

File 250028 – Chapter 78 Fiscal and Equity Evaluation - MADACC.

This worksheet is designed for departmental use to evaluate fiscal and equity implications of the proposed Phase I Animal Ordinance compared to the current Chapter 78 framework. Responses will inform the unified Fiscal & Equity Impact Statement for Council review.

A. Baseline and Program Cost Questions

Question
What was the City's total contribution to MADACC in the most recent fiscal year? <i>See attached budget breakdown</i>
What portion of this amount supports impoundment and boarding versus field enforcement? <i>See attached budget breakdown</i>
What are MADACC's current annual intake figures and average per-animal costs?
What are current DNS staffing levels and FTE allocation for animal enforcement?
What cost-recovery mechanisms currently exist and what revenue do they produce? <i>MADACC has annually and consistently increased their non-member revenue. Over the past 13 years we have created a robust adoption program which brings in around \$500K, we have increased donations (depending on grants) to \$350 - \$400K per year. This has enabled us to increase necessary employees, in particular, having three veterinarians rather than just one. With 12K animals coming in, it is imperative to have a larger staff medical staff.</i>

B. Fiscal Change and Reallocation Analysis

Question
Estimate startup costs for implementing microchipping, and public outreach. <i>There will not be start up costs for microchipping, as we already provide that service. A veterinarian is not required to administer a microchip, so we can do them on location easily. Public outreach is also built into our current model.</i>
Quantify potential savings or cost reductions from microchipping over 5 years. <i>Microchip costs have been covered for the past few years by Friends of MADACC. I am hopeful they will continue to cover the costs to purchase and administer. We can return animals in the field, rather than bring them into the shelter when an animal is found with a microchip that is valid (current information available on it). We do not bill for animals returned in the field. Good Samaritans will be able to return animals to owners rather than calling MADACC for service.</i>
Identify potential revenue or cost recovery from new or tiered service fees. <i>Currently financial conditions are bleak when it comes Milwaukee County's population large increase in revenue overall. Most microchips are done for free. Sterilization surgeries are usually low cost, or free with a redemption. However, we have had a reduction in public spay/neuter opportunities due to being down one veterinarian who did large numbers of surgeries each day. Milwaukee County residents tend not to come in for large dogs or cats. The hardest animals to adopt out or transfer. MADACC was never set up to be a revenue generating endeavor. Wisconsin Humane Society,</i>

as our private shelter counterpart has traditionally been the organization who does that with a very strong Development Department, and a mission that aligns with the majority of residents across Milwaukee County. MADACC has always been the place that euthanizes animal rather than letting owners have them back. Which is no longer the case, but certainly was once. MADACC was conjured to a low cost pound facility. Animals not reclaimed, adopted by the finder or transferred were euthanized for time and space. That model, aside from being immoral and unethical addresses none of the animal and human issues we face in the community. Landlord restrictions, lack of resources for veterinary care, inability to provide training, proper confinement, and husbandry practices are the issues that negatively impact our population and trickles down to their pets. Should our intakes begin to recede through the fully proposed program, which is strong on cat spay/neuter, limiting cat intake (no healthy, clean and well fed adults – just sick, injured, seized, bite cases and noted continuing problem animals) and breeding practices and via microchips and other educational programming, we will be able to decrease some staffing levels and then retrain some staff to provide a Community Resources position in order to keep animals in homes. That is what shelters need to do in addition to our services which already exceed expectations. We need to be social workers, be hands on with many people for getting assistance with a sick or injured pet or getting an animal home. We need to educate the community that animals are not just to be used for easy money/breeding, cannot train themselves, require financial and time resources many people are unable or unwilling to provide, and lastly, should be a lifetime commitment.

Could the current MADACC contract be restructured to allocate a portion to preventive programming?

I do not believe so. Also, I am not sure what you mean by preventative programming. MADACC has no educational facilities for classes or training opportunities. Nor staff able to take on that kind of programming. The City could provide more education to law enforcement officers to make more meaningful and judicious choices on scene when animals are present. Holding owners accountable for egregious violations of ordinances or basic care expectations needs to be a priority. I see the same people violate the same ordinances and statutes repeatedly without any serious consequences. People need to be held accountable for abandoning animals when they move out of a residence. I am not sure how that can be done, but I can let you know when it occurs and you can see how much that adds to our intake population each year.

List external grants or matching-fund opportunities that could offset City costs.

MADACC regularly applies for grants via Best Friends, ASPCA and Humane World, along with local opportunities. I believe that the city could assist with getting our mission out into the public domain where we would be able to continue to grow our donation intake from the community. I say that our municipalities fund us to get the animals in and reclaimed. All the rest we do with donations, kindness, acts of charity, relationships we have nurtured over the years and so on.

C. Resident and Equity Impact Evaluation

Question

<p>What is the average redemption cost per pet reclaimed by an owner?</p> <p><i>Currently, an intact, unlicensed animal with no rabies vaccine that comes in as a stray from the City of Milwaukee will pay the following fees on the day the animal comes into MADACC will pay \$60 ordinance, \$24 or \$36 license fee depending on the time of year, \$30 for a licensed intake \$40 for unlicensed intake, \$30 rabies fee, \$25 boarding fee per day. That means, \$179. \$145 if current with license and rabies. If we get in an animal that is already licensed, we can give it a same day “FREE RIDE HOME” and not intake the animal if we can drop off or have owner pick up. One time per year.</i></p>
<p>How many low-income residents were unable to reclaim animals due to costs in the past 3 years?</p> <p><i>If we have people come in with less than the fees required, we will work with them or have Friends of MADACC will cover some of their costs. Unfortunately, most of the large dogs and adult cats are not ever reclaimed, nor even called about. Many people swear they are coming in and never do. We have residents use us as a boarding facility and then do not have money to reclaim the animal when they come back from Florida. No owner that comes into MADACC and asks for financial assistance will leave without their pet or get extra, non-fee incurring time to reclaim.</i></p>
<p>Estimate household compliance costs under current and proposed ordinances. Will reduce ordinance fee to \$25, will provide free spay/neuter if necessary for compliance. MADACC plans to continue free reclaim microchips.</p>
<p>Could a hardship waiver or voucher program be implemented and at what cost?</p> <p><i>I believe our current policies already act in this way.</i></p>
<p>How would the ownership limit (3 animals) affect current residents and equity outcomes?</p> <p><i>We want to allow those with the maximum number of animals currently to apply for the Fanciers Permit, even if they will be over the limit moving forward under the following conditions: All animals are current with a 2026 license prior to April 1, 2026. All animals will need to come to MADACC to have a photograph on file with MADACC and a microchip so they cannot be replaced should another animal pass or be given away. All animals in the home would have to be licensed every year for the Grandfathering exception to remain in play. They would also have to have an approved Fancier Permit renewed as required by City of Milwaukee. The City of Milwaukee does not have the space or resources to support the current population of animals in the city. Additionally, the cost to own a pet that is healthy is currently becoming out of reach for the middle class. Veterinary costs have outpaced the public ability to pay for those services. There are no low cost full veterinary clinics in the City of Milwaukee. I believe we will see a reduction in surrendered or abandoned animals as people begin to adhere to the proper limits.</i></p>

D. Administrative and Implementation Capacity

Question
How will DNS and MADACC coordinate inspections and enforcement for tethering, TNR, and dangerous animals?
Are current systems compatible with new reporting requirements?
Estimate training and outreach costs needed for staff and the public.
List metrics to measure success and compliance under the new ordinance.

Provide a timeline and milestones for Phase II ordinance development.

E. Legal and Policy Coordination

Question
Confirm DNS and MADACC authority to administer TNR and community-cat programs.
Assess liability or insurance issues for volunteer caretakers or participants.