

RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT FORM

Report Title: "Tails of Marin" Marin County Animal Control Services & The Marin Humane Society

Report Date: April 7, 2008

Response by: Executive Director Marin Humane Society

By: Neil Trent

FINDINGS

- I (we) agree with the findings numbered: F4 and F6
- I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the findings numbered: F9

(Attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed; include an explanation of the reasons therefore.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendations numbered R2 have been implemented.
(Attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)
- Recommendations numbered _____ have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future.
(Attach a timeframe for the implementation.)
- Recommendations numbered R4 and R5 require further analysis.
(Attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.)
- Recommendations numbered _____ will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable.
(Attach an explanation.)

Date: 6/24/08

Signed: _____

Neil Trent

Number of pages attached _____

RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT FORM ATTACHMENT

MARIN HUMANE SOCIETY (MHS)

Findings:

F9: Marin Humane Society's role of enforcement of leash laws, noise ordinances and waste pickup needs to be clarified. Although the unincorporated areas of Marin have a control law, nine cities have separate leash laws. Some of those cities only have leash laws in certain areas of their jurisdictions. Marin Humane Society doesn't currently enforce noise ordinances; enforcement is done by law enforcement either through the Sheriff's department or local police departments. With MHS's nine officers, patrolling for violators is done when time permits or when a specific complaint area is generated. Patrol priorities are given to complaint areas. There may be a perception that pet guardian compliance is dismal, however in the last five years there have been 1,431 citations issued by MHS officers for compliance violations. Enforcement of local ordinances continues to be a priority for MHS.

Recommendations:

R2: MHS has already started implementing this by updating our website, reviewing our public information materials and communicating with County and local officials.

R4: This recommendation requires further analysis due to a variety of community-based approaches to cat overpopulation. With new ordinances comes enforcement costs and this would impact MHS in its role as service provider. We would welcome pursuing this concept to develop new strategies that work toward ending cat overpopulation. A working group could be established that consists of members of the JPA, MHS and community partners to address this topic. A timeframe of three to six months would be reasonable to explore this.

R5: This recommendation requires further analysis. MHS is eager to implement anything that encourages pet guardian compliance, especially in these areas. Intensive public education campaigns cost money. A partnership between the County, municipalities and MHS could help keep costs down and would inspire creative strategies. Targeted community-based approaches could easily be identified with increased partnerships. A timeframe of three to six months would be reasonable to address this.