Attachment 3

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dear members of the Calistoga City Council, my name is John Lincoln and I have relied on Dr. Franguelins services to take care of my pets for nearly 8 years. As a supporter of Wine Country Animal Lovers I am well aware of the upcoming decision of who to award the animal control contract to Napa County or PAS. This is a no-brainer but apparently not to everyone who sits on the council. Why would you want local animals and lost pets sent to an animal control center where 20% are killed. Can you imagine the look on your childs face when you explain to them that there beloved pet was killed because he lost his collar and was sent to Napa County Animal shelter (the orginization you voted for). After canceling your contract with Napa 7 years ago for poor service and high cost what exactly has changed so drasticly that would make you reinstate them in calistoga. Please Award the Contract to Petaluma Animal Services who only have a 1% kill rate and will guarantee better and cheaper service.

Two years ago I found a stray dog on a jobsite. He had no collar or chip; so I took him to Calistoga pet clinic where Dr. Franguelin examined him and ran some test. He informed us that the dog had heartworms and if sent to Napa County Animal Control it would be put down almost immediately. Dr. Franguelin informed us

that with the help of WCAL the $1,000.00 treatment for heartworms would be free to us if we agreed to adopt the stray dog. Fast forward 2 years, We now have a healthy, loving dog named Red, who without the help of Dr. Franguelin and WCAL would be nothing but smoke and ashes thanks to Napa County Animal control. For everything Dr. Franguelin and WCAL have done for Calistoga I believe it would be in the towns best interest, and respectful towards Dr. Franguelin and WCAL to award the animal Control contract to Petaluma Animal Services.

Sincerely, John Lincoln

From: Meg Heitz [mailto:mpheitz@sonic.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2015 8:31 AM
To: Kathy Flamson
Subject: Animal Service Contract

Dear Kathy,
We are sending the email below to the City Council members, but I wanted to be sure to send it to you for submission into the packets to be handed out tomorrow.

Dear City Council Members,

We wanted to write you a quick note with our views on the Animal Service contract that will be before you on April 21st.

There's obviously a lot of interest in this matter and the newspaper articles got us thinking about it. Here's our thoughts:

- The city of Calistoga is (of course) located in Napa County, as such we have a team of Firefighters, Police Officers and other responders that already interface and regularly communicate with Napa County Sherif, Cal-fire, Ambulance services, and County animal control folks.
    - Animal services and control for animals that occur just outside of the Calistoga City limits are currently served well by the folks from the Napa County Animal Control and Shelter.
    - Napa County Animal Control Services has been servicing calls within the city limits of Calistoga over the past two years (17 calls last year).
        - If the contract were to go to Petaluma (PAS), Napa County Animal control would continue to respond to dog bites within the City of Calistoga due to rabies regulations.
- By contracting for our municipal animal services with those serving us just over the city limit line it seems evident that we would both have better synergy of service and communication.
    - Keeping our city's revenue inside Napa County would also keep our dollars (and animals) 'at home' so to speak, which would strengthen the resources that Napa County Animal Services has to offer over time.
    - Both locals and visitors to Calistoga would no doubt begin their search for a stray dog or cat in Napa County, and would not think that their animal might be sheltering in Petaluma, so we would have a faster route to getting loved pets home.
- The Napa County shelter and Animal control services facilities and staff are top notch. We highly recommend a visit so that you can personally see what a fantastic organization is within our own county (call Kristen Loomer, Napa County Animal Shelter Manager, @ 707-253-6169).
    - There is quite a bit of mis-information being distributed by WCAL which essentially paints the Napa County staff as animal haters, which is clearly not at all true. These professionals of course love animals and are deeply concerned for their well being. I'm fairly certain that none of them are in it for the money, glamor or to inflict cruelty.
- In response to the thought that the Calistoga Pet Clinic / PAS / WCAL contact is the most "local" option for keeping our dollars and pets close to home, it must be said that the contract at hand is with an organization from Petaluma in Sonoma County.
    - However in the paper and in handouts around town, the WCAL / Calistoga Pet Clinic folks repeatedly state that as soon as "minor zoning technicalities" are cleared up the PAS contract animals will be boarded in Calistoga.

- The Calistoga Pet Clinic was allowed to be sited in the Rural RESIDENTIAL zone on 2 acres (as opposed to the 5 acre minimum required) by the acceptance of a variance, which also stipulated that there would be zero boarding of animals at the site.
    - The Calistoga Pet Clinic has not been discrete in it's constant and consistent disregard for the use permit that it should abide by.
    - Local citizens and the City of Calistoga have looked the other way on these violations, as without a proper agreement elsewhere, the boarding of stray animals was a necessity.
- Now that we, as a City are tackling the issue properly, we should carefully consider a contract to those who would disregard their permitted use in Calistoga.
- Essentially the City of Calistoga should enforce the use permit violations at the Calistoga Pet Clinic, and not encourage the expansion of the permitted uses of the small site within a residential area, by granting a contract that the proponents of which clearly state that their intention is to board Calistoga's strays at a location that is neither appropriate or zoned for such use.

The audience on April 21st will no doubt be filled with WCAL supporters, who like all of us, want the best for Calistoga's pets and wild animals. Meg and I believe that the most local option, with the highest integration with our own responders, and that actually has a permitted facility and trained, passionate staff is to grant the contact to Napa County Animal Services. We would absolutely support keeping our services in Calistoga once there is a legally zoned and permitted option (that isn't in a residential area). But to grant a contract with the hopes of such a permitted use seems like the cart before the horse.

Thanks for your consideration,
Peter & Meg Heitz
2882 Foothill Blvd
Calistoga, CA 94515
707-320-3575

April 16,2015

Dear Members of Calistoga City Council,

My name is Donna Demostene and I'm writing this letter regarding the Wine Country Animal Lovers (WCAL) and the animal control contract with the county of Napa.
I am a client of Dr. Franquelin's and I think it's important for you to know all that Dr. and his staff do to save animals. For many years at his own expense he has saved animals that would otherwise be euthanized. He and his staff rehabilitate, physically and emotionally the unwanted. Special need animals are saved and carefully placed in loving homes because of WCAL. It's with great concern that if a contract is awarded to Napa County Animal Control many animals that would have had a chance will be killed. Napa has a poor track record of euthanizing an average of 20 percent of dogs and cats that are brought to them. Petaluma on the other hand has a 1 percent kill rate. This seems like a no brainer. WCAL is an organization that is willing to go above and beyond to save as many dogs and cats as is humanly possible.
Please support the contract with Petaluma Animal Services, your vote will give the animals a second chance.
Thankyou for your consideration.

Very Truly Yours,

Donna Demostene

Donna Demostene
POB 1223
Healdsburg, Ca
95448

4/15/2015

Dear members of the Calistoga City Council,

My Name is Bev Lincoln and I have been a pet owner for 8 years. I have been following the issues related to Wine Country Animal Lovers (WCAL) and the animal control contract with the County of Napa the past few weeks with great interest. As a client of Dr Franquelin and lifelong animal lover, I strongly support awarding the animal control contract to Petaluma Animal Services (PAS) over the County of Napa as I believe PAS will provide a better service to the residents of this city. I avidly support the fact that PAS is a No kill shelter and I firmly support the work of Dr. Franquelin and his partnership with WCAL. Further, the fact that Calistoga's previous contract with the County of Napa was unsuccessful and the fact that it is Not a No kill shelter is of great concern to me as a pet owner & animal lover.

Two years ago, our sweet boy Red "found" my husband at the top of Oakville grade. He was starving and, as it turned out, horribly ill with heart worm disease. Dr Franquelin and all of the wonderful, loving, caring people

at WCAL welcomed him with open arms, administered medicine and Nursing that was Needed, and gave him kindness and comfort literally bringing him back to life. These angels did all of this with smiles on their faces, warmth in their hearts and DIDN'T CHARGE US A CENT! We Need [redacted] people like Dr Franquelin and organizations like WCAL and PAS in our community and in our lives. They set a perfect example of what is really right in this world and it would be shameful and tragic if we didn't support them wholeheartedly. Please open your hearts to our animal friends. All they ever want is a chance to live and Dr. Franquelin, WCAL and PAS assures them of that. For these reasons, I ask the Calistoga City Council to award the animal control contract to PAS.

Sincerely,

Bev Lincoln
4340 Chiles Pope Valley Road
St Helena, Ca 94574

April 12, 2015

Dear members of the Calistoga City Council,

My name is Teresa Butler and I have been a resident of this area all my life. My late husband, Veterinarian Bill Butler and I owned and operated the Calistoga Pet Clinic on Lincoln Avenue for 17 years. Based on our overwhelmingly negative past experiences with Napa County Animal Control, I am shocked to hear that you are entertaining the idea of contracting with them once again.

My husband Bill was frustrated by his experiences with Napa County Animal Control due to their slow response time and blatant disregard for the Up Valley residents and the needs of their pets. We were regularly expected to hold stray animals at the Calistoga Pet Clinic for days without compensation, taking up kennel space that could otherwise have be used by paying clients. Bill frequently provided medical care and emergency surgeries to help stray animals in distress at his own cost. Additionally, we were awoken at all hours of the night to open the clinic and take in stray animals from the local Police Department due to Napa County's inability to respond reliably or in a timely manner. Not surprisingly, none of this changed when we sold the Calistoga Pet Clinic to Steve Franquelin and the situation deteriorated even further when Calistoga failed to provide animal control services at all starting in 2008. I applaud Steve's attempt to provide a local resource to help stray animals by founding Wine Country Animal Lovers. This local animal rescue group has done a wonderful job filling a void, providing a service that Calistogans and their pets are entitled to, and WCAL has done all this without financial support from the City of Calistoga.

I trust the recommendation of Wine Country Animal Lovers and strongly support awarding the animal control contract to Petaluma Animal Services (PAS) because I believe they will offer a better service to Calistoga. Further, the fact that Napa County Animal Shelter has not achieved no kill status yet is particularly concerning to me as a pet owner. I urge you to please award the animal control contract to PAS rather than Napa County.

Sincerely,

Teresa Butler

Teresa Butler
1207 Silver Street, Calistoga CA 94515

Mayor Canning, City Manager Spitler and Council Members Dunsford, Barnes, Lopez-Ortega and Kraus

I have spoken to most all of you at one time or another over the past two weeks on the subject of the City's upcoming awarding of a contract for Animal Control and Sheltering services. Thank you again for the time that you have spent with me discussing this very important issue. I would like to summarize and recap those views, positions and opinions of my wife and I that we have compiled over the past two weeks and even well before on this matter.

As I mentioned already and as a reminder, we reside at 2970 Foothill Boulevard and own the next residence at 2946 Foothill Boulevard. Both properties share the entire property line with the parcel currently being leased and occupied by the Calistoga Pet Clinic at 2660 Foothill Boulevard.

As we know, the City is evaluating two proposals, one being from Napa County Animal Control and Sheltering (Napa) and the other from Petaluma Animal Services (PAS). I may not have these names exactly correct but I believe clear enough as to who I am speaking of within the following. A bullet point summary as we see it and for your consideration is as follows:

1. Contracting with an entity that is located within our county and already providing services within our county and in and around Calistoga (ie. **Napa**) is preferred over contracting with an entity that is not located within the county and that is not already providing services within the county or in and around Calistoga.
    a. Napa and the City of Calistoga are of course both located in Napa County.
        i. Accordingly, each parties interests are already more closely aligned as they have a long and steady working relationship and will continue to work jointly together in some level on such common/shared services as county animal control and sheltering, fire protection, law enforcement, emergency services, just to name a few.
        ii. There is and will continue to be a spirit of cooperation between the entities (the City and Napa) as they interface and work together to address and provide Animal Control and Sheltering.
            1. As an example perhaps, in an emergency animal control situation, Calistoga Police and Napa County Police may just be in a position to jointly respond given that I frequently see Napa County police located in Calistoga. Often I see Napa County Police parked on Foothill Boulevard and on Tubbs Lane available to assist Napa on a moment's notice if necessary.
            2. In the prior year, Napa answered 17 calls in Calistoga even without a contract.
            3. Napa will continue to answer any "bite" calls within the city even if PAS should be awarded the contract. Quite an overlap and hence the potential for conflict in execution of any contract that would exist with PAS should they be awarded the contract.
            4. Does PAS's proposal provide financial relief to the City for those cases where PAS would not have to respond? How would that be managed to make sure the City is not paying PAS for services not rendered?
    b. The Pets recovered by Napa stay in Napa County at the Napa animal shelter
        i. Residents and visitors of Calistoga are more familiar with Napa County and will think first about contacting Napa County about their

lost pet versus having any thought of contacting Sonoma County, Petaluma or any other remote location for that matter.

ii. Much publicity has been raised recently over the notion that using PAS will effectively mean that our lost pets will remain in Calistoga via sheltering at the Calistoga Pet Clinic (CPC).

1. While Sheltering has been occurring at CPC this has been in direct violation of the terms and conditions of CPC's use permit.
2. The forming and organizing of an animal shelter in a residential neighborhood as CPC and Wine Country Animal Lovers (WCAL) has done and continues to do today should not be allowed to continue.
3. Any representations made to the public by CPC and WCAL that jointly they only have minor issues to resolve regarding the use permit which at that time will permit sheltering of our pets in Calistoga at CPC rather than in Petaluma (via a contract with PAS) are deceiving.
4. My knowledge of CPC's original permitting process (where it was expressly stated that no sheltering of animals would be allowed, along with other restrictive covenants, stipulations and requirements), my past and recent discussions with the Calistoga Planning Department as well as with the Plan Commission and many of you on this email have indicated that no sheltering should occur in a residential neighborhood, now or in the future. Therefore, it is apparent that the representations being made by CPC and WCAL that one's support of PAS is a way of insuring that sheltering *continues* to occur at CPC is not true.
5. A vote for PAS is not a vote for sheltering in Calistoga, the public record should reflect.

c. PAS is located in Petaluma.

i. They do not already have an ongoing presence in Calistoga.

ii. The drive from Petaluma to Calistoga is longer in miles and far longer in drive minutes given the terrain covered and the frequency of delays on 101.

d. PAS's first loyalty is and will continue to be to serve Sonoma County.

i. Should PAS become stretched too thin, either operationally or financially, it seems likely that they would be more loyal to the residents and City of Petaluma. Their name is in fact *Petaluma* Animal Services and not Calistoga or Napa Animal Services.

2. Contracting with a public entity (ie. **Napa**) for these kinds of services is preferred over contracting with a privately organized and privately funded charitable organization.
   a. The City has a deep and lengthy working relationship with Napa County and hence has many reference points from which to evaluate Napa's ability to perform the contract adequately, professionally and ethically.
   b. The City has not worked with PAS to know from experience PAS's ability to perform the contract. At least not to my knowledge.
   c. Napa is more financially secure than PAS and has the full faith and credit of Napa County backing it.

i. PAS, organized as a 501(c) charitable organization, is dependent on the inflow of private charitable contributions with which such

flow is inherently unpredictable given the discretionary nature of contributions in general. Since unpredictable, the likelihood exists that PAS could experience a material financial shortfall impacting the ongoing performance of the contract unless adequate established reserves are already in place from which to draw upon. Has PAS submitted detailed financial statements including a Balance Sheet to be reviewed by the counsel to ascertain PAS's financial wherewithal?

ii. Napa, with the effective financial backing of Napa County, is better capitalized and therefore is much less risky financially given that Napa County's operating capital comes from tax revenues that are NOT discretionary. I suspect that Napa County presently has adequate established financial reserves much like those reserves that the City of Calistoga presently has.

d. Animal Control and Sheltering services, much like fire protection, police protection, emergency services, etc., continue to be best provided by the Public Sector rather than by the Private Sector

i. These types of services are inherently difficult to privatize given the significant amount of regulation necessary as a provider of these services given the nominal revenue and profit potential available to a private sector entity from providing these types of services.

ii. Most private sector entities, including 501(c) entities as PAS is, providing these types of services have not developed the large operating scale necessary to cost effectively absorb the high cost of regulation as well as the administration necessary to transition from a part time operation to a full time operation. Most often the operation and administration of such part time operations is dependent on a large amount of volunteer labor that, much like charitable contributions, is discretionary and therefore unpredictable.

iii. PAS, as a charitable organization and private sector provider of these services, does not have the operating scale necessary to offer the assurance that they will be able to pay for this high cost of regulation and administration now and in the always uncertain future.

iv. PAS in summary is a much too fragile organization, through no fault of their own, for which to rely and depend for these services to be delivered on a recurring basis.

3. Contracting with an entity that has a lengthy established sustainable operating history (ie. **Napa**) is preferred over an entity with a shorter less established and therefore less sustainable operating history.
   a. Napa's facility is a fabulous facility staffed with very caring and compassionate associates.
   b. Recent representations have been made by news outlets and WCAL that Napa has a deplorable facility staffed with uncaring and unprofessional people. This is just not true and frankly undeserving. Visits to the Napa facility, by residents as well as by many on this email, refute these representations.
   c. Much discussion has been occurring over the live release rates of both bidders.

i. PAS advertises themselves as a no kill shelter.

1. It is my understanding that PAS is *not* required to accept any and all pets presented to it.

2. Is PAS able to refer refused pets to Sebastapol for instance? Has there been discussions by those on this email around this topic?
3. Is it possible, even, that any refused pets have found their way over to Napa?
4. Napa accepts every and all pets presented to it while still maintaining stellar live release rates.
5. Simply comparing each bidder's percentages on the surface to arrive at a conclusion as to performance without digging deeper into the data used to calculate such percentages could lead one to the making of an inaccurate decision. Has the data behind these rates been analyzed thoroughly and completely?

ii. Should PAS be effective in expanding their operation, they are proposing a contract in Mendocino County according to local news reports, what assurances do they make that they will continue to operate effectively.

1. Napa has the distinct advantage of having the physical and operating infrastructure already in place to assure that they can continue delivering results of adoption at the same stellar rates as in the past.
2. What assurance has PAS given that as they grow they can continue to deliver the live release results, subject to further understanding as discussed in 3(c)i above, that they have been advertising.
3. It is quite possible that PAS in the future could experience results no better and perhaps even less than Napa given PAS's limited scope of operations to date as outlined in detail above.

In closing, the Calistoga Community has demonstrated its impressive enthusiasm for the welfare of our pets. Napa's performance and results, as outlined above, are fantastic standing on their own. Imagine the difference and the impact that could be made to the Pet Community in Calistoga as well as all of Napa County as these two groups come together through the awarding of this contract to Napa. Further, a true spirit of Community from one end of the County to the other could flourish as we all work together to further our love, passion and dedication for taking care of all of our pets and animals. From our family that has always had and still does have many pets, we hope you find this letter heartfelt and helpful.

Sincerely,

Julie and Keith Weppler