

Good morning Board of Supervisors

This was my public comment to the internal operation committee on October 27th regarding the animal benefit fund.

The following is an outline of my concerns on how this money was utilized in 2024 and 2025  
Joy Bound received \$200,000 for shelter intervention and then received another \$750,000 from measure X funding only a small portion of that is going for spay and neuter services

I did request at the October 27th meeting that the internal operation committee direct animal services to appoint a panel that involves a member of a rescue community to make decisions on how the animal benefit fund is allocated.

No funding from the animal benefit fund has been allocated for 25 26 although proposals were taken in June.

I am requesting that the proposals be identified and evaluated for those that are actually doing spay and neuter services in the community.  
Enough funding has been allocated for Joy Bound out of the measure x funding and currently if you look at their financial statements they have 83 million in reserve.

Below is my public comment to the internal operation committee on October 27th  
Several members of the rescue Community attended that meeting and shared the same concerns.

The presentation raises many questions on what these organizations are receiving funding for and the amount spent on each animal.

Presently Contra Costa County is in a domestic animal overpopulation crises because of lack of low cost spay and neuter resources.

This is reflected in this presentation, showing that only a third of this funding was actually provided to groups that are actually doing spay and neuters in the community.

This presentation does not outline how the 200,000 allocated for shelter intervention was spent and there's many concerns regarding how each group that received this funding and how they actually provided services.

This presentation reflects that \$50,000 was spent on shelter intervention by East Bay SPCA and that it served 51 animals.

Funding in the amount of \$74,000 went to Joy bound, serving over 170 animals.

Funding also went to Jelly's place and the amount of 10,000 and served over 55 animals.

Since there is no outline of how this money was spent by each group or what services they provided, it raises questions regarding amount spent by each organization.

East Bay SPCA spent \$1,000 on each animal, yet jelly's place was able to accomplish services for less than \$200 per animal. Joy bound spent close to \$435 per animal.

Could the presenter please outline what services are involved in shelter intervention and is the same as pet retention. And also where are these animals coming from that need these services? Is there a financial requirement? Also the staff report indicates 100, 000 for general. Cuz the presenter please explain that.

My concern is that funding allocated to East Bay SPCA has a much higher rate per animal.

This may be due to the fact that they are not in this County and they are far from the target areas that needs services

Area such as East County that are economically and culturally diverse, and in my experience most at risk to relocate their animals, rarely have the resources to drive into another County.

Continuing to give funding of the animal benefit funded to joy-bound, is a duplication of services because they are currently receiving over \$700,000 from our measure X. A recent public request regarding measure x funding to Joy bound revealed that the contract included grooming and that joy-bound spent \$2,400 on Flea Combs and printed their name on the items for marketability.

They are also spending money on microchips and vaccine clinics but offering no adequate spay and neuter resources, which is furthering contributing to this animal overpopulation in this County

More concerning is the contract with measure X stated, Tony larusso's animal rescue foundation doing business as Joy Bound. If you look at their 990 returns they have a surplus of 83 million. I am unclear why Contra Costa county is funding services through a non-profit that currently has such a large reserve.

The other pronounce problem, at this point is that the animal benefit fund has not been released for 25-26 although proposals have been accepted. The allocation of funding should be put before this committee so that the public and small nonprofit rescues who depend on this money can comment on how it should be allocated.

Although shelter intervention and pet retention is important those should be Services provided by Contra Costa County through the general fund.

Presently for the last 5 years Contra Costa Animal Services adopted a policy to turn away healthy cats and kittens unaltered and telling people that bring them in or call the shelter just to leave them on the streets.

This is called Community sheltering, the expectation of CCAS is that small nonprofits will assist the public when these cats are returned, unaltered to the streets for spay and neuters. Unfortunately CCAS is not keeping any data about the animals they are turning away from the shelter. The previous animal service director Beth Ward in 2022 estimated at that point 450,000 inside outside cats in this County.

As you can see from this presentation only \$100, 000 was allocated for funding for groups that do spay and neuters of the situation. This does not go far when our nonprofit clinics such as Joy bound or Animal fix Clinic are charging nonprofits \$150 to 200 a cat.

I am requesting that the internal operations committee collaborate with Ben Winkleblack, the present director of CCAS regarding the proposals for 25-26 to be brought before this committee before allocations. There is a need for transparency in this process and this would allow the public all the small nonprofits to educate this committee on the need that this animal benefit fund be focused in on spay and neuter services.

Please include this in your next agenda for discussion.

Thank you Lisa Kirk  
Fix Our Shelters