

 **Fwd: Board meeting on Tuesday 3/20/2012**

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY
11:56 am, Mar 19, 2012

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 9:54 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Gabriele Frei** <gabrielefrei@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat, Mar 17, 2012 at 4:27 PM
Subject: Board meeting on Tuesday 3/20/2012
To: Norma Santiago <bosfive@edcgov.us>, John Knight <bosone@edcgov.us>, Ron Briggs <bosfour@edcgov.us>, Jack Sweeney <bosthree@edcgov.us>, Ray Nutting <bostwo@edcgov.us>

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please find my letter pertaining to Tuesday afternoon's meeting regarding the Animal Shelter attached.
Sincerely,
Gabriele Frei

Sent from my cool ASUS laptop

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

 **Board of Supervisors.docx**
15K

**PAWED letter for 3/20 meeting**

1 message

Charlene Welty <pets4life@att.net>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 9:08 AM

To: edc.cob@edcgov.us

Hi Suzanne--attached is our letter for distribution to the Supervisors for the 3/20/12 meeting at 2pm for the animal shelter discussion. Thank you.

Charlene Welty, President
People for Animal Welfare in El Dorado County (PAWED)
4050 Durock Rd. # 19
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
530-677-2476
www.pawedpets.org

**BOSletterMarch2012.doc**

94K



People for Animal Welfare in El Dorado County

*A Nonprofit Organization Dedicated To Saving And Improving The Lives
Of Companion Animals In El Dorado County*

4050 Durock Rd, #19, Shingle Springs, CA 95682

530-677-2476 pawed@att.net

www.pawedpets.org

March 19, 2012

Board of Supervisors
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, Ca 95667

Dear Supervisors,

On March 20, 2012, the animal shelter project will be discussed and it appears that we are at yet another crossroads in this project. We urge the Board to consider the following when providing direction to staff on the next steps:

I. Guiding Principles

Since the inception of this project in 2005, PAWED has consistently advocated that the following principles guide decision making:

- **Location**—a central location that is:
 - easily accessed by the public and volunteers,
 - facilitates response time for Animal Services Officers to respond to calls from the public,
 - can easily be accessed to assist animals and the public during disasters.
- **Functionality:**
 - size should be based on needs assessment,
 - design based on accepted standards of shelter animal care,
 - includes space for housing livestock on the premises.
- **Safety and Security:** location and design must insure safety and security for the animals, staff and the public.
- **Community Resource/Asset:**
 - must be visible and have a positive image,
 - as the FIRST permanent animal shelter on the Western Slope, it is an important community asset that should have at least 40 years of productivity.
- **Volunteer Assistance:**
 - volunteer assistance is critical to the operation of the shelter,
 - an accessible, functional and safe shelter will help attract and retain volunteers.

II. Data needs supporting backup analysis

The powerpoint presentation scheduled for the March 20, 2012 meeting includes specific data. We have the following questions:

- Page 6: Alternate Site Parameters: "A Minimum of 13,000 square feet". How was this determined? What is the supporting documentation? The current 17,600 sf shelter design that was prepared by the architect and 10-1235.13B. 3 of 32

approved by the Board was based on a formal needs assessment. If the shelter size is to be reduced, what is the reduction based on?

- Page 8: Alternate site A: “Current estimate leaves a \$700,000 budget surplus/contingency after building purchase and tenant improvements”. How is this amount determined if there has not yet been an analysis of this alternate nor a design prepared? Additionally, this amount would not be left if additional adjacent land for livestock is purchased—which is stated as one of the parameters for the alternate sites, on page 6.
- Page 9: Alternate site B:
 - “Building square footage is only adequate for 10-20 year facility”. If this is the case, why is this alternate being considered? Is the county prepared to go through another similar shelter site selection process and investment in another 10-20 years? This alone does not meet our guiding principle that the permanent shelter be able to serve the community for at least 40 years.
 - “Current estimate leaves a \$2.1 M budget surplus/contingency after building purchase and tenant improvements.” Same comment as for Alternate A above.

We understand the need to consider Alternate sites at this point, since it appears that building the shelter at the Y is now not feasible due to projected significant cost overruns. However, we urge the Board to consider our guiding principles and the need for a written analysis of the figures specified for each Alternate, before important decisions are made.

There are only 21 months left before the current shelter must relocate. Clear and accurate information and decision making based on facts are essential to insure this project is completed prior to January 2014. We continue to stand ready to assist the county in this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

/s/
Charlene Welty
President

 **New Shelter**

1 message

Susan Davidson <notatworkanymore@yahoo.com>

Sun, Mar 18, 2012 at 5:28 AM

To: "edc.cob@edcgov.us" <edc.cob@edcgov.us>

I would like to express how important I feel it is to have a new shelter for the abandoned animals. The measure of a society is in how we treat our animal friends. Please do everything you can to make it a reality! Thank you

Sent from Yahoo! Mail on Android



West, Kristie <WestK@crc.losrios.edu>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 11:56 AM

To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bostw o@edcgov.us" <bostw o@edcgov.us>, "bostthree@edcgov.us" <bostthree@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>

• **Dear County Supervisors:**

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or 26% reduction in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. It is not. I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time.

To be clear, looking at other options, as long as they can deliver the needed product, is reasonable. We support that review of alternatives. There is a critical, fundamental error in what staff is proposing to do, however, that will set this project up for failure again, if the Board doesn't change it. They are saying that 13,000 square feet is adequate, not the approved 17,600 square feet. They give no explanation of what they are cutting in this 4,600 square foot (26%) reduction or how operations will be affected. This is simply not acceptable! See our March 15 alert at [for details.](#)

Thank you,

Kristie West

March 17, 2013

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am writing in regard to the planned Permanent Animal Shelter.

I am a foster volunteer for ASA's kittens (this is my sixth season): I want to see my tax dollars used in a useful way.

The idea of once again reducing the size of the building to fit the budget is unacceptable to me. DOT has used too much money already for its studies, which we learned in the last meeting, were apparently incomplete or whatever their excuses were. Presumably the people involved in planning for this new Shelter project hold degrees; So far it has been shameful to see them at work!

This County requires a full size Shelter where all personnel from Animal Services works under a single roof, instead of being scattered in multiple buildings across town. Staff needs enough room to house all the animals that come in. We need meeting rooms to hold 'first time volunteer meetings'. Shrinking the footprint of the Shelter building is not going to solve any of those problems, present or future.

Please do not accept a smaller Shelter building project; we need to implement the current plans for a 17,600 square foot building at the County owned site to be implemented now. So much money has already been spent. Stop wasting any more tax-payer-money on re-design and researching alternative sites; it's been done already. Move on!

Many volunteers are ready to raise funds where needed for this new Permanent Shelter to come true. Let's do this right and follow through with the current plans and start building!

Sincerely,

Gabriele Frei
4201 Jewel Way
Placerville CA 95667

 **Fwd: Animal Shelter Project**

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 9:53 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jeff Lee** <JeffLee@hughes.net>

Date: Sun, Mar 18, 2012 at 11:15 AM

Subject: Animal Shelter Project

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Supervisors,

Once again, I am writing you to support the completion of the Western Slope Animal Shelter.

Looking over the County's online Power Point presentation, I have a great concern for the size of the Shelter being again reduced in size from its 17, 000 sq. ft. footprint. Remember that the original building program totaled 21,000 sq. ft. But due to budget concerns the shelter project was reduced to the 17,000 sq. ft. footprint, in 2007 when direction was given to design it. This 17,000 sq. ft. size building is the minimum and does not allow much if any room for future growth in service demand.

I urge you not to push this project in time or squander this opportunity to complete a facility that will serve today's needs as well as the future's.

Your presentation also has cons for different sites stating that fencing could be an issue for animal security. In all honesty, a proper fence will provide for security in any terrain. Please do not dismiss any site due to fencing issues.

Jeff Lee

PO Box 266

Coloma, CA

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

 **Fwd: New shelter size reduction not acceptable!**

1 message

The **BOSONE** <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 9:53 AM

——— Forwarded message ———

From: **Debra Kelley** <lucykohi05@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Mar 18, 2012 at 12:44 PM
Subject: New shelter size reduction not acceptable!
To: bosfive@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisors,

You seem to have agreed with at least part of my previous e-mail, in which I suggested cost overrun projections for the new animal shelter need to be “thoughtfully evaluated and creatively managed.” Looking at existing buildings that might be retrofitted for shelter use seems to fall under “creatively managed;” certainly if an appropriate structure could be found and retrofitted cost effectively, that would be creative management. But from the looks of the power point presentation CAO staff will speak from at your March 20 meeting, the “thoughtfully evaluated” part of my suggestion is pretty much missing. Specifically the issues that are more *thought-less* than *thought-ful* are:

Where is CAO’s rationale for cutting the building size by 26%? What functions does CAO propose the new shelter can do without, and how will the new shelter be expected to cope with those function cuts? Has CAO staff explored the effects of those proposed cuts with Animal Services, which is really the only entity that can logically evaluate the service impact of those proposed cuts? And if, as CAO staff apparently asserts, there will be a surplus at the end of the project under any of their suggestions, then the rational for reducing shelter size is not to stay in budget. So why are they even proposing a reduction?

On what is CAO staff basing its savings projections? Renovation costs for any existing building aren’t knowable yet, because a new design needs to be developed for renovations to any possible building choice. So any current estimates of savings are meaningless. And though having land adjacent that might be used for housing livestock is a plus for any given building, without knowing what that land will cost it’s not possible to even say that land would truly be available to a future shelter. Much more work and detail is needed before the CAO staff can make accurate projections.

Maybe CAO has in fact done significantly more work than the power point presentation suggests; maybe not referencing that significant work in the power point text is intended to pique our interest and keep us engaged during the March 20 discussion. But if in fact that is not staff’s strategy, then it has many holes to fill before the Board should consider its recommendations.

Sincerely,
Debra Kelley
District 2

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

 **Fwd: Shelter**

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 9:56 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **JOHN MALICK** <johnmalick@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 3:20 PM
Subject: Shelter
To: bosone@edcgov.us

I am concerned that staff is looking at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue with the current project. Also for this review, staff has decided with **NO supporting operational analysis**, that a 4,600 square foot or **26% reduction** in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. **IT'S NOT!!** Urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are a least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time.

Thank You and please do the right thing!

John Malick
4341 Blanchard Rd
Placerville CA, 95667
(530) 626-4533
johnmalick@sbcglobal.net

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

**Fwd: Western Slope Shelter --- Do not reduce the size.**

1 message

The **BOSONE** <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 9:56 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Greg Harris** <edenlandscapedesigns@hotmail.com>
Date: Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 3:41 PM
Subject: Western Slope Shelter — Do not reduce the size.
To: "bob (edh supervisor) knight" <bosone@edcgov.us>

Subject: Western Slope Shelter**Dear Supervisor Knight:**

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or 26% reduction in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. It is not. I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet. They should not underestimate the size and need of the animal shelter. Their fundamental assumption is wrong and unsupported. Tell them they simply must get it right this time.

To pursue this reduction will provide an inadequate facility from the start, lead to increased future costs, and inadequate services for the future. Please do not allow this mistake to happen.

Thank you.

Greg

Gregory Harris
Owner and Principal Designer
EDEN DESIGNS - Landscape Planners
916.201.0747
Contractor's Lic. 947067

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your

3/19/12

Edcgov.us Mail - Fwd: Western Slope Shelter — Do not reduce the size.

system.
Thank you.

 **Fwd: Western Slope Shelter size reduction?**

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 9:54 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Colln Melville** <cfmelville@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Mar 17, 2012 at 8:34 AM
Subject: Western Slope Shelter size reduction?
To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I understand you may the CAO staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project.

I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with **no** supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or **26% reduction** in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate.

I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review.

Please don't shoehorn the shelter into another inadequate facility and please get this project moving forward to a construction date.

Thank you,
Colin & Susan Melville
96 Rancho del Sol
Camino CA 95709

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

The BOSFOUR <bosfour@edcgov.us>

 **3/20/12 Board of Supervisor Meeting- Agenda Item re: ANIMAL SHELTER**

1 message

Bill Lichtenberger <blichtenberger1@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 4:40 PM

To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>

Cc: barblee530@gmail.com, pets4life@att.net, mail4kellyadams@yahoo.com

Dear Supervisor,

I understand that at the March 20 Board of Supervisors meeting, CAO staff will be presenting a number of options regarding the new County animal shelter for your consideration. Two of those options include reducing the size of the new shelter to either 9,000 or 13,000 square feet (sf). As you are aware, in 2007 after much discussion and review by staff and the BOS, it was decided the minimum size of the building needed to be 17,600 sf. This was to meet accepted industry standards, health and safety issues, and size and number of animals housed among other things. To my knowledge the criteria that established that minimum has not and should not change, and therefore anything smaller is not acceptable.

CAO staff has also indicated in their Alternative Options A & B that they are including \$1.4 million in road improvements on the current site, and that there will be \$700,000 (Option A) or \$2.1 million (Option B) in surplus if either option is pursued.

I have two questions: (1) Why isn't that surplus being used to purchase a larger building? and (2) Since the road improvements will increase the value of the existing site considerably, are the monies from the sale of that parcel being included in the overall budget for purchase/renovation of the new shelter?

I urge you to direct CAO staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet in size, and to not underestimate size requirements for an operational Animal shelter.

Respectfully,

Bill Lichtenberger
El Dorado, CA 95623

 **new animal shelter**

1 message

Dave Cook <deerdave@sbcglobal.net>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 5:16 PM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Supervisors Briggs, Knight, Nutting, Santiago and Sweeney,

I am appalled to hear that the Board may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to become the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. After this many years of work, the project is now up for a major re-scoping?? I also hear that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a building of only 13,000 square feet (a 26% reduction from the original plan!) will be adequate. How can that be true?? What I would want to know is what critical functions will be ignored, what safety issues might arise for shelter staff and how many additional animals at the shelter will be euthanized for lack of adequate space (the most likely outcome). These are some of the key questions I would want answered and I hope you will too before you make any related decisions.

I am sympathetic to your dilemma regarding the increasing costs of this project, given the financial situations of local government entities as well as at the State level (where bad news often trickles down to cities and counties), but this is not just about money; it is about lives, the lives of companion animals who have wronged no one. These animals should not have to pay with their lives for human error.

Having worked in State service for 33 years before I retired, I have often found myself defending the competence and integrity of government workers, responding both to serious complaints and also to targeted jokes. I have to admit however, that in this case I am puzzled by how such an enormous cost (\$2 million in road work!) was not previously estimated more accurately and how in general this project has dragged on so long with little noticeable progress or success. It is possible that there has been some incompetence at the staff level and perhaps also some lack of oversight at the executive steering committee level (that would be you) but it is mostly water under the bridge now. My hope is that at both levels, better work will be done in the future. The focus needs to be kept on delivering the tools needed (in this case, an adequate animal shelter) by Animal Services to perform their duties and to prevent an outcome that would result in additional euthanasia.

Dave Cook

Shingle Springs

P.S. I have a good deal of project management experience and I offer myself on a volunteer basis to assist staff in this work. I have no doubt that there is a fair amount of experience & expertise in various staff disciplines but a fresh set of eyes on this project at the management level may keep it properly focused and prevent future slippage. I also offer to volunteer time to provide training to you in your key role as an executive steering committee on this project. I have observed your expressions of frustration with staff in earlier Board meetings but there may be more effective ways to guide staff in fulfilling your requests and thereby ensure project success. You have my e-mail address and I can be reached by phone at 530-363-4848.

**PLS DO NOT REDUCE ANIMAL SHELTER SIZE!!!!**

1 message

Kelly Adams <mail4kellyadams@yahoo.com>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 12:42 PM

Reply-To: Kelly Adams <mail4kellyadams@yahoo.com>

To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>

RE: 3/20/12 Board of Supervisor Meeting- Agenda Item re: ANIMAL SHELTER proposed SIZE REDUCTION

Dear Supervisor,

I understand that at the March 20 Board of Supervisors meeting, CAO staff will recommend reviewing existing industrial buildings that could be retrofitted to provide the Western Slope Animal Shelter. This is apparently in response to the projected \$2 million budget shortfall currently estimated by DOT. My concern, and that of so many El Dorado County residents, is: **there is a critical, fundamental error in what the CAO staff is proposing to do.....they are stating that 13,000 square feet is adequate, not the approved 17,600 square feet. No explanation is given for cutting the square footage by 4,600 square foot--a 26% reduction-- nor how operations will be affected by this cut. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE!**

My fellow citizens and I are urging you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, and to not underestimate size requirements for an operational Animal shelter.

Thank you for listening and doing the right thing. We've been trying to get a meeting of the minds on this issue for such a very long time and we'd hate to see you proceed when the fundamental assumption on square footage requirements is in error. The animal shelter needs to be at least 17,000 square feet for a no frills, adequate, functioning animal shelter. We'll still have less than other counties allot for animal services--but at least it will meet bare minimum space requirements. Reducing the square footage by 4,600 sq. feet will not serve the needs for housing this important function and would result in an unfortunate unsatisfactory outcome. Please, please review this and adjust accordingly.

Sincerely,

Kelly Adams,
5305 Sierra Real
El Dorado, CA 95623

March 16, 2012

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or 26% reduction in the accepted building program of 17,000 square feet, is adequate. It is not. I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time.

Thanks,

JoAnn LoFranco

**Animal Shelter Item at the March 20th Board Meeting**

1 message

Joel Williamson <joel_williamson@yahoo.com>
Reply-To: Joel Williamson <joel_williamson@yahoo.com>
To: "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 2:57 PM

Dear Supervisor Briggs,

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or **26% reduction** in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. **It is not.** I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time.

To be clear, looking at other options, as long as they can deliver the needed product, is reasonable. I support that review of alternatives. There is a critical, fundamental error in what staff is proposing to do, however, that will set this project up for failure again, if the Board doesn't change it. They are saying that 13,000 square feet is adequate, not the approved 17,600 square feet. They give no explanation of what they are cutting in this 4,600 square foot (26%) reduction or how operations will be affected. This is simply not acceptable!

Please support the original 17,600 square foot design.

Thanks and best regards,

Joel Williamson
2630 Baker Road
Placerville, CA 95667

 **Animal Shelter**

1 message

Nancy Swenson <nswenson1@me.com>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 3:01 PM

To: Jack Sweeney <bosthree@co.el-dorado.ca.us>, John Knight <bosone@co.el-dorado.ca.us>, Norm Santiago <bosfive@co.el-dorado.ca.us>, Ray Nutting <bostwo@edcgov.us>, Ron Briggs <bosfour@edcgov.us>

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am an animal advocate and support a new animal shelter in El Dorado County. However, after attending the last BOS meeting about the shelter I learned that the costs for the new planned shelter are way over budget. The 2 million dollar road to be built by the DOT is unacceptable. I feel like the DOT is sticking their hands too deep in our taxpayer's pocket. Therefore, I would like to make the following suggestions:

Option 1:

1. Fire the DOT and hire a local private contractor to build the road to the planned shelter.
2. Scrap the brick and mortar building and buy pre-fab/modular buildings. For example: 3-4 pre-fabs, use one for dogs, another for cats, rabbits, birds, small animals, and one for administration. You will also need a barn of some type for horses and other large farm animals.

Option 2:

1. Sell the land that is currently owned for the shelter.
2. Buy a different plot of land (real estate is cheap) that already has a road in place.
3. Build the brick and mortar shelter as planned on the new land parcel.
 - a. or replace building the shelter with several smaller modular buildings for use as in Option 1.
4. If the location is great, add an additional modular building and lease it to a veterinary group which could provide income to the shelter and could provide vet services for the sheltered animals.

Option 3:

1. Find an existing plot of land with an existing building and road and convert it to a shelter.

Option 4:

1. Any combination of the above.

El Dorado County has lots of ranches and rural land. I believe it is important for the shelter to accommodate every kind of animal. Sierra Wildlife and Rescue takes care of the our wildlife so our wildlife would not need to be included.

I don't know if any of these suggestions are workable or acceptable but I thought I'd submit them for your consideration.

Thank you for your time.

Nancy Swenson
nswenson1@me.com

Cameron Park, CA 95682
530-676-3382

**Western Slope Animal Shelter**

1 message

Denise Spielman <dmspielman@yahoo.com>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 2:06 AM

Reply-To: Denise Spielman <dmspielman@yahoo.com>

To: "bosone@edcgov.us" <bosone@edcgov.us>, "bosfive@edcgov.us" <bosfive@edcgov.us>, "bosfour@edcgov.us" <bosfour@edcgov.us>, "bostwo@edcgov.us" <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "bosthree@edcgov.us" <bosthree@edcgov.us>

Supervisors -

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or **26% reduction** in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. **It is not.** I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time.

Sincerely,

Denise M Spielman



1 message

Carol Menke-Clark <menkeclark4508@sbcglobal.net>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 10:35 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Supervisors:

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or **26% reduction** in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. **It is not**. I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong.

PLEASE get it right this time.

Thank You,

Carol Menke-Clark

Kyburz

**Please proceed with the Approved Animal Shelter**

2 messages

jim shook <jim.shook@sbcglobal.net>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 8:05 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Honorable Supervisors;

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or **26% reduction** in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. **It is not.** I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time. Thank You, Jim Shook, Shingle Springs.

The Explanation:**jim shook** <jim.shook@sbcglobal.net>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 8:06 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Honorable Supervisors;

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or **26% reduction** in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. **It is not.** I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time. Thank You, Jim Shook, Shingle Springs.

The Explanation:

 **Animal Shelter**

1 message

Nancy Estrada <nancyest@sbcglobal.net>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 9:25 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or **26% reduction** in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. **It is not.** I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time.

Jose and Nancy Estrada

Milton Ranch



Western Slope Animal Shelter Review

1 message

Nancy Powers <npowers2@hughes.net>

Fri, Mar 16, 2012 at 9:34 AM

To: bosfour@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisor:

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter, rather than to continue the already-approved project. While evaluating such an alternative is reasonable, I also understand that, for this review, staff has decided, with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or a **26% reduction** in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. It has already been agreed that 17,600 feet is the required space, and any lesser amount would be detrimental to the care of the animals. I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,600 square feet, and not underestimate size and costs in this latest animal shelter project review. The staffs' fundamental assumption is wrong; therefore, if the Board accepts this approach, it will be making an egregious error.

After so many years of effort by the Board and concerned residents to ensure that the shelter will be adequate for what will inevitably become a growing population of animals needing protective services and placement in new homes; after presuming upon the goodwill of so many residents throughout the county who have assisted in fostering and placing animals; and after possibly endangering the health and welfare of residents seeking help with wild and domestic animal issues, not to mention the health and welfare of the animals, due to inadequate county services, providing inadequate facilities and services would be a great break of faith and trust with your constituencies.

I urge you to stick to the original plans for an adequate shelter and the provision of improved animal services

 **Fwd: Agenda Item #19 – Western Slope Animal Shelter**

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 11:26 AM

——— Forwarded message ———

From: **Jamie Hartshorn** <jamiehartshorn@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 10:27 AM
Subject: Agenda Item #19 – Western Slope Animal Shelter
To: bosone@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisor Knight:

I wish I could attend the portion of the meeting at which the above will be discussed, a prior commitment takes precedence.

Hopefully you'll agree that plans to site a shelter at the "Y" should be abandoned. There is no way this county is going to come up with the \$2-million-plus in additional funding estimated to complete it. This particular property should never have been purchased, but there's no use crying over wasted time and money. It is time to move on and look at other options.

While I have been involved in the Western Slope Animal Shelter Coalition, I am not sending the email it has requested. I am fully supportive of exploring existing buildings in the county, even spaces smaller than the 17,600-square-foot figure that seems to be fixed in some minds. Admittedly, I came on board just a few years ago, after the whole needs assessment phase and first set of plans (and after the economy tanked), but wonder if: A) it is humanly possible to plan something to meet needs 40 years down the road, especially given the economic climate and B) theirs (George Miers & Associates) is only way to arrive at acceptable shelter dimensions.

A quick look online turns up a whole range of facilities of different sizes designed by national firms. One (http://planningyouranimalshelter.com/estimating_size.htm) gives 90-100 square feet per dog and 45-50 sf per cat, which also factors in space for admin offices, medical space, storage, and educational space. Using their figures and an estimated 100 dogs / 50 cats, they come up with a shelter size of 12,500 sf. My husband is a regular volunteer at the current shelter and tells me he has never seen more than 20 dogs at one time (including holds in the back) and 20 cats. Thus it would seem—by this estimate, anyway—13,000 sf would be adequate for current requirements and needs into the future. Bear in mind the county has been getting by for years with a facility that's *maybe* 5,000 sf.

I am also wondering if, in addition to industrial-park space, the county has explored other types of buildings such as vacant auto dealerships. There is one at the Ponderosa exit off 50 (4101 Wild Chaparral Rd., Shingle Springs) that would seem to be ideal—well away from other properties, including residential, highly visible and easily accessible, with potential for expansion.

Finally, I would suggest that the county may be better off continuing to "farm out" any livestock it takes in, rather than trying to find space that will accommodate both small and large animals. It would seem that for the additional several-hundred-thousand-dollars more it will cost for barns and acreage (not to mention the difficulty of finding a suitable location, plus the additional work piled on an already-strapped staff) the county could pay for many years of board and care for what livestock it does receive. Alternately, it seems a space like 4101 Wild Chaparral Rd. might be able to accommodate small livestock (such as goats, sheep, and alpacas) and the really large animals (horses, cows) could be farmed out.

Thank you for taking the time to listen.

Jamie Hartshorn
Placerville, CA

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.

Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.

If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.

Thank you.

Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

 **Animal Shelter Board of Supervisors Agenda Item 19, 3/20/12**

1 message

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>
To: Cindy Johnson <cynthia.johnson@edcgov.us>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 11:30 AM

—— Forwarded message ——

From: **Barbara Lee** <barblee530@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Mar 18, 2012 at 10:59 PM
Subject: Comments - Board of Supervisors Agenda Item 19, 3/20/12
To: edc.cob@edcgov.us
Cc: bosfour@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

To: Susan Allen de Sanchez, Clerk of the Board:

Attached is correspondence from the Animal Shelter Coalition for El Dorado County – comments re: Item 19, Western Slope Animal Shelter Project, BOS Agenda of 3/20/12.

Thank you.

Barbara Lee

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
Any retransmission, dissemination or other use of the information by persons other than the intended recipient or entity is prohibited.
If you receive this e-mail in error please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete the material from your system.
Thank you.

 **3-20-12BOSAgendaItem19.pdf**
108K

Animal Shelter Coalition for El Dorado County

March 18, 2012

Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

Re: March 20, 2012 Board Agenda Item #19 – Western Slope Animal Shelter

Members of the Board,

We hope that the proposed evaluation of feasible alternatives to the current Shelter project site will yield a workable solution to the project's estimated budget shortfall. At this late date in the project, locating an existing building that meets location, size, and large animal housing criteria may provide that solution, if it can be renovated to create the required animal shelter elements.

However, if you decide to research alternative sites A and B, as described in the Item 19 Power Point Presentation, we urge the Board to direct staff to use a minimum of 17,000 square feet as their alternate site building size parameter – not the 13,000 square foot criteria listed in Slide 6. Board action June 16, 2007, directed the design process for “an approximate 17,000 square foot facility.” While the 17,600 square foot design and the adopted floor plan that resulted from that process may need to be set aside to pursue an existing building alternate, the building program (functions/spaces that need to be provided) remains valid. The space needs derive from an analysis of numbers and types of animals held, dimensions of cages/kennels, accepted industry standards, safety requirements, code requirements and health protocols. On January 31, 2012, the Board authorized DOT to eliminate \$150,000 from Phase 2 of the shelter project, in the form of a reduction of some “portion of interior walls.” That is the only shelter building reduction the Board has approved and it was in interior build out, not the building size. Secondly, that action does not directly relate to the alternate approach being considered now. Thus, we believe the approved shelter plan is currently about 17,000 square feet.

If the Board is considering reducing the size of the shelter, we urge you to share the new space analysis and building program as well as the analysis of the 4,600 square feet eliminated from the adopted shelter plan. Many interested community members have been engaged in the shelter project issue for many years. We, too, have invested a great deal of time and energy in this community conversation. A reduction by one fourth is a fairly significant one. Respectfully, we believe the community deserves to hear what is proposed for elimination and have the opportunity to comment. That seems only fair.

It seems that this project is poised to take a new direction and we are hopeful that it yields the centrally located, right sized, functional shelter that the community is expecting. But, we must get this right, this time. Please do not begin a new review with a flawed assumption at the outset. That will only result in questionable conclusions.

P. O. Box 361
Coloma, CA 95613

www.newshelternow.org

asc.edc@gmail.com

10-1235.13B. 27 of 32

In addition to our paramount issue, above, listed below are additional concerns:

Improvement Cost Estimates. The slides list surpluses remaining at project completion for both Alternate A and B. We are very pleased to hear staff thinks an alternative approach can complete the shelter within the remaining budget and leave a balance. We are concerned, though, that again projected costs may be underestimated at a very preliminary stage, setting up decision makers and the public for disappointment when refined numbers that include design and adjacent properties are delivered. But since staff projects a surplus upon completion of the project, we are even more surprised at the reduction in the size of the facility at the outset of this review. Up to this point, any reduction discussion was tied to budget and was in interior build out options at that.

Life of the Facility. We are very concerned with the comment on Slide 9 that Alternate Site B has a life of only 10 – 20 years. That is only 25% to 50% of the 40 year asset that we thought we were going to achieve. Again, we have to get this right, this time. After all this, El Dorado County deserves better than a ten or even twenty year facility.

Alternate Site Neighbors. Any site the County reviews will presumably have industrial/commercial or possibly some residential neighbors. We know the main issues for neighboring properties are noise and presence of livestock. Please address these issues early and once a property is likely, we encourage County staff to engage the neighbors in plans for shelter location, and explain the shelter's commitment to be a good neighbor. If we can be of any assistance in those communications, we are willing to help. Please give neighbors an opportunity to raise questions early and not let their first notice be a few days before a Planning Commission hearing.

Conclusion

I apologize for the length of this input. But since it looks like this seven year project is about to adjust course in a significant way, we were compelled to clearly, completely substantiate our position that a 17,000 square foot shelter is expected. We all want to get it right this time. Let's initiate the next evaluation based on solid, valid, adopted criteria.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

/s/ Barbara Lee
Animal Shelter Coalition for El Dorado County

M El Dorado County Animal Shelter Project

2 messages

Corinne Chapa <little_rhiney@yahoo.com>

Tue, Mar 20, 2012 at 11:05 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Dear Board of Supervisors,


I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or 26% reduction in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. It is not. I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time.

To be clear, looking at other options, as long as they can deliver the needed product, is reasonable. We support that review of alternatives. There is a critical, fundamental error in what staff is proposing to do, however, that will set this project up for failure again, if the Board doesn't change it. They are saying that 13,000 square feet is adequate, not the approved 17,600 square feet. They give no explanation of what they are cutting in this 4,600 square foot (26%) reduction or how operations will be affected. This is simply not acceptable! See our March 15 alert at http://www.newshelternow.org/resources/FactSheet_3-15-12.pdf for details.

El Dorado County Animals need us all to stand up and be their voice! You can make a difference!

Thank you!

Corinne Boren, Cameron Park, CA
www.newshelternow.org

 **FactSheet_3-15-12[1].pdf**
202K

The BOSONE <bosone@edcgov.us>

 **Animal Shelter Project**

1 message

Stacy Wright <stacy_wright@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Mar 19, 2012 at 3:43 PM

To: bostwo@edcgov.us, bosone@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, bosfive@edcgov.us

Dear Supervisor:

Please continue to **support the original 17,600 square foot plans** for the Western Slope Animal Shelter project. Reducing the size of the facility will simply be spending money on something that will be inadequate for the needs of the county & will cause unnecessary problems in the future. The homeless, abandoned & neglected animals of our county deserve better. As a family that has adopted a "rescue dog", we feel very strongly about this project & wish to see it completed correctly.

Please support the original animal shelter project design. There must be another solution for either a new, or retrofitted building.

Thank you for your time & consideration.

Best regards,

The Wright Family

El Dorado County Animal Shelter Concern

Debbie Payne <achesnpayne@comcast.net>

Tue, Mar 20, 2012 at 11:20 AM

To: bosone@edcgov.us, bostwo@edcgov.us, bosthree@edcgov.us, bosfour@edcgov.us, and <bosfive@edcgov.us>

It is unacceptable to reduce the size of the shelter. You are setting up this center to fail if you do not have acceptable room for the animals.

This has been worked on for years & a 26% reduction is JUST NOT RIGHT!

What is the basis for this change?

Please reconsider.

Thank you.

Deb Payne

Rescue, CA.

El Dorado County Animals need us all to stand up and be their voice! You can make a difference

I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or 26% reduction in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. It is not. I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time. I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or 26% reduction in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. It is not. I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time. I understand you may direct staff to look at retrofitting existing buildings to provide the permanent Western Slope Shelter rather than continue the approved project. I also understand that for this review, staff has decided with no supporting operational analysis, that a 4,600 square foot or 26% reduction in the accepted building program of 17,600 square feet is adequate. It is not. I urge you to direct your staff to evaluate spaces that are at least 17,000 square feet, not underestimate size, and not under cost this latest animal shelter project review. Their fundamental assumption is wrong. Tell them they simply must get it right this time.

Suzanne Allen de Sanchez <suzanne.allendesanch@edcgov.us>

 **Western Slope Animal Shelter Project**

mary dohnke <maryinthehills@wildblue.net>

Tue, Mar 20, 2012 at 9:32 AM

To: suzanne.allendesanch@edcgov.us, Ron Briggs <bosfour@edcgov.us>, John Knight <bosone@edcgov.us>, Ray Nutting <bostwo@edcgov.us>, "Norma.santiago" <bosfive@co.el-dorado.ca.us>, Jack Sweeney <bosthree@edcgov.us>

PRESS THE RESET BUTTON ON THIS PROJECT!

EDC Supervisors;

Having researched the history of this ill-planned project, it seems to us that providing a suitable facility for animals has taken a back seat to considerations for developing private land. To proceed with this project as planned would be fiscal irresponsibility, putting the actual building of a Western Slope Animal Shelter in jeopardy.

In previous comments that we have submitted, we expressed concerns about the strange configuration of the road to the shelter. The proposed, circuitous road does not appear to establish an approach to the animal shelter in a manner that would best serve both the shelter and EDC taxpayers.

As small business owners we have had to pay *ourselves* for 1/2 mile of pipe to connect to public water. We also had to pay *ourselves* to establish the required encroachment. It is my opinion that the private property owner is receiving more than the animals or the EDC taxpayers in the proposed arrangement.

We submit that you either redesign the current site to be more financially viable or that you move forward researching alternative sites.

Another option might be to create a coalition between already existing animal protection organizations in our county with the EDC Sheriff having oversight. This third option might eliminate the need for a new facility altogether, allowing existing animal service providers to have their facilities upgraded to accommodate additional homeless animals.

It's time to dump this problematic project proposal now under consideration and move forward with a focus on the needs of our homeless animals and the EDC taxpayers.

Tom and Mary Dohnke