relatively insignificant this further reinforces our view of excess capacity.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years reduces from an initial 45 days to 40 and for cats from 50 days to 45 . All are well in excess of the assumed 14 day LOS.

## OPERATIONS

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Like the Intake History, Complaints Investigated show a decline over the three year period. The disparity between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In Norwalk's case the Complaints are 15 to 20 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Norwalk's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is well below the WestCOG average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 421,825$ reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 3.25$, second lowest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Stamford Animal Control responded to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services. They include Pet Training and Community Educations. Stamford engages with private Humane Societies and has robust Volunteer participation.

Stamford issued ten APCP Sterilzation Vouchers in 2018. Seven were utilized. Statistics for 2019 were not available.

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were also directly addressed. Stamford follows the State mandated protocols in its shelter operation in terms of holding time prior to availability for adoption, they include Intake, Innoculation, Shelter Cleaning, Adoption And Spay Neuter protocols.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 25 dog kennels and 15 cat cages Stamford's need calculates as follows:

$$
40 \times 15=600 \text { minutes/day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=10 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires staffing to cover a total of 70 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the future. At an assumed 35 hours per week of work time for a full time employee this requires two staff members dedicated to feeding and cleaning.

Stamford has 1 full time MACO, 3 Assistant ACO's and 1 part time Kennel Manager and 1 part time Volunteer Coordinator. This appears to be sufficient given the small number of animals the shelter serves versus its maximuim capacity. If the number of animals it serves increases significantly the need for increased staffing will become evident.

## CONCLUSION

Stamford's facility physically fails to meet the standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV. The building is 33+ years old, nearing the end of its useful life. It appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. Stamford's animal shelter should be replaced or, at a minimum, renovated to meet minimum standards. Because of the number of animals it serves, Stamford should consider joining with adjacent communities in the development of a regional shelter.

END OF PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT
Exhibits Follow


## Stamford Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.25 \%$ | Canines <br> $63 \%$ | Felines <br> $34 \%$ | Small others <br> $3 \%$ | Large others <br> $0.3 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 129,638 | 324 | 204 | 109 | 11 | 1 |
| 2029 | 137,143 | 343 | 216 | 115 | 12 | 1 |
| 2039 | 145,083 | 363 | 228 | 122 | 12 | 1 |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 63 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 38\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 40 | 25 | 15 | 25 | 125 | 3,125 |
|  |  |  |  | 15 | 65 | 975 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 9,125 | 5,475 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ .25\% of Populaton | 204 | 109 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 45 | 50 |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 4,100 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$ 1,640,000$ |
| 4,100 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,845,000$ | 8 kennels to service 204 dogs. Capacity is at least 630 dogs

Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 5 cages - Capacity = 380

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.25 \%$ | Canines <br> $63 \%$ | Felines <br> $34 \%$ | Small others <br> $3 \%$ | Large others <br> $0.3 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 129,638 | 324 | 204 | 109 | 11 | 1 |
| 2029 | 137,143 | 343 | 216 | 115 | 12 | 1 |
| 2039 | 145,083 | 363 | 228 | 122 | 12 | 1 |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces <br> Available | Canines 63\% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 38 \% \end{gathered}$ | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 40 | 25 | 15 | 25 | 125 | 3,125 |
|  |  |  |  | 15 | 65 | 975 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  | 9,125 | 5,475 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Length of Stay Calculations <br> Based on 2019 Census Data

| @ .25\% of Populaton | 216 | 115 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) | 42 | 47 |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 4,100 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$ 1,640,000$ |
| 4,100 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,845,000$ | 8 kennels to service 204 dogs. Capacity is at least 630 dogs

Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 5 cages - Capacity $=380$

## Stamford Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.25 \%$ | Canines <br> $63 \%$ | Felines <br> $34 \%$ | Small others <br> $3 \%$ | Large others <br> $0.3 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 129,638 | 324 | 204 | 109 | 11 | 1 |
| 2029 | 137,143 | 343 | 216 | 115 | 12 | 1 |
| 2039 | 145,083 | 363 | 228 | 122 | 12 | 1 |


| Anticipated Shelter Statistics | Spaces Available | Canines 63\% | Felines$38 \%$ | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 15 | Animals | SF/Animal | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces | 40 | 25 |  | 25 | 125 | 3,125 |
|  |  |  |  | 15 | 65 | 975 |
| Days/Year |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care |  | 9,125 | 5,475 | Proje | Shelter Size | 4,100 |

## Length of Stay Calculations

Based on 2019 Census Data
@ .25\% of Populaton
Available Length of Stay (LOS)

| 228 | 122 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 40 | 45 |

Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only

| Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SF | Cost/SF | Est. Cost |  |
| 4,100 | $\$$ | 400 | $\$ 1,640,000$ |
| 4,100 | $\$$ | 450 | $\$ 1,845,000$ | 8 kennels to service 204 dogs. Capacity is at least 630 dogs

Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 5 cages - Capacity $=380$

## Western Connecticut Council of Governments

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For
Weston Animal Control


Mission: We are responsible for all Domestic and Wildlife safety and control.

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for Weston, Connecticut analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the community's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the Weston Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Weston's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Weston's Intake reports to APCP's are incomplete. Direct reporting for 2019 was for a total of 35 which represents a significant increase from the past two years.

Weston Animal Control services community strays for dogs with no cats reported. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity.

The directly reported 35 total animals (dogs) served in 2019 represent only $0.34 \%$ of Weston's population, estimated at 10,259 . This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on the 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced a "live release" rate of $100 \%$ for dogs. The majority of live release for dogs is via return to owner (RTO). 35 of the 35 dogs served were RTO. Weston did not serve any other animals.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units x $365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay (LOS) $=$ Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as 1-2 days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Weston facility are based on serving +/- 35 dogs on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days, demonstrating the need for only 2 dog kennels to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 21 days for dogs from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 25 dog kennels and 15 cat cages calculates an average LOS for dogs of 45 days and for cats 50 days, which is the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit B projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 625 square feet at a cost range of between \$250,000 and \$281,250.

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, Weston's existing shelter fails to meet minimums:

- Primary enclosures (kennels) were observed to be in "fair" condition with dog kennels as chain link, not recommended;
- Kennel floors are unsealed concrete only listed in "fair" condition;
- Kennel drainage was observed to be in "fair" condition and noted as "not recommended" because "trench" type drains do not support sanitary conditions;
- Natural Light, daylighting is listed as "good";
- Temperature Control is listed as Forced Air with no air conditioning, condition unknown;
- Ventilation is porvided via the HVAC with condition unknown;
- Sound Control - None provided.

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 126 per year.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years reduces from an initial 52 days to 51 This is well in excess of the assumed 14 day LOS.

## OPERATIONS

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture’s "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Complaints Investigated show a decline over the three year period. The disparity between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In Weston's case the Complaints are 22 to 1,211 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Weston's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is well above the WestCOG average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 86,640$ reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 8.45$, second highest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Weston Animal Control responded to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services. They includeed only Safety \& Identification. Weston does engage with private Humane Societies

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were not directly addressed. Weston follows the State mandated protocols in its shelter operation in terms of holding time prior to availability for adoption as well as all State mandates for Animal Control.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 5 dog kennels Weston's need calculates as follows:

$$
5 \times 15=75 \text { minutes } / \text { day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=1.25 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires staffing to cover a total of 8.75 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the future. At an assumed 35 hours per week of work time for a full time employee this requires only one staff member dedicated to feeding and cleaning.

Weston has 1 full time Animal Control Officer and 1 part time. This appears to be sufficient given the small number of animals the shelter serves versus its maximuim capacity. If the number of animals it serves increases significantly the need for increased staffing will become evident.

## CONCLUSION

Westonl's facility physically fails to meet the standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV. The building is 20+ years old, approaching its useful life. It appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. Weston's animal shelter should be replaced or, at a minimum, renovated to meet minimum standards. Because of the minimum number of animals it serves, Weston should, as an alternative, consider joining with adjacent communities in the development of a subregional shelter.

## Weston Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

shelterplanners.com


## Weston Animal Shelter Planning Statistics

shelterplanners.com



| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals $0.34 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | Small others | Large others |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 10,259 | 35 | 35 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2029 | 10,379 | 35 | 35 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2039 | 10,500 | 36 | 36 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces <br> Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 0\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |  |
| Program | d Spaces | 5 | 5 | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125 \\ 65 \end{gathered}$ |  | $625$ $0$ |
| Days/Yea |  |  | 365 | 365 |  |  |  |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 1,825 | 0 | Projec | Shelter Siz |  | 25 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation | ation |
| @ .34\% of Populaton |  |  |  | 36 | 0 | SF | Cost/SF |  | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay (LOS) |  |  | 51 | \#DIV/0! | 625 | \$ 400 | \$ | 250,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 625 | \$ 450 |  | 281,250 |

# Western Connecticut Council of Governments 

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For

## Westport Animal Control



Mission: As being the Animal Control Officer it is my duty to perform and enforce all Ct. State Statutes and town of Westport Municipal Ordinances related to animals. Also, to provide for the public's safety in regard to dogs, cats, and other domestic animals, sick or injured wildlife. Intake of impounded animals. Adoption of abandoned animals and medical care.

## PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for Westport, Connecticut analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the community's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the Westport Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Westport's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Westport's Intake report for the past three years is incomplete so we cannot determine if it matches the downward movement consistent with APCP's 20 year trend. Directly reported intake was 150 for 2019, 125 higher than that reported to APCP leading us to believe the statistics we received from APCP are invalid.

Westport Animal Control services community strays for dogs only. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity.

The directly reported 150 total animals (dogs) served in 2019 represent only $0.54 \%$ of Westport's population, estimated at 28,015 . This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on the 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced a "live release" rate of $100 \%$ for dogs. The majority of live release for dogs is via return to
owner (RTO). 141 of the 150 dogs served were RTO with 9 adopted. Westport served no other animals.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units $\times 365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay (LOS) = Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as $1-2$ days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Westport facility are based on serving +/- 150 dogs on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days, demonstrating the need for only 6 dog kennels to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 15 days for dogs from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 10 dog kennels calculates to an average LOS for dogs of 24 days, which is the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit B projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 1,250 square feet at a cost range of between $\$ 500,000$ and \$562,500.

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, Westport's existing shelter fails to meet minimums:

- Primary enclosures (kennels) were observed to be in "fair" condition with dog kennels as chain link, not recommended;
- Kennel floors are sealed concrete only, with unsealed areas and cracking observed;
- Kennel drainage was observed to be in "fair" condition and noted as "not recommended" because "trench" type drains do not support sanitary conditions;
- Natural Light, daylighting is listed as "acceptable" with windows in the kennel run ward;
- Temperature Control is listed as Forced air heat with "some" air conditioning, condtition unknown;
- Ventilation consists of "Thru-wall Fans", condition unknown;
- Sound Control is listed as "fair" with acoustical tile ceilings.

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 260 per year.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years reduces from an initial 24 days to 23 . This is well in excess of the assumed 14 day LOS.

## OPERATIONS

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Westport's call history, like its Intake history, is lacking data for 2017 and 2018. The disparity in 2019 between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In Westport's case the Complaints are 90 to 110 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Westport's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is above the WestCOG average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 155,998$ reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 5.57$, fourth highest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Westport Animal Control responded to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services. They offer Veterinary Services and Pet Education/Training.

Westport issued one APCP Sterilzation Voucher in 2018. One was utilized. Statistics for 2019 were not available.

Westport partners with several groups focused on animal welfare. "WASA" works hand in hand with Anial Control in both day to day operations by assisting with walking dogs as well as the long-term placement of impounds. This group is also responsible for significant fundraising used to provide veterinary car to dogs that have been impounded by Animal Control.
"TAILS" provides housing for felines that come through Westport Animal Control intake. They have a foster network in place and assists with veterinary care for cats. This group also works with Animal Control and the community to remediate feral cat colonies through both education and TNR strategies.
"Wildlife in Crisis" is dedicated to the rehabilitation and care of wildlife that Animal Control comes into contact with. They also serve as an informational resource for the Department and the community.

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were not directly addressed. We assume Westport follows the State mandated protocols in its shelter operation in terms of holding time prior to availability for adoption and all other mandates for Animal Control.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 10 dog kennels and 10 cat cages Westport's need calculates as follows:

$$
20 \times 15=300 \text { minutes/day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=5 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires staffing to cover a total of 35 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the future. At an assumed 35 hours per week of work time for a full time employee this requires only one staff member dedicated to feeding and cleaning.

Westport has 1 full time Animal Control Officer and 1 full Time Assistant ACO. Staffing appears to be sufficient given the small number of animals the shelter serves versus its maximuim capacity one ACO may be able to handle cleaning and feeding. If the number of animals Westport serves increases significantly the need for increased staffing will become evident.

## CONCLUSION

Westport's facility physically fails to meet the standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV. The building is 30+ years old, approaching its useful life. It appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. Westport's animal shelter should be replaced or, at a minimum, renovated to meet minimum standards. Because of the minimum number of animals it serves, Westport should, as an alternative, consider joining with adjacent communities in the development of a regional shelter.

END OF PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT
Exhibits Follow


| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals $0.54 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canines } \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | Small others | Large others |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 28,015 | 150 | 150 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2029 | 29,340 | 157 | 157 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2039 | 30,728 | 165 | 165 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces <br> Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 0\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |  |
| Programmed Spaces |  | 10 | 10 | 0 | Animals 10 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { SF/Animal } \\ 125 \\ 65 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total SF } \\ 1,250 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  | 1,250 |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 3,650 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| @ .54\% of Populaton |  |  | 150 | 0 | SF | Cost/SF |  | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay |  | OS) | 24 | \#DIV/0! | 1,250 | \$ 400 | \$ | 500,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1,250 | \$ 450 | \$ | 562,500 |


| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals $0.54 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Canines } \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Felines } \\ 0 \% \end{gathered}$ | Small others | Large others |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 28,015 | 150 | 150 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2029 | 29,340 | 157 | 157 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2039 | 30,728 | 165 | 165 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces <br> Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 0\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |  |
| Programmed Spaces |  | 10 | 10 | 0 | Animals 10 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { SF/Animal } \\ 125 \\ 65 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total SF } \\ 1,250 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  | 1,250 |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 3,650 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| @ .54\% of Populaton |  |  | 157 | 0 | SF | Cost/SF |  | Est. Cost |
| Available Length of Stay |  | OS) | 23 | \#DIV/0! | 1,250 | \$ 400 | \$ | 500,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1,250 | \$ 450 | \$ | 562,500 |



# Western Connecticut Council of Governments 

Preliminary<br>Needs Assessment Study

For
Wilton Animal Control


Mission: Wilton Animal Control is a division of the Wilton Police Department that enforces State Laws in regard to domestic pets and wildlife. We also are tasked with enforcing both Wilton Dog Ordinances (10C-2 Running at large \& 10C-9 Removal of Dog Waste). Animal Control investigates reports of animal bites, roaming dogs, animal cruelty, excessive barking complaints, sick or injured domestic pets, and sick or injured wildlife. We enforce rabies control by quarantining biting animals pursuant to State Law and investigate reports of potentially rabid wildlife. We house and care for homeless and abandoned domestic pets and find suitable homes for them.

## PRELIMINARY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

This Preliminary Needs Assessment Study for Wilton, Connecticut analyzes the optimum sizing for an animal shelter capable of serving the community's sheltering needs over the next 20+ years. This Study also includes analysis of the existing facility, operated as the Wilton Animal Control Shelter.

Statistics from the Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) provides a view of Wilton's intake and outcomes for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Wilton's Intake shows a downward movement consistent with APCP's 20 year trend. Directly reported intake was 66 for 2019, 30 higher than that reported to APCP.

Wilton Animal Control services community strays for dogs and cats. Based on data submitted, the current facility has significant excess capacity.

The directly reported 66 total animals (dogs) served in 2019 represent only $0.35 \%$ of Wilton's population, estimated at 19,002. This is well below the national average range of $3-4 \%$ of the human population. We believe this is largely due to the nature of the operation and the availablity of private humane groups in the WestCOG territory. Significant numbers of Owner surrenders are most likely taking place at those facilities.

Based on the 2019 directly reported data, the Animal Control Shelter produced a "live release" rate of $98.1 \%$ for dogs and $37.5 \%$ for cats. The majority of live release for dogs is via return to owner (RTO). 51 of the 54 dogs served were RTO with 2 adopted and 1 euthanized. Wilton served other animals, 3 small and 2 large. These are statistically insignificant and not included in this study.

## SHELTER SIZING

The most important factor in accommodating the number of animals to be housed is calculation of "available animal care days" the shelter can provide. Each individual kennel or cage represents the ability to provide 365 animal care days annually. So, the number of housing units x $365=$ available animal care days.

Average Length of Stay (LOS) $=$ Total animal care days $\div$ Animals served/year and is predicated, of course, on the number of available housing units in a particular shelter.

Some animals may stay as little as 1-2 days while other may stay for 30 days or more. The Association of Shelter Veterinarians (ASV) considers anything beyond a 1 to 2 week stay to be "long term". The Connecticut mandate for holding prior to release for adoption is 7 days. We will use the ASV 14-day average as the basis for our calculations noting that using 7 days would double the capacity.

Optimum sizing calculations for the Wilton facility are based on serving +/- 54 dogs and 8 cat on an annual basis setting the minimum number of spaces of animal housing to achieve at least an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days, demonstrating the need for only 2 dog kennels and 1 cat cage to handle the current, annual loads. This number of animal housing "spots" provides an initial average (LOS) of 14 days for dogs and 46 for cats from intake to release. (Refer to Exhibit A)

Our "2019 Existing Conditions" analysis (Exhibit B) with the shelter's existing 10 dog kennels and 10 cat cages calculates to an average LOS for dogs of 68 days and for cats 456 days, which is the facility's current capacity. As previously stated, the facility has significant excess capacity.

Based on the number of animal housing units, Exhibit B projects and calculates the value of a new shelter of 1,900 square feet at a cost range of between \$760,000 and \$855,000.

When measured against the Association of Shelter Veterinarian's (ASV) "Guidelines for Standards of Care for Animal Shelters" (2010) - Facility Design and Environment section, Wilton's existing shelter fails to meet minimums:

- Primary enclosures (kennels \& cages) were observed to be in "fair" condition with dog kennels as chain link, not recommended. Cat cages listed as "adequate" are painted wire cages;
- Kennel floors are sealed concrete only, with spalling and cracks observed;
- Kennel drainage was observed to be in "fair" condition and noted as "not recommended" because "trench" type drains do not support sanitary conditions;
- Natural Light, daylighting is listed as "adequate with high windows in runs and generous windows for cats";
- Temperature Control is listed as Forced air with no air conditioning, condition unknown;
- Ventilation - None provided;
- Sound Control - None provided.

Over time, population growth can cause an increase in the total animals served, slowly reducing the shelter's capacity. In Bethel's case this is negligible and we anticipate any potential growth will be overcome via the facility's excess capacity far into the future.

Based on 2019 data, the current maximum capacity to house dogs with an average Length of Stay (LOS) of 14 days is at least 260 per year and for cats, 260 as well. Wilton actually reported 2 more kennels and 4 more cat cages than were observed at the shelter. These variants do not materially affect our view of excess capacity.

Despite the considerable excess capacity, we continued our analysis looking at future projections in 2029 and 2039. These can be found in Exhibits C \& D and reveal that average LOS for dogs in 20 years reduces from an initial 68 days to 63 and for cats reduces from 456 days to 422 . These are well in excess of the assumed 14 day LOS.

## OPERATIONS

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture's "Animal Population Control Project" (APCP) also provides a view of Bethel's Call History for 2017/2018 through 2019/2020 as follows:


Wilton's call history follows a descending trend over the three years shown in the graph above. We note the 2017 "Complaints Investigated" appears out of line with the figures for 2018 and 2019. We believe this to be a mis-entered amount. The disparity between the high number of "cases" versus the minimal number of "animal bites" and "summons/infractions" is true to the overall trends in the WestCOG jurisdictions. In

Wilton's case the Complaints are 95 to 305 times the numbers of bites and/or summons/infractions. Again, 2017 appears to represent an anomoly.

Wilton was one of only two jurisdictions that provided very detailed information regarding their call/case load. Their format and accounting for calls can serve as a model for all of the WestCOG Animal Control offices in the future.

## OPERATIONAL COSTS

Wilton's annual cost of Animal Control Operations is above the WestCOG average of $\$ 5.18$ per capita. At $\$ 110,404$ reported, the cost per capita is $\$ 5.81$, fifth highest in the WestCOG area.

## SHELTER PROGRAMS

Wilton Animal Control did not respond to our request they identify "Programs" such as: Safety \& Identificaiton; Spay/Neuter; Veterinary Services; Pet Training; Community Pet Education or Euthanasia Services.

## SHELTER PROTOCOLS

Shelter protocols were directly addressed. Wilton follows the State mandated protocols in its shelter operation in terms of holding time prior to availability for adoption with an additional 3 days (10) for Isolation of sick animals. Wilton has Intake, Innoculation, Shelter Cleaning and Adoption protocols plus some unique protocols such as Taser, Bite Stick-Baton, Body Cam and Dog Bite/Quarantine.

## STAFFING

The National Animal Control Association (NACA) and the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) project staffing needs for animal care in shelters. They recommend 15 minutes per animal per day as the minimum for feeding and cleaning. At 10 dog kennels and 10 cat cages Wilton's need calculates as follows:

$$
20 \times 15=300 \text { minutes } / \text { day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr} .=5 \text { Hours per day }
$$

This requires staffing to cover a total of 35 hours per week maximum, assuming all housing units contain animals, which we know they don't and are unlikely to in the future. At an assumed 35 hours per week of work time for a full time employee this requires only one staff member dedicated to feeding and cleaning.

Wilton has 1 full time Animal Control Officer and in 2019 had 1 Part Time Assistant ACO who retired at EOY 2020. Staffing is now insufficient. However, given the small number of animals the shelter serves versus its maximuim capacity the ACO may be able to handle cleaning and feeding. If the number of animals Wilton serves increases significantly the need for increased staffing will become evident.

## CONCLUSION

Wilton's facility physically fails to meet the standard requirements currently recommended by the ASV. The building is 37 years old, approaching its useful life. It appears to be appropriately staffed to provide sufficient care for the animals. Wilton's animal shelter should be replaced or, at a minimum, renovated to meet minimum standards. Because of the minimum number of animals it serves, Wilton should, as an alternative, consider joining with adjacent communities in the development of a regional shelter.

Exhibits Follow



2 kennels to service 54 dogs. Capacity is at least 260 dogs
Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cage - Capacity = 260


| Year | Population <br> Census Est. | Animals <br> $0.35 \%$ | Canines <br> $82 \%$ | Felines <br> $12 \%$ | Small others Large others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 19,002 | 66 | 54 | 8 |  |
| 2029 | 19,793 | 69 | 56 | 8 |  |
| 2039 | 20,533 | 71 | 58 | 9 |  |



| Year | Population Census Est. | Animals $0.35 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 82 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 12\% | Small others | Large others |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 19,002 | 66 | 54 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| 2029 | 19,793 | 69 | 56 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| 2039 | 20,533 | 71 | 58 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Shelter Statistics |  | Spaces Available | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canines } \\ 50 \% \end{gathered}$ | Felines 50\% | Rule of Thumb Shelter Sizing |  |  |  |
|  |  | Animals |  |  | SF/Animal |  | Total SF |
| Programmed Spaces |  |  | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 125 |  | 1,250 |
|  |  |  | 10 |  |  | 65 |  | 650 |
| Days/Year |  |  | 365 | 365 | Projected Shelter Size |  | 1,900 |  |
| Available Animal Care Days (Shelter Capacity) |  |  | 3,650 | 3,650 |  |  |  |  |
| Length of Stay Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Based on 2019 Census Data |  |  |  |  | Construction Cost Calculation |  |  |  |
| @ .35\% of Populaton |  |  | 58 | 9 | SF | Cost/SF |  | Est. Cost |
| Available | ength of Stay | OS) | 63 | 422 | 1,900 | \$ 400 | \$ | 760,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1,900 | \$ 450 |  | 855,000 |
| Assuming a 14 Day LOS Average this shelter requires only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 kennels to service 54 dogs. Capacity is at least 260 dogs |  |  |  | Cats @ 14 Day Average requires only 1 cage - Capacity = 260 |  |  |  |  |

# WestCOG Regional Animal Control Study 

## Shelter Surveys
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Appendix D


## Bethel Animal Control

Approximate Age of Facility: 50+ years
Approximate Size of Facility: 2,130 GSF
Barrier Free Compliance: Facility is non-compliant in multiple categories including restroom layout, door operation, and level changes at entrances.

## General Condition of Facility:

The single building has a metal roof and patchwork of CMU, metal, and wood siding in poor condition. Numerous holes and evidence of leaking was observed. All interior areas are old, worn out, and in generally poor condition.

| No. | Item | Quan. | Size (ft) | Type | Condition | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 11 | $3 \times 10$ | Galvanized Chain Link* | Fair |  |
| 2 | Dog Runs Isolation/Quarantine | 2 | $3 \times 10$ | Galvanized Chain Link* with plexiglass and metal panels | Fair | No separate air-handling systems to prevent infection of other dogs |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 0 |  |  |  | One approximately $8 \times 16 \mathrm{ft}$ chain link outdoor enclosure |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Open Trench Drain at Aisle** | Poor | Hospital sink for solids |
| 5 | Cages | 6 | $2 \times 2$ | Galvanized Chain Link* | Fair |  |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Sealed Concrete | Fair | Cracking and unsealed areas; open joints at CMU walls |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  | $1 \times 1$ | Vinyl Tile | Poor |  |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Painted CMU and wood siding | Fair |  |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Painted gypsum board | Acceptable |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  |  | Plastic sheeting over insulation | Fair | Some open seams and punctures |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  | $2 \times 4$ | Acoustical Tile | Fair |  |
| 12 | Daylighting |  |  |  | Poor | Almost none |
| 13 | Temperature Control |  |  | Forced Air Heat | Unknown | Minimally operational; no AC |
| 14 | Ventilation |  |  | Thru-wall Fans | Unknown | Not operating during visit |
| 15 | Sound control |  |  |  | Poor |  |
| 16 | Fire Alarm/Sprinkler |  |  |  | Fair | Smoke detection only |
| 17 | Cleaning Systems |  |  | Bathing / Laundry / Run cleaning system | Acceptable |  |
| 18 | Food Prep/Wash |  |  | Table in Ward | Fair | Food stored in metal cans |

## Notes:

* Chain link is not recommended for use in dog runs because the material can trap toenails and cause injury. It is also difficult to properly clean.
** Open trench drains are not recommended because they harbor pathogens and are difficult to properly maintain. Drains in aisles allow unsanitary materials to be tracked around shelter.


SITE PLAN

## Bethel Animal Control

## 154 GRASSY PLAIN STREET

 BETHEL, CTAPPROXIMATE AREA: 6.16AC

NOTE: LOT AREA BASED ON AERIAL MAPPING GIS DATA
$\qquad$

BETHEL ANIMAL CONTROL
154 GRASSY PLAIN STREET BETHEL, CT

APPROXIMATE AREA: 2,130 GSF


SCALE: $1 / 16$ " = 1' - $0 "$


LEGEND
1 RECEPTION / OFFICE
2 FOOD PREP / LAUNDRY
3 RESTROOM
4 INTERIOR DOG RUNS
5 GARAGE / STORAGE



## Danbury Animal Control

Age of Facility: 1 year
Approximate Size of Facility: 3,470 GSF
Barrier Free Compliance: Facility in general appears to be compliant.
General Condition of Facility:
The single building has a metal roof with low CMU and high metal siding walls that are in excellent condition. All interior areas are new and in excellent condition.

| No. | Item | Quan. | Size (ft) | Type | Condition | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 24 | $4 \times 6$ | SS Bar \& Panel Gates CMU Dividers | Good |  |
| 2 | Dog Runs Isolation/Quarantine | 0 |  |  |  | No isolated runs provided |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 24 | $4 \times 10$ | SS Bar \& Panel Gates CMU Dividers | Good | No separate fenced Exercise Yard provided |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Trench Drain at Aisle | Good | Drainage at front of runs not optimal for cleaning or operations |
| 5 | Cages | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Resinous Epoxy | Good |  |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  | $1 \times 1$ | Vinyl Tile | Good | Vinyl tile is not optimal because of maintenance issues with seams |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Painted CMU | Good |  |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Painted gypsum board | Good |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  |  | Insulated roof decking | Good |  |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  | $2 \times 4$ | Acoustical Tile | Good |  |
| 12 | Daylighting |  |  |  | Good | Clerestory windows above dog runs |
| 13 | Temperature Control |  |  | Forced Air Heat No Air Conditioning | Unknown | Operational |
| 14 | Ventilation |  |  | HVAC System Returns | Unknown | No separate ventilation systems in dog runs |
| 15 | Sound control |  |  |  | Fair | Minimal sound absorption in dog run areas |
| 16 | Fire Alarm/Sprinkler |  |  | Detector and Alarm System | Adequate | No sprinklers observed |
| 17 | Bathing/Grooming Laundry Run Cleaning |  |  | SS Tub <br> Residential W\&D Hose bib (H+C?) | Good |  |
| 18 | Food Prep/Wash |  |  | Kitchen Area | Good | Enclosed Room |

## Danbury Animal Control

## 23 PLUMTREES ROAD DANBURY, CT



APPROXIMATE AREA: 144.26 AC.

NOTE: LOT AREA BASED ON AERIAL MAPPING GIS DATA
DANBURY LOCATION PLAN

DANBURY ANIMAL CONTROL
23 PLUMTREES ROAD
DANBURY CT.

APPROXIMATE AREA: 3,470 GSF


| LEGEND |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | RECEPTION / WAITING |
| 2 | OFFICE |
| 3 | RESTROOM |
| 4 | INTERIOR DOG RUNS |
| 5 | EXTERIOR DOG RUNS |
| 6 | MECHANICAL / STORAGE |
| 7 | STAFF BREAK ROOM |
| 8 | CONFERENCE ROOM |
| 9 | LOCKER ROOM |
| 10 | LAUNDRY |
| 11 | GROOMING \& BATHING |




## Greenwich Animal Control

Approximate Age of Facility: +15 years
Approximate Size of Facility: 3,200 GSF
Barrier Free Compliance: Facility in general appears to be compliant.
General Condition of Facility:
The single building has an asphalt shingle roof and CMU walls that are in good condition. All interior areas are in good and well-maintained condition.

| No. | Item | Quan. | Size (ft) | Type | Condition | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 9 | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \times 6+ \\ & 4 \times 10 \end{aligned}$ | SS Bar \& Panel Gates and Dividers | Good | Back-to-back |
| 2 | Dog Runs Isolation/Quarantine | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \times 6+ \\ & 4 \times 8 \end{aligned}$ | SS Bar \& Panel Gates and Dividers | Good | In separate Ward Back-to-back |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 0 |  |  |  | Approximately $12 \times 30 \mathrm{ft}$ fenced Exercise Yard provided |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Trench Drain at back of each run | Adequate | Hospital sink for solids |
| 5 | Cages | $6+2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \& 4 X \\ & 2.5 \times 2.5 \end{aligned}$ | SS Cage with raised furniture platform | Adequate | Separate compartments for food and litter is better |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Resinous Epoxy | Good |  |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  | $1 \times 1$ | Vinyl Tile | Adequate | Vinyl tile is not optimal because of maintenance issues with seams |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Painted CMU | Good |  |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Painted CMU and gypsum board | Good |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  |  | Tectum Decking | Good |  |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  | $2 \times 4$ | Acoustical Tile | Good |  |
| 12 | Daylighting |  |  |  | Poor | No windows in run or cage wards |
| 13 | Temperature Control |  |  | Forced Air Heat | Unknown | Operational; no AC |
| 14 | Ventilation |  |  | Separate ventilation systems in dog runs | Unknown | Operational |
| 15 | Sound control |  |  |  | Good | Tectum ceiling and baffle slots in upper CMU walls |
| 16 | Fire Alarm/Sprinkler |  |  |  | Good | Both provided |
| 17 | Bathing / Grooming Laundry Run Cleaning |  |  | SS Tub Groom Table Residential W\&D $\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{C}$ Hose bib | Good |  |
| 18 | Food Prep/Wash |  |  | Kitchen Area | Good | Enclosed Room |



SITE PLAN

## Greenwhich Animal Control

## 393 NORTH STREET GREENWHICH, CT

APPROXIMATE AREA: 144.26 AC

NOTE: LOT AREA BASED ON AERIAL MAPPING GIS DATA


GREENWHICH LOCATION PLAN

GREENWHICH ANIMAL CONTROL
393 NORTH STREET
GREENWHICH CT.

APPROXIMATE AREA: 3,200 GSF


| LEGEND |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | RECEPTION / WAITING |
| 2 | OFFICE |
| 3 | RESTROOM |
| 4 | INTERIOR DOG RUNS |
| 5 | FOOD PREP |
| 6 | MECHANICAL / STORAGE |
| 7 | CAT CAGE WARD |
| 8 | CAT / SMALL MAMMAL CAGE WARD |
| 9 | COUNSELING ADOPTION ROOM |
| 10 | LAUNDRY |
| 11 | GROOMING \& BATHING |




## New Milford Animal Control

Approximate Age of Facility: 50+ years
Approximate Size of Facility: 1,530 GSF
Barrier Free Compliance: Facility is non-compliant in multiple categories including restroom layout, door operation, and level changes at entrances.

## General Condition of Facility:

The single building has an asphalt shingle and corrugated metal roof areas and painted CMU walls that are in fair condition. All interior areas are old, worn out, and in generally fair to poor condition.

| No. | Item | Quan. | Size (ft) | Type | Condition | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 18 | $3.5 \times 5$ | Galvanized Chain Link* | Fair |  |
| 2 | Dog Runs Isolation/Quarantine | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 18 | $3.5 \times 8$ | Galvanized Chain Link* | Poor | Additional approximately 16 X 30 ft semi-secured fenced area |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Open Trench Drain at Aisle** | Poor |  |
| 5 | Cages | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \times 2.5 \mathrm{X} \\ & 2.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SS Cage | Adequate | Cages are inside one run |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Unsealed Concrete | Poor |  |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  |  | Sheet Vinyl | Poor | Severe wearing, holes, and delamination |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Painted CMU | Poor | Unsealed and flaking paint |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Painted CMU and gypsum board | Fair to Poor |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  |  | Gypsum/Hard Board | Poor | Open seams and holes |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  |  | Gypsum/Hard Board | Fair |  |
| 12 | Daylighting |  |  |  | Fair | Small clerestory windows |
| 13 | Temperature Control |  |  | Unit heaters | Unknown | Operational; no AC |
| 14 | Ventilation |  |  |  | N/A | No systems observed |
| 15 | Sound control |  |  |  | N/A | None provided |
| 16 | Fire Alarm/Sprinkler |  |  |  | N/A | No systems observed |
| 17 | Bathing / Grooming Laundry Run Cleaning |  |  | None observed None observed CW Bib/disinfectant | Poor <br> Poor <br> Adequate |  |
| 18 | Food Prep/Wash |  |  | Kitchen Area | Adequate | Enclosed Room |

## Notes:

* Chain link is not recommended for use in dog runs because the material can trap toenails and cause injury. It is also difficult to properly clean.
** Open trench drains are not recommended because they harbor pathogens and are difficult to properly maintain. Drains in aisles allow unsanitary materials to be tracked around shelter.


Property Line Area: 1.88 AC

Existing Animal Control Building

NEW MILFORD ANIMAL CONTROL

86 ERICKSON ROAD
NEW MILFORD, CT
APPROXIMATE AREA: 1,530 GSF




## Newtown Animal Control

Approximate Age of Facility: 10 years
Approximate Size of Facility: 3,550 GSF
Barrier Free Compliance: Facility in general appears to be compliant.
General Condition of Facility:
The Main building has an asphalt shingle roof with CMU and fiber cement board walls in good condition. The Feral Cat Pavilion's separate asphalt shingle roof and welded wire walls are in good condition. There are also several shade pavilions and storage sheds in good condition. All interior areas are in good and well-maintained condition.

| No. | Item | Quan. | Size (ft) | Type | Condition | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.5 \& 6 X \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | SS Bar \& Panel Gates and Dividers | Good | 2 separate 8-run wards |
| 2 | Dog Runs Isolation/Quarantine | 2 | 4 X 6 | SS Bar \& Panel Gates and Dividers | Good | In separate Ward |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 18 | $\begin{aligned} & 4 / 4.5 \& 6 \\ & \times 8 \end{aligned}$ | SS Bar \& Panel Gates and Dividers | Good | Multiple fenced Exercise Yards and canopies |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Trench Drain at Aisle | Adequate |  |
| 5 | Cages* | 8 | $\begin{aligned} & 3.5 \times 2.5 \\ & \times 2.5 \end{aligned}$ | 3-compartment <br> Laminate Condos | Good | Communal areas also provided |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Resinous Epoxy | Good |  |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  | $1 \times 1$ | Vinyl Tile | Adequate | Vinyl tile is not optimal because of maintenance issues with seams |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Painted CMU | Good |  |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Painted CMU and gypsum board | Good |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  | $2 \times 4$ | Acoustical Tile | Adequate | Not moisture resistant |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  | 2×4 | Acoustical Tile | Good |  |
| 12 | Daylighting |  |  |  | Fair | Minimal windows in run and cage wards |
| 13 | Temperature Control |  |  | Forced Air Heat and Air Conditioning | Unknown | Operational and relatively new |
| 14 | Ventilation |  |  | Separate ventilation in dog runs | Unknown |  |
| 15 | Sound control |  |  | Acoustical Tile Ceilings | Adequate |  |
| 16 | Fire Alarm/Sprinkler |  |  | Detector and Alarm System | Adequate | No sprinklers observed |
| 17 | Bathing / Grooming Laundry Run Cleaning |  |  | SS Tub and Grooming Residential W\&D H+C Hose bib | Good |  |
| 18 | Food Prep/Wash |  |  | Kitchen Area | Good | Enclosed Room |

## Notes:

* One outdoor rabbit hutch in a covered fenced area also provides additional animal species housing.


Newtown Animal Control

## 21 OLD FARM ROAD NEWTOWN, CT

APPROXIMATE AREA: 162.37 AC.

NOTE: LOT AREA BASED ON AERIAL MAPPING GIS DATA





## Norwalk Animal Control

Approximate Age of Facility: 40+ years
Approximate Size of Facility: Unknown—no Plan provided, and no photographs allowed.
Barrier Free Compliance: Facility compliance is unknown, but likely does not comply with current Codes. General Condition of Facility:
The single building has an asphalt shingle roof and painted CMU walls that are in fair condition. All interior areas are in generally fair condition but are well maintained.

| No. | Item |  | Quan. | Size (ft) | Type | Condition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  | Notes: |  |  |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 17 | $4 \times 5$ | Galvanized Chain <br> Link* | Fair |  |
| 2 | Dog Runs - <br> Isolation/Quarantine | 3 | $4 \times 5$ | Galvanized Chain <br> Link* | Fair |  |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 20 | $4 \times 8$ | Galvanized Chain <br> Link* | Fair | Small, fenced exercise yard <br> provided |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Open Trench Drain <br> at Aisle** | Fair |  |
| 5 | Cages |  |  | Sealed Concrete | Fair |  |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Sealed / Painted <br> CMU | Fair |  |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  | $1 \times 1$ | Gypsum/Ceramic <br> tile | Adequate |  |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Acoustic Tile | Adequate |  |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Acoustic Tile | Adequate |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  |  | Forced Air HVAC | Unknown | Operational <br> AC Unknown |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  |  |  |  | HVAC Return Air |

## Notes:

* Chain link is not recommended for use in dog runs because the material can trap toenails and cause injury. It is also difficult to properly clean.
** Open trench drains are not recommended because they harbor pathogens and are difficult to properly maintain. Drains in aisles allow unsanitary materials to be tracked around shelter.


Norwalk Animal Control

## 13 S. SMITH STREET

 NORWALK, CTAPPROXIMATE AREA: 14.94AC

NOTE: LOT AREA BASED ON AERIAL MAPPING GIS DATA

## NOTE: <br> NO PLAN PROVIDED BY TOWN OF NORWALK PER THE DIRECTOR OF THE ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICE



SCALE: 1/16" = 1' - 0"


LEGEND

1 RECEPTION / OFFICE
2 FOOD PREP / LAUNDRY
3 RESTROOM
4 INTERIOR DOG RUNS
5 GARAGE / STORAGE


> NOTE: INTERIOR PHOTOS OF FACILITY WERE NOT PERMITTED BY THE TOWN PER THE DIRECTION OF THE ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICER.

## Stamford Animal Control

Approximate Age of Facility: 33 years (Additions)

## Approximate Size of Facility: 2,400 GSF

Barrier Free Compliance: Facility is non-compliant in multiple categories including restroom layout, door operation, and level changes at entrances.

## General Condition of Facility:

The single building has an asphalt shingle roof with CMU and wood siding walls that are in fair to poor condition. All interior areas are old, worn out, and in generally fair to poor condition.

| No. | Item | Quan. | Size (ft) | Type | Condition | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 30 | $3.5 \times 5$ | Galvanized Chain Link* | Fair |  |
| 2 | Dog Runs Isolation/Quarantine | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 29 | $3.5 \times 10$ | Galvanized Chain Link* | Fair | Two approximately $20 \times 40$ ft chain link Exercise Yards |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Open Trench Drain at Aisle** | Poor | Unfinished, cracking, and spalling |
| 5 | Cages | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3.5 \times 2.5 \\ & \times 2.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 3-compartment Laminate Condos | Fair |  |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Sealed Concrete | Poor | Cracking/unsealed areas; open joints at CMU walls |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.75 \mathrm{X} \\ & 0.75 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Ceramic Tile | Poor | Cracking/unsealed areas; open joints at CMU walls |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Painted CMU | Fair |  |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Painted CMU | Fair |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  |  | Gypsum/Hard Board | Fair | Some open seams and punctures |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  | $2 \times 4$ | Gypsum/Hard Board Acoustical Tile | Fair <br> Poor |  |
| 12 | Daylighting |  |  |  | Fair | Small clerestory windows in run ward |
| 13 | Temperature Control |  |  | Forced Air Heat (AC unknown) | Unknown | Old systems but operational |
| 14 | Ventilation |  |  | Thru-wall Fans | Unknown | Not operating during visit |
| 15 | Sound control |  |  | Open Styrofoam on Ceiling | Poor |  |
| 16 | Fire alarm/Sprinkler |  |  |  | N/A | None observed |
| 17 | Cleaning Systems |  |  | Bathing / Laundry / Run cleaning system | Acceptable |  |
| 18 | Food Prep/Wash |  |  | Separate Kitchen | Fair | Separate Food Storage Room |

## Notes:

* Chain link is not recommended for use in dog runs because the material can trap toenails and cause injury. It is also difficult to properly clean.
** Open trench drains are not recommended because they harbor pathogens and are difficult to properly maintain. Drains in aisles allow unsanitary materials to be tracked around shelter.


Stamford Animal Control

## 201 MAGEE AVENUE STAMFORD, CT

APPROXIMATE AREA: 23.00AC

NOTE: LOT AREA BASED ON AERIAL
MAPPING GIS DATA
STAMFORD LOCATION PLAN

STAMFORD ANIMAL CONTROL
201 MAGEE AVENUE
STAMFORD, CT

APPROXIMATE AREA: 2,400 GSF


## LEGEND

1 OFFICE/RECEPTION
2 OFFICE
3 RESTROOM

4 INTERIOR DOG RUNS
5 EXTERIOR DOG RUNS
6 MECHANICAL
7 FOOD PREP / BOWL WASH
8 LAUNDRY

9 WORK ALCOVE
10 CAT CAGE WARD
11 STORAGE



## Weston Animal Control

## Approximate Age of Facility: 20+ years

## Approximate Size of Facility: 750 GSF

Barrier Free Compliance: Facility is non-compliant in multiple categories including restroom layout, door operation, and level changes at entrances.

## General Condition of Facility:

The single building has an asphalt shingle roof and vinyl siding walls that are in good condition. All interior areas are in generally fair condition but are well maintained.

| No. | Item | Quan. | Size (ft) | Type | Condition | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \times 4+ \\ & 4 \times 8 \end{aligned}$ | Galvanized Chain Link* | Fair |  |
| 2 | Dog Runs Isolation/Quarantine | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 0 |  |  |  | No fenced exercise yard provided |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Open Trench Drain at Aisle** | Fair |  |
| 5 | Cages | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Unsealed Concrete | Fair |  |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  | $1 \times 1$ | Vinyl Tile | Fair |  |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Unsealed CMU | Fair |  |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Wood wall paneling Gypsum/Ceramic tile | Adequate |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  |  | Gypsum/Hard Board | Adequate |  |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  |  | Gypsum/Hard Board | Adequate |  |
| 12 | Daylighting |  |  |  | Good |  |
| 13 | Temperature Control |  |  | Forced Air HVAC No AC | Unknown | Operational |
| 14 | Ventilation |  |  | HVAC Return Air | Unknown |  |
| 15 | Sound control |  |  |  | N/A | None provided |
| 16 | Fire Alarm/Sprinkler |  |  |  | N/A | No systems observed |
| 17 | Bathing / Grooming Laundry Run Cleaning |  |  | Raised Tub <br> None observed CW Bib/disinfectant | Fair <br> Poor <br> Adequate |  |
| 18 | Food Prep/Wash |  |  | Combined with restroom and bathing | Fair | Food in metal cans |

## Notes:

* Chain link is not recommended for use in dog runs because the material can trap toenails and cause injury. It is also difficult to properly clean.
** Open trench drains are not recommended because they harbor pathogens and are difficult to properly maintain. Drains in aisles allow unsanitary materials to be tracked around shelter.
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## Westport Animal Control

Approximate Age of Facility: 30+ years
Approximate Size of Facility: 1,320 GSF
Barrier Free Compliance: Facility is non-compliant in multiple categories including restroom layout, door operation, and level changes at entrances.

## General Condition of Facility:

The single building has a low-slope asphalt shingle roof with cement board siding walls that are in acceptable condition. All interior areas are aging and in fair condition but well maintained.

| No. | Item | Quan. | Size (ft) | Type | Condition | Notes: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 9 | $4 \times 11$ | Galvanized Chain Link* | Fair |  |
| 2 | Dog Runs - <br> Isolation/Quarantine | 1 | $4 \times 11$ | CMU and solid door | Acceptable |  |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 10 | $4 \times 10$ | Galvanized Chain Link* | Fair | Approximately $20 \times 40 \mathrm{ft}$ chain link Exercise Yard |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Open Trench Drain at Aisle** | Fair | Unfinished, cracking, and spalling |
| 5 | Cages | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Sealed Concrete | Fair | Cracking and unsealed areas |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  | $1 \times 1$ | Vinyl Tile | Fair |  |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Painted CMU | Acceptable |  |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Painted Gypsum Board | Acceptable |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  | 2 $\times 4$ | Acoustical Tile | Fair | Not water resistant |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  | $2 \times 4$ | Acoustical Tile | Acceptable |  |
| 12 | Daylighting |  |  |  | Acceptable | Windows in run ward |
| 13 | Temperature Control |  |  | Forced Air Heat and some AC | Unknown | Operational |
| 14 | Ventilation |  |  | Thru-wall Fans | Unknown | Not operating during visit |
| 15 | Sound control |  |  | Acoustical Tile Ceiling | Fair |  |
| 16 | Fire Alarm/Sprinkler |  |  | Smoke \& Fire Alarm | Acceptable | No Sprinklers |
| 17 | Cleaning Systems |  |  | Bathing / Laundry / <br> Run cleaning system | Acceptable | No sink in work room |
| 18 | Food Prep/Wash |  |  | Work room | Fair | Food in rubber cans |

## Notes:

* Chain link is not recommended for use in dog runs because the material can trap toenails and cause injury. It is also difficult to properly clean.
** Open trench drains are not recommended because they harbor pathogens and are difficult to properly maintain. Drains in aisles allow unsanitary materials to be tracked around shelter.
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## Wilton Animal Control

Age of Facility: 37 years

## Approximate Size of Facility: 1,450 GSF

Barrier Free Compliance: Facility is non-compliant in multiple categories including restroom layout, door operation, and level changes at entrances.

## General Condition of Facility:

The single building, which is a wing of a town offices building, has a membrane and corrugated metal roof with stucco and CMU walls that are in fair condition. All interior areas are old, relatively worn out, and in generally fair condition.

| No. | Item |  | Quan. Size (ft) | Type | Condition | Notes: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Dog Runs - General | 8 | $4 \& 8$ X 4 | Galvanized Chain <br> Link* | Fair |  |
| 2 | Dog Runs - <br> Isolation/Quarantine | 0 |  |  | Quarantine is provided in <br> general runs, which is not <br> ideal |  |
| 3 | Dog Runs - Exterior | 8 | $4 \& 8 \times 8$ | Galvanized Chain <br> Link* | Poor | No fenced exercise yard <br> provided |
| 4 | Run Drainage |  |  | Open Trench Drain at <br> Aisle** | Fair |  |
| 5 | Cages | 6 | $3.5 \times 2.5$ <br> X2.5 | Painted wire Cage | Adequate | Cages in communal room <br> (food/water in cages and <br> litter bins outside) |
| 6 | Floor Finish - Runs |  |  | Sealed Concrete | Fair | Spalling and cracks |
| 7 | Floor Finish - Other |  |  | Sheet Vinyl <br> Vinyl Tile | Fair <br> Fair |  |
| 8 | Wall Finish - Runs |  |  | Unfinished CMU | Fair |  |
| 9 | Wall Finish - Other |  |  | Painted Gypsum <br> Board | Adequate |  |
| 10 | Ceiling Finish - Runs |  |  | Open wood decking | Fair | Evidence of leaking*** |
| 11 | Ceiling Finish - Other |  |  | ACT/Gypsum Hard <br> Board | Fair |  |
| 12 | Daylighting |  |  |  | Forced air HVAC | Unknown |

## Notes:

* Chain link is not recommended for use in dog runs because the material can trap toenails and cause injury. It is also difficult to properly clean.
** Open trench drains are not recommended because they harbor pathogens and are difficult to properly maintain. Drains in aisles allow unsanitary materials to be tracked around shelter.
*** According to the Animal Control Officer, roof leaks were recently repaired.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{\text {i }}$ Ridgefield data was not provided during the study. The study used estimates for Ridgefield’s Animal Control Profile based on neighboring datasets.
    ${ }^{i i}$ At the time this report was drafted, New Fairfield is no longer a member of the regional animal control facility based in New Milford. The data in this report however is from the time when New Fairfield was a participating member of New Milford. New Fairfield's Animal Control Facility is in development and was not part of the site visit process.
    iii Roxbury is outside of the WestCOG jurisdiction; however, it is an active member in the regional facility operated in New Milford.

[^1]:    Smaller jurisdictions
    had very few or no
     used.

[^2]:    animals WestCOG can expect to serve in the future.

