HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
Monday, February 3, 2014
6:00 p.m.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers

Members Present:  Alderman Burrus, Alderman Braithwaite, Alderman Grover, Alderman Fiske, Alderman Holmes, Alderman Tendam

Members Absent:  None

Staff Present:  Wally Bobkiewicz, Chief Richard Eddington, Henry Ford, Jennifer Lasik, Joseph McRae, Melissa Parker

Others Present:  Alderman Rainey, Mayor Elizabeth Tisdahl, Alderman Wynne

Presiding Member:  Alderman Holmes

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM
With a quorum present, Madam Chair Holmes called the meeting to order at 6:11 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 2013
Alderman Fiske moved approval.  Alderman Tendam seconded.   A voice vote was taken to approve the November 4, 2013 minutes and it was approved 6-0.

III. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

IV. TOWNSHIP OF EVANSTON
HHT1 Assessor Bonnie Wilson’s Report
Assessor Wilson’s Report is included as Attachment 1.

HHT2 Township Monthly Bills
Alderman Grover moved approval.  Alderman Braithwaite seconded.   A voice vote was taken to approve the Township Monthly Bills and it was approved 6-0.

V. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION
HH3 Harley Clarke Mansion

Citizens Comments.
Ms. Norah Diedrech, Executive Director for Evanston Art Center, referred to two documents that were included in the packet.  The first was the completed IFF Assessment on 2603 Sheridan Rd which concludes that the facilities, including the coach house, will be inadequate for an expanded city arts program that the Evanston Art Center is looking to develop and implement.  The second document in the packet is the EAC’s plan for the creative regeneration.  There are a list of programs that were included that are unique and not offered elsewhere.
In light of what the EAC would like to provide for the community it will not be possible within the footprint and configuration of the building at 2603 Sheridan Rd. The EAC Board of Trustees has determined that the total cost for the renovation of $5 million would not make sense.

Ms. Diedrich provided a hard document and asked the Committee to seriously consider the bulleted items. The EAC is requesting to stay in the building for up to 2 years beginning on January 1, 2014. They would agree to pay $111,500 that was identified in the immediate year one section for building code life safety and accessibility improvements in the IFF document. The EAC requested that the City will not trigger the 240 day period in the lease. It would not be an easy move for the EAC. They have tried to find a new space and have not been able to do so in time. They made immediate safety upgrades as soon as possible when the Fire Department came in and they are in compliance. A vote for 240 days would discontinue collaborations prematurely and put people out of work. The EAC put an online petition online Friday night and right before the meeting they had over 1,700 people who have signed.

Several other citizens spoke in favor of extending EAC transition to two years from the Harley Clarke Mansion and several other citizens spoke in favor for moving forward with the IDNR since it seems to be ideally suited for the space and would be financially sustainable.

City Manager, Wally Bobkiewicz, pointed out a couple documents included in the packet among the EAC’s communications which were the letter from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources that reiterated their continue interest in the facility and the lease. For the Committee’s recollection the discussion of the Harley Clarke Mansion started back in the Spring of 2011 and it was determined in July that the City would be looking for another use of the building. It is coming on about three years to find other uses for the building.

Alderman Fiske asked about the fact that the IDNR stated in its letter that they would occupy the building by this Fall. Is that correct?

Mr. Bobkiewicz specified that is what the letter states but the City has not done any additional work with them. Perhaps it could be Fall but probably more likely toward the end of the year. The letter shows their earnestness to move forward with the project.

Alderman Fiske asked if there had been any discussions with the EAC that about a temporary site that would work for them.

Mr. Bobkiewicz stated that based on previous conversations with the EAC that an interim site was not one that they were looking to entertain but rather they would like to go from one permanent site to another. There have not been specific discussions and if there is interest in an interim site then with the help of the Economic Development Staff we would assist with that.

Alderman Grover asked Mr. Bobkiewicz if he gathered a sense of urgency from IDNR if we were to pursue discussions with the IDNR about the use of the building.

Mr. Bobkiewicz gathered from discussion at the community meeting was that IDNR did not seem to think there would be a way to co-exist. If we move forward with the IDNR we should do so in a way that would meet their needs. We have dealt with Harley Clarke for a number of years and we need to make a decision. We need to find a way for EAC to transition out that is respectful to them as well as to move forward with the State.

Alderman Grover shared the thoughts that we have a lease term which provides 240 days or 8 months until October 2014. One could say that the EAC transition began more than 2 years ago and she was fairly certain that the EAC’s strategic planning process had included looking for a new facility for the better part of the past 2 years. There have been other non-profits that have come into Evanston and found space for their needs which have not acquired a long space of time to adapt to their specific needs. She would like to revoke the formal revisions of the lease but with the understanding that we work with EAC to make sure there is a smooth transition. Alderman Grover was hesitant to lose this perspective tenant.
Alderman Tendam stated the question was asked how we got here. Most people know that this has been an unusual journey that we couldn’t have predicted. He believed the Committee and the City put out mixed messages to the EAC. He doesn’t know that much about the IDNR proposal and it sounds interesting but he doesn’t want to risk losing the EAC for a prospect we don’t know that much about. He thought that 240 days was not enough time for the EAC but believed 2 years is too much. He stated that there should be a decision for somewhere in between those timeframes and believes there will be some flexibility. He wants to find a transition that can serve both the EAC and a new tenant.

Alderman Fiske asked if we are not certain that the IDNR is wrapped up then at what point would the clause be acted upon. Could it be at the point, where the IDNR deal is completed, instead of moving forward right now?

Mr. Bobkiewicz indicated that his concern is once the opportunity is in place it would be too much to ask them to wait another 8 months. There are discussions in Springfield about a capital bill that could provide additional funding that a State agency like the IDNR might be eligible for that only come along every few years. They could miss out on that type of funding if there was a further delay.

Alderman Burrus thanked Mr. Bobkiewicz for finding a viable tenant that is willing to upgrade the building in a manner that is safe and pay to rent. She disagreed with Alderman Tendam’s statement about sending the EAC mixed messages. She thought it has been clear from the time she has been on Council which has been about five years that something needed to be done with Harley Clarke. We talked about the RFP process and then when we got bids in we went through those and the EAC has had a very long time to make a decision on what to do. They were looking to move. This wasn’t a big surprise to the EAC because there have been many years of discussion about this. At one point the EAC stated they wanted to leave, and then they wanted to stay and now they want to leave again. We need to move forward because this is about dollars and cents and the viability of having programming for the arts as well as social service agencies. We have to be financially responsible.

Alderman Holmes stated that we need to think about what will happen after 2 years if we were to extend the transition for the EAC. We may not have a viable tenant at that point. She believes that we would have to serve the notice to the EAC first before legally moving forward with negotiations of another tenant. She thought that if the new tenant is willing then we could negotiation to possibly stretch the EAC to a full year or more. She was happy to hear that the IDNR would be taking care of the safety issues since that was a major concern for her. She believed we need to move ahead to do what we can to get additional time for the EAC but in the meantime suggest other spaces for the EAC.

Alderman Grover wants to proceed in parallel by transitioning the EAC and pursue the partnership with the IDNR. She believes the IDNR are reasonable people and we can find a way to make it happen to serve the EAC that will ensure they will be her two years from now and both organizations will be providing great programming for the City.

Alderman Fiske agreed with Alderman Grover especially since the EAC has decided that the facility does not work with them. She wants to work to perhaps provide a temporary space for the EAC if we have to and provide all the support that we can to give them a soft landing.

Alderman Tendam thinks there a lot of potential if it is the IDNR that is selected and comes back with a proposal that we like. He also thinks there is a lot of flexibility as well. This is the big unknown to the EAC and it’s reasonable that they would be concern about their future. He wants to ensure that as soon as we know there is a serious proposal from the IDNR that we put them in touch with the EAC to work it out and let them know it is a concern of ours as well.

Alderman Grover moved to receive the report and direct the City Manager to issue the notice of the lease termination to the Evanston Art Center pursuant to the current lease agreement and that we also direct the City Manager to continue discussions about a partnership with the IDNR. Alderman Burrus seconded. A voice vote was taken and it was approved 5-1. Alderman Tendam was not in favor.

**HH4 Community Animal Rescue Effort (C.A.R.E.)**

Mr. Bobkiewicz’s specified that in the report included in the packet that he is looking for direction for an amendment to the agreement between the City and C.A.R.E. There was a document that showed
C.A.R.E. had agreed to not only provide services to the shelter but also the expansion to the shelter. The work on the expansion did not move forward largely because of economic concerns but the operation of the animal shelter has continued. While there has been a lot of community discussion in the past few weeks he would like to come back to his request for direction on an amendment to the existing agreement for a twelve month period. The existing facility is not what it should be and wasn’t ten years ago when the City began the discussion years ago.

Gail Lovinger, a C.A.R.E. Board member, presented to the Committee on behalf of C.A.R.E. The presentation is included as Attachment 2.

Alisa Kaplan presented on behalf of a group of concerned volunteers at the Evanston Animal Shelter. The presentation is included as Attachment 3.

Alderman Grover moved for the direction of the Committee to form a sub-committee that would include two Committee members to review the operations of the animal shelter and the agreement with C.A.R.E. She expressed concern of people taking sides and might take a turn that the citizen comments could take that would undermined what the efforts of the volunteers have done. She nominated Alderman Tendam and Alderman Fiske to be on the sub-committee to secure an agreement with C.A.R.E. Alderman Burrus seconded the motion.

Alderman Holmes stated that after reading both reports we know we need to just sit down and figure this out. She was not certain that this forum was the proper place. She agreed that a sub-committee would be a great avenue to move forward and asked if Alderman Tendam and Alderman Fiske would be willing to partake in the committee which both of them expressed they would. She wanted to ensure that there would be people from all sides involved to work with City staff and the City Manager to get it resolved. A voice vote was taken and it was approved 6-0.

Citizen’s Comments
There were 2 speakers on behalf of the Waukegan Police Department that shared their current procedures for animal control and how they work closely with rescue shelters. They are striving for no-kill shelters.
There were 7 speakers that spoke in favor for C.A.R.E.
There was one speaker concerned about what money was going toward with the Evanston Animal Shelter.
There were 28 speakers that spoke in favor of the concerned volunteers.
Submitted citizen’s comments – Attachment 4.

In response to a couple of citizen comment’s that mentioned that there was money that had disappeared from C.A.R.E.’s fundraising efforts, Alderman Tendam wanted to go on record for vouching that nothing has been done in regards to disappearance of money.

Mr. Bobkiewicz stated that we would work with three members of C.A.R.E., and three members of concerned volunteers along with Alderman Tendam and Fiske to form the sub-committee.

VI. COMMUNICATION

VII. ADJOURNMENT
It was moved and seconded for adjournment at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Melissa Parker
Administrative Secretary
To: Human Services Committee

From: Bonnie Wilson, CIAO
Evanston Township Assessor

Date: February 3, 2014

Re: Update on the Assessor office

I am still accepting applications for the Senior Freeze and the Senior Exemption. The deadline was scheduled to be February 5th, however, the Cook County Assessor’s office will be extended the deadline. I do not have an exact date at this time.

On Tuesday February 11, the Cook County Assessor office, Cook County Commission Larry Suffredin office and my office will be at the Levy Center helping senior with their exemptions during the lunch hour from 11:00 to 1:00.

So far, I have seen 180 taxpayers and today I saw over 24 taxpayers.

I would like to encourage seniors to make an appointment to come to the Assessor’s office for their senior applications. I want to remind them that every senior over 65 can apply for a senior exemption. But only seniors over 65 whose household income is less than $55,000 can apply for a senior freeze.

Do not forget the Evanston Township Office is now at the Civic Center on the first floor next to the City Clerk’s office. Our new phone number is 847-448-8136. Please call for an appointment.
FIRST INSTALLMENT TAX BILLS ARE DUE MARCH 4

Contact:
Bonnie Wilson
Evanston Township Assessor
847-448-8178

First installment property tax bills for tax year 2013 arrived in the last week of January, according to Bonnie Wilson, Evanston Township Assessor. “Property taxes are paid in two installments,” Bonnie Wilson said. “The first installment bill is fifty-five percent (55%) of the total property tax bill for the previous year, and will be due on March 4, 2014.”

Taxpayers should note that first installment tax bills will not reflect homeowner, senior citizen or other exemptions, nor will they reflect successful assessment appeals that were filed for tax year 2013. “The first installment is just an estimate based on what was paid last year,” Bonnie Wilson explained. “When the second installment bill is mailed in the summer, it will reflect all exemptions for which the property is eligible as well any savings due to successful 2013 tax appeals.”

Details about Paying Taxes. If money for property taxes is paid into an escrow account with a taxpayer’s mortgage company, the financial institution should receive the tax bill electronically, even if the taxpayer also receives a copy of the bill. Bonnie Wilson, Evanston Township Assessor advises taxpayers with property tax escrows held by their mortgage companies not to pay property taxes on their own. If they do, an overpayment of property taxes may result.

Property owners who do not have mortgage companies paying their taxes can make tax payments in person, by mail, or on-line at the Cook County Treasurer’s web site, www.cookcountytreasurer.com. In-person payments are accepted at the Cook County Treasurer’s downtown Chicago office at 118 N. Clark Street and at any Chase Bank in the Chicago area. Chase branches most convenient to Evanston Township residents are located at Chase Banks at 1603 Orrington, 635 Chicago Ave., and 901 Grove in Evanston.

Release date: February 3, 2014
• Thank you Alderman Holmes and Human Services Committee for permitting us time to present information to this committee.

• I’m Gail Lovinger Goldblatt, a 20-year plus volunteer at C.A.R.E., a C.A.R.E. board member, and a dog adoption counselor

• Recent articles along with associated on-line “chatter” made it clear that there are significant misunderstandings about CARE, its role in the community, and its relationship with both the City of Evanston and the city’s Animal Shelter.

• I want to spend this brief time talking to you about what C.A.R.E. is and does. We are available to this committee at this meeting and any other time to respond to any questions that you have. We believe in transparency and have tried to post all relevant information on our website.
Community Animal Rescue Effort is not the Evanston Animal Shelter and is not Animal Control.

• All volunteer, not for profit humane org—care for hundreds of stray, lost, and abandoned dogs and cats that come into the shelter every year
• Serving Evanston community for more than 25 years
• Every adoptable pet deserves a safe and loving forever home
• Adoption program takes into account needs and expectations of community and adopters as much as animals
• We train, socialize, and provide mental stimulation to make our animals more adoptable and relieve the stress of the shelter. We have no time limit on how long an animal can stay at the shelter.
More than Adoption Group—Community Service Organization

- Provide Behavioral Assistance
- Stock Pet Food Sections of two Pantries and anyone in need of pet food who comes to the shelter
- Worked with Police Department to waive $35 give up fee for people with financial hardship
- Humane education—Preteens, Schools, Girl Scout and other groups
- Cover Shelter evenings, weekends, and holidays—regardless of weather
- Care for all animals on a daily basis
- Routinely help adopters who take dogs and cats with health issues cover the ongoing costs of their care.
Relationship with City

• Operate under Police Department’s SOPs
  – Require behavior evaluation
  – Only Chief Animal Warden has the authority to euthanize an animal
  – SOPs require that dogs that are likely to present danger in home or the community should be euthanized
  – We’re not allowed to take in dogs that have bitten
  – Ultimately, responsibility lies with Animal Control for determining what do with animals that C.A.R.E. does not believe are appropriate to adopt in our community.
Behavior Evaluations

• As Triptow report indicated, we use industry standard evaluation process and our evaluators have necessary expertise

• Observe dogs from moment they come in
  – Give them extra time if they need it
  – Work with dogs to modify specific behaviors through training and retest
  – We love dogs; we want them all to pass.
  – At same time, we feel responsible to our adopters and the community to adopt dogs that to the best of our ability we know to be safe.

• If any City Council members are interested in observing an evaluation or seeing video clips of dogs going through the same part of the evaluation, just let us know.
Expectations of Adopters

• Expect to find solid dogs that with a bit of work will become really great dogs
• Not looking for dogs that need to be managed carefully to avoid harm to people or other animals
• Surveys & applications tell us that #1 reason people would return or give up an animal is aggression towards people or other animals.
• Based on past City Council discussions, we know that this has been a concern in Evanston
• PAWS—Gold Standard of shelters—euthanized 41 dogs for behavior reasons in 2012; PAWS hand picks dogs that seem most adoptable; CARE takes what comes in the door
• Of the 29 dogs euthanized in 2012, 14 were euthanized for medical reasons, biting history, or other reasons unrelated to behavior evaluation.
Commitment to Improvement

• Expanded canine foster program
• Shortened length of time it takes to put dogs up for adoption—working with more vets
• Getting them up on almost 100 adoptable animal websites as well as C.A.R.E.’s website
Going Forward

- Met with City officials in November and have recommended that Animal Control follow *best practices* in decisions on what to do with dogs that C.A.R.E. doesn’t believe should be adopted in the community.

- Evaluate and qualify rescues—Humane Society of US has provided C.A.R.E. with samples—ensure that they have the capacity and resources to care for these animals.

- Provide prospective rescues with results of C.A.R.E.’s behavioral evaluation so they can make informed decisions about how they will use their resources.

- Last March, the Police Chief said that the Chief Animal Warden would be trained in behavioral evaluation—we still think that would be valuable in making good decisions that serve the community.
Going Forward

• Volunteers, who donate their time and energy and put their heart into what they do, devastated and demoralized by the misstatements and efforts to destroy a reputation and a good name built over the course of more than a quarter of a century

• C.A.R.E. will continue as a humane organization devoted to providing every adoptable pet a safe and loving forever home.
  – Don’t know whether it will be possible to do this in Evanston
  – Or, if Evanston even wants an adoption group like C.A.R.E.

  – Future partnership to be successful must respect C.A.R.E.’s role and expertise, protocols for communication, and a process for resolution of disagreements.
Who we are

• Senior volunteers who became concerned about dog euthanasias at the Evanston Animal Shelter

• Approached CARE Board members about specific dogs and issues – especially behavior evaluations - throughout 2011 and 2012

• Formally submitted questions to Board in October 2012

• Board acknowledged euthanasia rate was 40-50% but said they had no plans to reduce it

• At that point, we approached City officials
What are the issues at the Evanston Animal Shelter?

1. The euthanasia rate
2. Behavior evaluations
3. The recommendations from the two reports, the ASPCA and Janice Triptow reports
4. CARE’s Draft Agreement for the City and what it means for “failed” dogs
5. The rescue dogs
Euthanasia numbers at the shelter

• About 250 dogs come into the shelter every year (2010-2012)
  – 150 are returned to owner.
  – 80-100 become shelter dogs and go through CARE’s behavior evaluation process
  – CARE “fails” just under half (46%) of those dogs and recommends them for euthanasia
CARE’s new calculations

• Why does CARE’s percentage seem lower?
  – CARE recently started including the many “lost” dogs returned to their owners. These dogs do not belong to the shelter and do not go through CARE’s evaluation process.
  – This is a new strategy. Again, in October 2012, the Board acknowledged the rate was 40-50%.
  – More importantly, CARE’s new number attempts to obscure the very real disparities between CARE’s treatment of unclaimed dogs and that of other communities
Unclaimed dogs have a 1 in 2 chance of survival

This is not in dispute.

Until the City intervened, an unclaimed dog had only a 55% chance of surviving CARE’s behavior evaluation process.
Deemed unadoptable 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adoptable</th>
<th>Unadoptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasha 1/10/12</td>
<td>Snowy 1/11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormy 1/11/12</td>
<td>Rommy 1/21/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogart 1/25/12</td>
<td>Schmidt 1/26/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radar 2/2/12</td>
<td>Louie 2/15/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs 2/26/12</td>
<td>Max 3/9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia 3/11/12</td>
<td>Levi 3/21/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seigfried 4/9/12</td>
<td>Nacho 5/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch 5/3/12</td>
<td>Haley 5/14/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles 5/27/12</td>
<td>Checkers 5/31/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinky 6/7/12</td>
<td>Ruth 6/13/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter 6/16/12</td>
<td>Becca 6/25/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy 6/25/12</td>
<td>Lady 6/23/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruiser 7/3/12</td>
<td>Rover 7/9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee 7/22/12</td>
<td>Apollo 8/7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeus 8/7/12</td>
<td>Sugar 8/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley 8/11/12</td>
<td>Riley 8/11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Coco 8/17/12</td>
<td>Miranda 9/1/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuckles 9/20/12</td>
<td>China 9/22/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naia 11/1/12</td>
<td>Rollie 11/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny 10/23/12</td>
<td>Snickers 11/25/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callie 12/8/12</td>
<td>Ted 12/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunker 12/20/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unadoptable</th>
<th>Adoptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pansy 1/28/12</td>
<td>Onyx 2/7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wiggles 2/28/12</td>
<td>Mopsy 2/28/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd# 1 3/12/12</td>
<td>Shepherd # 2 3/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koi 3/5/12</td>
<td>Unnamed Pit 3/14/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally 3/17/12</td>
<td>Zena 3/29/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 3/30/12</td>
<td>Wrigley 4/1/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola 4/1/12</td>
<td>Buster 4/2/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownie 4/8/12</td>
<td>Brandy 4/7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus 4/21/12</td>
<td>Claude 4/27/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destiny 5/4/12</td>
<td>Bella 5/4/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunner 5/18/12</td>
<td>Eli 6/3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocco 6/18/12</td>
<td>Bumble 7/3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikkos 7/21/12</td>
<td>Goldie 8/2/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel 8/17/12</td>
<td>Venus 8/20/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laila 8/27/12</td>
<td>Big Coco 8/27/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roscoe 8/30/12</td>
<td>Cooper 9/9/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbo 10/9/12</td>
<td>Charlotte 10/23/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeus/Blue 11/15/12</td>
<td>Sgt Friday 11/23/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi 12/2/12</td>
<td>Arya 12/4/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky 12/11/12</td>
<td>Rudolph 12/18/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # of Animals
- Adoptable 43
- Unadoptable 40

% of Total Animals
- Adoptable 52%
- Unadoptable 48%

% Excluding Medical or Warden Recommendations (in grey)
- Adoptable 54%
- Unadoptable 46%

Approved 3.3.14
For Unclaimed Dogs the Picture is Clear

CARE

Euthanized 45%
Adopted 55%

Data for 2010 through 2012 as presented in CARE Whiskerings, Aug 2013
Other shelters are doing better

Euthanasia rates for unclaimed dogs

- Chicago Anti-Cruelty Society (2012 intake, 2496)
- New York City ACC (2012 intake, 9057)
- Waukegan Animal Control (2012 intake, 347)
- North Chicago Animal Control (2012 intake, 99)
- CARE (2012 intake, 86)

*All intake numbers are for unclaimed dogs only*
ASPCA (creators of SAFER test) Report

- Recommendation: Discontinue evaluations until they can be brought up to ASPCA standards
- “it does not appear that either behavior evaluation tool [is] being executed and interpreted accurately.”
- “not necessary to use both assessment tools”
- “The [physical] space [] is inadequate and does not provide the dogs with sufficient choices.”
- “Neither [test] is intended to be used to determine if a dog should be euthanized. Rather, they are intended to gather information about that animal and, combined with additional information, determine the best course of action”
Triptow Report (CARE’s expert)

- Recommendation: Review evaluation process and consider relaxing criteria
- CARE evaluations produce a “high failure rate”
- “too rigorous, particularly in light of newer data suggesting that findings of failed tests are not thoroughly predictive of behaviors outside the shelter.”
- Concern about subjecting dogs to two successive tests
- “Using...tests as a basis for euthanizing is becoming less common...”
Other issues raised by both reports

• Failure to vaccinate
• Poor communication with EPD & shelter staff,
• No enrichment (e.g. toys, treats) for “failed” dogs
• Lack of cooperation with outside rescue groups
• Long kennel stays of many animals
• Restrictive adoption practices
• Lack of a foster program
  (1 dog put in foster last week)
• And more
CARE’s Draft Agreement with the City

- Did not address any of the major issues raised in the ASPCA or Triptow reports, such as the validity of behavior evaluations and vaccination protocols
- Instead, it argues that CARE should control the process of transferring “failed” dogs to outside rescue groups
- Would require that CARE work effectively with outside rescue groups
The rescue world today

• Rescue groups are helping **cut euthanasia rates** at shelters around the country

• Small organizations that don’t have a lot of money, but are successful at finding good homes for animals they pull from shelters

• Rescues **expand the adoption and foster pool**
  – Especially important for harder-to-place dogs in a smaller community like Evanston

• Successful cooperation with rescues requires strong relationships with partnering shelters. The shelter leadership also has to be a strong **advocate for its dogs**.

• Can CARE work effectively with outside rescue groups?
Can CARE work with rescue groups?

Our concern is that CARE has not built bridges with rescue groups in the past.

• CARE has transferred **only one dog to rescue** (a “passed” dog) in past 3+ years

• CARE has **openly criticized the rescues** that have saved Evanston dogs and indicated that given the choice, they **would not have worked with them**

• CARE told aldermen they don’t reach out to rescues – they **wait for them to come to them**

• Other shelters roll out the red carpet for the rescues. They **will not work with the shelter if CARE makes it difficult**

• CARE’s evaluators impose the **stigma of a discredited and flawed test** on the “failed” dogs, making it more difficult to advocate for the dogs
What we’ve been able to do

• Since 2012, we have helped Warden Teckler partner with rescues to place 18 “failed” dogs
  – Because CARE would not pay for the care of “failed” dogs, we have paid for and coordinated spay/neuter, vaccinations, medical care, transport, and training

• We have formed relationships and seen firsthand the rescues’ dedication and their ability to find good homes for Evanston dogs

• As a result, the Evanston shelter only euthanized 4 dogs in 2013, down from 47 in 2010 and 41 in 2011
  – This is despite CARE's opposition to the warden's actions and its statement that - even after the ASPCA and Triptow reports - it will not make any changes to its behavior evaluation process
The Rescue Dogs

Dogs who failed CARE’s testing and were recommended for euthanasia but were rescued by Warden Teckler and are now in homes.
Does CARE’s test predict how a dog will behave in a home?

- CARE tested Ramsey when he was unneutered and caged next to a female in heat.
- He was underweight and was highly stressed in the kennel.
- The following video was taken after Ramsey had been in a home for two days. No special training was done with him.
There's something very wrong with this system, and we're asking the City Council to please help fix it. Our community deserves better.
Updated information on the dogs transferred from Evanston Animal Control to Secondhand Snoots Rescue
Presented by Erica Brown, President, Secondhand Snoots Rescue
Secondhand Snoots Rescue is a volunteer based, registered non-profit animal rescue organization. Founded in May, 2010 our mission is to save dogs from high-kill control animal control agencies. Our focus is animals with special needs, medical conditions and/or injuries.

We operate a thriving foster-home organization, and dogs are only placed in boarding when absolutely necessary. Dogs in boarding receive special attention from not only the boarding facility staff, but our volunteers who take them out for additional exercise time and socialization.

We believe that all animals deserve a chance at life and should be afforded the opportunity to thrive in a home. Common kennel problems such as excess energy, resource guarding, and cage reactivity are commonly seen in dogs in animal control agencies. Bringing these dogs into our foster-based rescue program allows us the opportunity to work one-on-one with these dogs, have our trainer work with them and have our foster homes work with their individual needs. Dogs do not behave the same in a home as they do in a kennel, with proper exercise, mental stimulation, care and nurturing and they become wonderful family members.

Both our foster and adoptive homes are screened with reference checks and home visits. Dogs are introduced to adoption applicants during the meet and greet phase of our adoption process. Dogs are often placed in homes on a foster to adopt contract and given a 2 - 3 week period of living with the family to see if it will be a good fit.

In 3.5-years we have only had 2 dogs returned from adoptive homes. We have transferred over 200 dogs into our program from animal control agencies, other organizations and owner surrenders. We currently have 23 dogs in rescue, 3 are in foster to adopt homes, 4 have pending applications and 2 of them are in boarding.

We feel that the relationship between the City of Evanston, Evanston Animal Control and C.A.R.E is very unique and has the potential to be a program that other cities would want to emulate. Having a dedicated rescue organization should lead the city on the path to being no kill. However the leadership at C.A.R.E.'s belief that their evaluation system is the end all-be all, and that other rescue organizations are not qualified to make a decision on whether or not they are able to safely rehabilitate a dog, leads to animals being euthanized unnecessarily. Secondhand Snoots Rescue was able to come in and evaluate and determine that the dogs that we transferred in would be a good fit in our program. There are a lot of great rescue organizations out there who would be more than willing to do the same.

It is my belief that if the relationship with C.A.R.E. is to continue, there has to be a program in place making animals available to other qualified rescue organizations. This is not something that should be managed by C.A.R.E., but should be managed by animal control as these animals would not be in C.A.R.E.'s custody. An appropriate screening program for the other rescues should be instituted. C.A.R.E. would be given the first opportunity to properly evaluate the animals in animal control and determine they would be a good fit for their program. If the animal is a good fit they would transfer him or her in. If the animal is not a good fit he/she would become available for other approved rescue organizations to come and evaluate. C.A.R.E. does not have to be, nor should it be the end all be all for these dogs, as shown by the ones that have been transferred to other organizations and placed into loving homes.
June, 2012

Eli (now named Grady) was picked up as an abandoned dog, tied to a pole in south Evanston. He was evaluated by C.A.R.E., deemed unadoptable and to be euthanized.

Eli was evaluated by Secondhand Snoots Rescue and we determined that his energy and manners were consistent with his age, breed and apparent lack of training. He was transferred to our custody and immediately moved to one of our partner veterinary offices where he received a thorough examination, was neutered, vaccinated and boarded. While in boarding Eli worked on basic manners and socialization. He bonded with a deaf female dog who was also in our care at the veterinarian’s office and the pair quickly became inseparable. Eli proved himself to be smart, obedient, loving and cuddly. He is truly a dog that I would call an ambassador to the breed.

Both dogs were adopted as a bonded pair by a wonderful family. They prove themselves to be wonderful members of both their family and society.

Please see the back page for a letter from his adopter.
October, 2012

**Columbo** (now named Squeaks) was evaluated by C.A.R.E., deemed unadoptable and to be euthanized because of resource guarding.

We evaluated Columbo and saw no signs of resource guarding. He was transferred to Secondhand Snoots Rescue and transported to one of our partner veterinary offices where he received a complete medical examination, was neutered and vaccinated. He was moved to one of our rescue partners for boarding where he was exercised daily by both the boarding staff and rescue volunteers and showed no signs of resource guarding. Columbo was adopted by an experienced large breed owner where he started resource guarding. We took him back into rescue immediately and he was reevaluated. We determined that that his guarding was not only manageable, but that he could be trained out of it, he returned to boarding and worked with our trainer on his guarding.

He was later adopted by an experienced large dog owner who reports that his guarding is about 90% gone. He loves to play fetch and is very motivated by the ball and easy to train. They are very happy with him. He does great with their cats even though they are sometimes not very nice to him.
November, 2012

**Charlotte** was found by a volunteer one morning tied to a bench outside of Animal Control. She was abandoned out there in the cold at some point overnight. She was evaluated by C.A.R.E., deemed unadoptable and to be euthanized because of resource guarding.

Charlotte was underweight and afraid in animal control, we did not see any signs of guarding on our evaluation. She was transported to one of our partner veterinary offices where she received a thorough examination where we learned that she had a heart murmur. She was evaluated by a canine cardiologist where she was diagnosed with a grade 6 heart murmur, and a subaortic stenosis. There is no cure for a subaortic stenosis, she was prescribed medication to help calm her rapid heart beat and immediately transferred into our sanctuary program, Safe Haven Snooits. She lived with a loving foster family, where the rescue remained responsible for her medical care, until lost her battle with her cardiac condition in September, 2013.

Please see the back page for a letter from his adopter.
January, 2013

Arya (now Dixie) was evaluated by C.A.R.E., deemed unadoptable and to be euthanized. She was evaluated by Secondhand Snoots Rescue and her behavior was appropriate for her age, lack of training and being in a kennel. She was transferred to Secondhand Snoots Rescue, vetted and moved to boarding where she was a staff favorite. She received daily exercise and “outings” while in boarding, from rescue approved staff members. She was adopted by a wonderful family and is the loving companion to their young son. She loved him the day she was taken for her meet and greet.

Her adopters had this to say just a few days after adopting her “As a Dad, a father of a 7 year old child, and someone who has had dogs in the home my whole life, I have NO concerns with the dogs behavior, demeanor at all. She is a sweet, loving dog. We had visitors to the house meet her, my parents early in the day, and my nephew later on and they were excited for us and really liked her. They were not at all intimidated or concerned either. She has so far never made us feel uneasy in anyway and we look forward to many years of this animal being part of the family. I know all animals are not the same, they are individuals like people, they all have their quirks, it would have truly been a shame had this dog been euthanized. She has been relaxing and getting used to her new surroundings. We are very happy.”
January, 2013

Mi Mi (now Brooke was evaluated by C.A.R.E., deemed unadoptable and to be euthanized. She was evaluated by Secondhand Snoots Rescue and it was determined that her energy and behavior were appropriate for her age and being in a kennel.

Mi Mi was transferred to Secondhand Snoots Rescue, received a full medical evaluation and veterinary care. She was moved to boarding with Arya, where she was also a staff favorite and received daily exercise and "outings" from rescue approved staff members. She moved from boarding to a wonderful foster home where she continued to blossom. She was adopted by a wonderful family with another dog.

Shortly after her adoption, her family reported that both dogs quickly became inseparable. She was doing great on walks, for baths and getting her nails trimmed (even better than her brother). She was starting a basic obedience class to continue the informal training she received in boarding and in her foster home. The family was house shopping so that the dogs would have more land to run around and play on.

Mi Mi is the dog on the top of the pile.
January, 2013

**Rudolph** (aka Rudy) was evaluated by C.A.R.E., deemed unadoptable and to be euthanized. It was noted that he was intolerant to handling.

Secondhand Snoots Rescue evaluated Rudy and determined that his behavior and energy were consistent with his age, breed and being in a kennel. He needed to be neutered and he needed training. He was transferred to Secondhand Snoots Rescue, vetted and moved into a foster home where he continues to thrive daily. His foster has reported that Rudy is a “cuddler who just wants to be near people, preferably in their lap. He loves everyone he meets and has converted many houseguests to pit bull lovers.”
February, 2013

Rocky was to be euthanized because he “bit” a volunteer. He was caged 2 cages down from a dog who was known to be reactive towards Rocky. It is my understanding that the incident was caused by a redirect from the other dog. There were no puncture wounds, only bruising. The volunteer reported that she was not afraid of Rocky after the incident and she took him out again right after the incident; she reported that that, just like every other time, Rocky was fine once he got out of the kennel.

Rocky was evaluated by Secondhand Snoots Rescue and we noted that he was very anxious in the cage, but calmed down very quickly when ignored, took treats very gently and was easy to take out of the kennel. We believed his behavior to be caused by both kennel stress and being caged so close to a dog who was reactive towards him. He was transferred to Secondhand Snoots Rescue and placed in boarding at one of our veterinary partner’s offices where he was very calm in the kennel and did not appear to have any issues. He was adopted by one of the office employees and is doing wonderfully, even goes to work with her.
February, 2013

**Abby** (now Gracie) was evaluated by C.A.R.E., deemed unadoptable and to be euthanized because she exhibited prey drive towards a cat when tested and was aroused when introduced to a dog who was known to have reactive tendencies towards some other dogs.

Abby was evaluated by Secondhand Snoots Rescue and we determined that her behavior was consistent with her age, breed and kennel stress. We believed that she would make a great companion for the right family. She was transferred to Secondhand Snoots Rescue and received a medical evaluation and veterinary care.

She is currently boarding at a board and train facility where she continues to work on her dog to dog social skills and is showing daily improvement. She is a staff favorite and is often taken out of boarding for by rescue approved staff, to spend time in their homes, on long walks and playing.
April, 2013

Ollie (formerly Henry) was to be evaluated and did not meet C.A.R.E.'s criteria for adoption, therefore deemed unadoptable and to be euthanized for resource guarding.

Secondhand Snoots Rescue evaluated Ollie and determined that he was young and his energy was consistent with his age and breed. He was very focused and both toy and food motivated. He showed no signs of possession guarding, and is a very vocal player. He was transferred to Secondhand Snoots Rescue care and received a full medical evaluation and veterinary care. He was moved to paid boarding and later transferred into a foster home.

In his foster home he spent 2-days a week going to doggy daycare where he was one of the staff favorites. He thrived in daycare and played appropriately with cogs of all sizes. He learned basic obedience very quickly and has been a joy to have in foster. Ollie does very well with kids and other dogs, he will make a family very lucky.
These are my thoughts for remarks for the meeting this evening. Please let me know your thoughts.

Good evening,

As a dog lover & owner, shelter/rescue/humane organization volunteer and certified dog trainer, I empathize with the passionate feelings of those fighting to save shelter dogs from euthanasia. I sympathize with the plight of the shelter dog living an existence caused by human fault. But instead of debating who is right or wrong, I want to present fact:

1. According to American Humane Association and Center for Disease Control statistics: each year there are 4.5-4.7 MILLION dog bites reported each year in the US. Of these, approx. 2/3 of the victims knew the dog, 50% involved children under 12 years of age and over 800,000 required medical attention. In my case, my 3 y/o daughter was bitten in the face by my aunts cocker spaniel.

2. The insurance industry pays more than $1 BILLION in bite claims each year. In my case, my daughters ER visit and treatment where paid by my aunts homeowners insurance which resulted in higher premiums for her at renewal.

3. City and county Animal Care & Control departments and municipalities are increasingly being named in lawsuits brought by dog bite victims; i.e. Cook County Park District currently in litigation due to pitbull attack resulting in a fatality.

The CDC recommends as a preventive measure that before bringing a dog into the home, people should seek dogs from local shelters/rescues or reputable breeders to get assistance with choosing an appropriate dog for their household. Here is where the slippery slope begins.

Shelters today are largely comprised of overbred, inbred, genetically imbalanced, socially deficit, abused or neglected dogs that have issues that go well beyond general behavior problems. There is no disputing that nurture can play a vital role in improving the lives of these dogs but it does not exstinguish nature.

We live in dog inclusive communities of dog parks and beaches, dog friendly cafes and venues. When people choose to bring a dog into their home it is because they are usually seeking a family companion to be part of that inclusive community. Unfortunately it is becoming more common to go to shelters/rescues
and getting a dog that guards its food bowl and possessions, being handed an instruction sheet on how to manage the problem and being told that the behavior should change once they are in the home. Often these adopters accept living with a dog that they need to put in another room when company comes over because they are too anxious that something will happen. Or adopting a dog that needs to be the only dog in the home because of aggressive behavior towards other dogs. I commend groups like (DINOS) Dogs In Need Of Space for being a resource for people with this issue but having to walk your companion very early in the morning, very late at night, crossing the street when others approach or tying a yellow ribbon to your dogs leash as a warning for others to stay away is very alienating. It is a life of management and is only as safe as human error. One mistake is a dog bite waiting to happen. There is no question that those in these situations love and care for their dog but of those I know in this situation they all said that if faced with the situation again they wouldn’t want to live the same restrictive lifestyle with their dog.

While not a perfect science, behavior evaluation is the tool we have available to try to provide adopters with safe family pets instead of behavior projects. The evaluations used were developed by the ASPCA and a renowned dog behaviorist and trainer and are widely recognized as the leading standards in the industry. They are no more invalid than the human personality profiles widely accepted as predictors of a persons future abilities to perform a specific job or identify psychopathic or sociopathic tendencies.

Euthanasia is not joyous for any reason but we are in a state of crisis with more animals in shelters needing homes than there are homes available. Behaviorally sound dogs are living their lives in cages while we debate what to do with dogs that are not ideally suited to live in the communities that we’ve created for them. CARE endeavors to provide exceptional medical care and training support to behaviorally sound dogs so adopters receive a quality pet and not a potential bite liability. Because of these standards, CARE had minimal return adoptions and few incident reports filed due to dogs with aggressive behaviors. This changed with the new city policy to send dogs who failed behavior evaluation to rescue. During the weeks that it took to find a rescue, there were many incidences with volunteers resulting in bite reports that involved several of the dogs that were ultimately still sent to rescue. I appreciate that CARE is concerned with quality of life for the dog, as well as safety for its volunteers, adopters and community.

Thank you.
CARE's Million Dollars -- Where is It, and Where is It Going?

I have been volunteering with CARE for 14 years, and I have participated in most of CARE's fund raisers during that time. The donations we solicited were all given to "CARE For the Evanston Animal Shelter." I've also been an Evanston resident for over 20 years, and I am troubled by the thought that CARE may take the $1 1/3 million that we raised "for the Evanston Animal Shelter" and take it elsewhere.

There is no question that donors thought they were giving money for "the Evanston animal shelter." We asked donors to contribute $20 each for a white t-shirt that read "We don't need a mansion, just an expansion." Since I arrived in 2000, both volunteers and donors have been working hard to raise money for a new, expanded shelter in Evanston. And when that vision was finally in our reach, the Board started moving money out of the Evanston building fund.

I was present at a Board meeting on August 25, 2013, when the Board voted to move $308,000 out of the building fund and into the operating fund, with the rest of the $1 1/3 million remaining in the building fund. However, at a meeting of all the volunteers on Sunday, October 27, 2013, the Board announced that there was only $29,000 in the building fund! Where is all this money going?

The money was supposed to be for an Evanston shelter.

Kenne Strauss

1616 Hinman Avenue
Apt. #3C
Evanston, IL
60201
To Whom it may concern,

I am writing to voice my concern over the Euthanasia Practices of the Evanston Animal Shelter. I feel the criteria they are using are alarming and inhumane. I think the part that is the most troubling for me is the test of touching a dog in the face while taking their bowl away. My sweet dog Tracy, was the gentlest, most docile dog and had the kindest disposition on the planet. She never had a cross or aggressive bone in her body. She hated it when her food was taken away while she was eating. She let out a low growl, warning us not to touch it. ANY dog would react the same way. This is not a valid criteria on aggressiveness.

Your Shelter should be a Safe Haven for these animals. They come to you lost, abandoned, scared, tired, hungry and in need of love, comfort and a soft spot to land while transitioning to a hopeful new adoptive family, or to be reunited with their lost family. Please give these animals a chance. They deserve it, and you owe it to the Community to show you have the Animal's care and protection as a priority.

Thank you.

Shenaya Bhote-Siegel
January 31, 2014

City of Evanston  
Human Services Committee  
Evanston IL

Dear Committee,

We are dog owners who have lived in Evanston for over a decade. We were shocked and concerned to read articles in the Evanston Review and the Daily Northwestern regarding the C.A.R.E. animal shelter and its euthanasia rate for dogs. According to the article, the euthanasia rate at the shelter has been significantly higher than at other Chicago-area shelters until volunteers at the shelter and the city warden stepped in to intervene. Reading the descriptions of the dogs that failed C.A.R.E.’s behavioral tests and were slated for euthanasia, we cannot help but feel horrified at the prospect that our own beloved dog Butters, had he not been adopted by us, might have suffered the same fate.

We urge the council to use whatever measures it has within its power to ensure that the C.A.R.E. shelter alters its euthanasia policies.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,  
Bruce Cross

Bruce and Karen Cross
Evanston Human Services Committee

Jan. 30, 2014

Abigail, the sweet, personable terrier who has occupied the emotional center of my family for ten years, was adopted from the Evanston Animal Shelter on Oakton Street.

From the first I was highly impressed by that shelter, especially by their rigorous requirements for adoption. I now feel betrayed, along with my numerous animal-loving fellow Evanstonians. To learn of their extraordinarily high rate of euthanasia is shocking to me not only for general humane reasons, but for personal ones as well: I shudder to think how close our Abbie came to losing her life in puppyhood. I strongly urge the members of Human Services Committee to determine the reasons behind such an abnormally high euthanasia rate, and to intervene decisively in this appalling situation.

Jesse Rosenberg
740 Hinman Ave. #2
Evanston