MEMORANDUM

Date: May 8, 2015

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
    Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
    County Administrator

Re: Pima Animal Care Center Intergovernmental Agreements

The County has and will secure Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) from all jurisdictions, with the exception of the City of Tucson, for animal care services beginning July 1, 2015.

We are currently in negotiations with the City regarding their IGA for animal care services. Attached is a May 4, 2015 letter I directed to the Interim Tucson City Manager regarding this matter. I hope the County and City can reach an agreement regarding the level of service the City desires for animal care services for next fiscal year and that an IGA that can be agreed upon before June 30, 2015.

CHH/anc

Attachment

c: Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
   Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Health Department
   Kim Janes, Chief of Internal Affairs, Pima Animal Care Center
May 4, 2016

Martha Durkin, Interim City Manager
City of Tucson
P.O. Box 27210
Tucson, Arizona 85726

Re: Your April 22, 2015 Letter Regarding Pima Animal Care Center Services

Dear Ms. Durkin:

Your April 22, 2015 letter contains a number of assumptions that are incorrect, and these are discussed below.

1. All other jurisdictions are charged and are paying administrative overhead and capital costs. The only jurisdiction that is not is the City of Tucson.

2. I offered to offset our administrative cost with the administrative cost the City charges the County for wastewater billing. As you can see, there is quite an inconsistent principle being applied in that the City does not want to pay administrative costs to the County for animal care services, yet charges the County for the same services in our wastewater billing intergovernmental agreement (IGA). I remain amenable to offsetting these administrative costs.

3. The City is the only jurisdiction not participating in financing the increased sheltering capacity that was employed nearly two years ago as an emergency measure. These costs are real; and the City, by participating in the animal care IGA bears responsibility for your share of these costs.

4. Since the increased sheltering cost attributable to City use is $244,578, it is not financially viable to offset this capital cost by the temporary use of less than one acre of City property during construction of the new Pima Animal Care Center.
(PACC). I do not believe the property would appraise for more than $30,000 to $40,000. To pay $244,578 for a temporary construction easement is not an economically sound decision for the County. I understand the present offer is $10,046 for a temporary construction easement. We would certainly be willing to purchase this property from the City, as it could be used for overflow parking.

I understand the City’s financial limitations; and as we discussed at the recent joint jurisdictional manager’s meeting regarding animal care issues, the County will not alter its present sheltering methodology or processes. Hence, the area where a jurisdiction can choose to reduce animal care expenses is enforcement activities. We are open to structuring an IGA with a cap on your financial participation, knowing that when the cap is reached, no further PACC enforcement will occur within your jurisdiction. This operational model would be acceptable to the County and allow the City to purchase the level of service you believe is necessary for your jurisdiction.

I have asked our staff to have an IGA in place for these services prior to July 1, 2015, as it is important to be clear about the animal care services requested by the City before the beginning of the fiscal year to avoid the present circumstance of the City disputing costs after they have been incurred by the County.

Sincerely,

C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator
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c: Jan Lesher, Deputy County Administrator for Medical and Health Services
Dr. Francisco Garcia, Director, Health Department