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Maddie’s Fund was established by Dave and Cheryl Duffield as the Duffield Family Foundation in 1994. In January 1999, the Board of Directors restructured the Foundation, defined its mission, implemented a new operating methodology and adopted the name Maddie’s Fund in honor of the family’s beloved Miniature Schnauzer.

Maddie’s Fund, the Pet Rescue Foundation, is helping to fund the creation of a no-kill nation. The first step is to help create programs that guarantee loving homes for all healthy shelter dogs and cats throughout the country. The next step will be to save the sick and injured pets in animal shelters nationwide.
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Maddie

Maddie was a Miniature Schnauzer whose unconditional love, devotion, loyalty and spirit inspired her caregivers, Dave and Cheryl Duffield, to start a foundation in her name.

Dave and Cheryl fell in love with Maddie when she was only ten days old. “We picked her up to hold her,” says Dave, “and this began the love affair.” Maddie melted our hearts from the first second we saw her,” adds Cheryl. “We loved her spirit, her devotion, her sweet ways, her stubbornness, her independence, her intelligence and unconditional love.”

The Duffields shared ten memorable and happy years with Maddie, while struggling to build a business from the ground up. There were good days and bad days, but Maddie was their constant source of joy and companionship. “She was our lighthouse during the stormy periods,” Dave recalls. When she passed away in 1997, Dave and Cheryl were heartbroken but made a promise to “give back to Maddie and her kind in dollars that which Maddie gave to us in friendship and love.”

In honor of Maddie, Maddie’s Fund®, the Pet Rescue Foundation, has spent $33 million since 1999 to save dog and cat lives.

Maddie’s Fund is investing in colleges of veterinary medicine and community collaborations of rescue organizations, traditional shelters, animal control agencies and veterinarians to reach the no-kill nation goal.

President’s Letter

Dear Friends,

Since 1999, Maddie’s Fund® has spent $33 million to support lifesaving projects in thirteen states, 211 counties and 1,864 cities. Grant funds have gone to 360 animal welfare organizations, 1,357 private practice veterinary hospitals, five universities and seven veterinary medical associations.

Maddie’s focus on building no-kill communities and the requirement of collaboration between rescue groups, traditional shelters, municipal animal control agencies and private practice veterinarians has led to dramatic and far-reaching results.

- Most partners in Maddie’s® community collaborative projects are exceeding their adoption targets and are well-positioned to reach the goal of community-wide adoption guarantees for all healthy shelter animals.
- In a reversal of a national trend that saw the US shelter death toll rise 17% in the past year, Maddie’s® community collaborative projects reduced deaths last year by 2% overall.
- Private practice veterinarians participating in Maddie’s® spay/neuter projects have performed 381,561 above baseline spay/neuter surgeries in five years.

Maddie’s Vision for the Future

We envision that by 2010, live release rates at animal control facilities will routinely be 60% (up from the current national norm of about 45%); community-wide adoption guarantees for healthy shelter dogs and cats will be commonplace; and model no-kill communities will exist throughout the United States.

Over the next five years, Maddie’s Fund plans to leverage its resources to help make this vision a reality.

Maddie’s Fund will continue to offer community collaborative grants: comprehensive awards guaranteeing adoptions for all healthy shelter dogs and cats community-wide within five years, with sustainability plans to save all healthy and treatable shelter pets in ten years. We will also continue to offer veterinary school grants: comprehensive grants that include teaching, research, and service. But we will add a variety of new grants for communities and veterinary schools that will lower initial funding barriers while continuing to build momentum towards Maddie’s no-kill vision.

We will also expand our grant giving and enhance our current funding models. We will become more proactive in our philanthropy to capitalize on the innovation taking place in the animal welfare movement. We will invest in leadership that demonstrates an ability to create change and to save lives. We will support pilot programs that promise new problem solving methods. And we will actively reward organizations and communities that are leading the way in achieving lifesaving goals.

Much has been accomplished over the past five years, but I believe progress will accelerate as we learn from our experiences and build on our successes.

Sincerely,

Rich Avazzino
A Look Back

Shortly after Maddie’s Fund was created, a Purpose and Policies statement was written to define the guiding principles, establish the philosophy and set the direction for Maddie’s first five years.

MADIE’S FUND
PURPOSE AND POLICIES

A Revolutionary Mission

to create no-kill communities
by supporting courageous, creative and compassionate solutions
that mobilize entire communities
to achieve a single, vital goal
while honoring core values and a life-protecting ethic
and building a solid base of local, community philanthropy.

A Revolutionary Mission

The mission of Maddie’s Fund is “to revolutionize the status and well-being of companion animals.” To carry out this mission, Maddie’s Fund intends to spend more than $200 million to help build, community by community, a no-kill nation. Our first goal is to see that healthy dogs and cats in animal shelters across the country are guaranteed loving homes.

to create no-kill communities

Maddie’s Fund defines a no-kill community as one in which every healthy and treatable dog and cat abandoned in that community’s shelters is guaranteed a loving home.

by supporting courageous, creative and compassionate solutions

Maddie’s Fund is looking for lifesaving solutions that will have an immediate, direct and measurable impact on stopping the killing of healthy shelter dogs and cats throughout the target community.

that mobilize entire communities

The ability of diverse animal welfare groups to work together in an environment that promotes trust, cooperation and harmony is important for creating a community-wide, no-kill safety net for companion animals. For that reason, Maddie’s Fund is particularly interested in supporting animal welfare organizations capable of developing collaborative pet-related projects with cooperating animal shelters, rescue groups, volunteer foster organizations, local animal control agencies, veterinarians and others.

to achieve a single, vital goal

Animals come to shelters with different needs. Many are healthy pets, ready and able to go into new homes. Others are sick, injured, or poorly-behaved. Of these, some will inevitably be beyond saving, due to incurable conditions or dangerous behavior. Others may be treatable, but will need medical and rehabilitative care before they can be re-homed.

Maddie’s Fund believes all these lives are precious. But we have chosen to invest our resources in saving healthy pets first. When we reach the juncture where healthy animals are no longer euthanized because there are “too many pets, not enough homes,” Maddie’s Fund will then focus its resources on programs to rehabilitate the sick, injured and poorly-behaved. In our view, expanding medical and rehabilitative programs for the sick and injured makes the most sense when we can guarantee that once treatable pets are cured, a home will be waiting for them.

We recognize that guaranteeing homes for all healthy pets is not the end of the road. It is, instead, a vital first step — the foundation upon which each community can build to save even more lives.
while honoring core values and a life-protecting ethic
Maddie’s Fund believes how we reach our goal is as important as achieving it. To be eligible for our grants, organizations must honor our core values of honesty, integrity, and mutual respect. This includes maintaining cordial, professional relations with colleagues and the public and carrying on public debate and discussion without personal attacks or recriminations. Organizations must also have a demonstrated commitment to saving the lives of homeless dogs and cats. For organizations operating animal shelters, this will generally mean that all dogs and cats accepted into the shelter are provided with lifesaving, affirmative care, i.e., comprehensive medical treatment and behavior rehabilitation. Euthanasia at these shelters is ordinarily limited to animals who cannot be rehabilitated, either because they are hopelessly ill or injured, or because they are aggressive and their placement would pose a risk to public safety.

and building a solid base of local, community philanthropy
The future of companion animal welfare depends on having strong, self-sustaining not-for-profit organizations capable of carrying on the cause for the animals in their communities. To build these organizations, Maddie’s Fund believes broad-based philanthropic, volunteer, and grassroots support is the key.

Maddie’s Fund® Accomplishments

Five Years Later
In reviewing our accomplishments, and in seeking opinions from national animal welfare leaders, we believe that Maddie’s Fund has made significant progress in addressing our mission, meeting our goals and contributing to the animal welfare movement as a whole. Our accomplishments include the following:

- Forged collaborations
- Enlisted private practice veterinarian involvement
- Stimulated the development of shelter medicine programs in veterinary schools
- Helped foster shelter accountability
- Created successful models
- Strengthened organizations
- Expanded the safety net of care for companion animals
- Influenced veterinary attitudes
- Shifted focus from shelter to community-wide goals
Maddie’s Fund forged collaborations nationwide within a diverse and often competitive animal welfare industry. Maddie’s Fund helped make collaboration between animal control, traditional shelters, veterinarians and rescue groups the operational model that many individual agencies and communities now aspire to.

Enlisted private practice veterinarian involvement, Maddie’s Fund opened new lines of communication to the veterinary community and actively solicited private practice veterinarians to join the animal welfare cause. In the past, veterinarians have generally worked with animal welfare either as salaried employees in shelters or as volunteers offering discounted services. Maddie’s Fund broke with the past by offering veterinary participation in Maddie’s Fund grant giving, incorporating veterinarians into nearly a dozen collaborative partnerships and paving the way for others to follow. These activities have helped to lessen the ill-will or even animosity that has often existed between animal welfare organizations and veterinarians.

Stimulated the development of shelter medicine programs in veterinary schools. Since Maddie’s Fund awarded a grant to UC Davis to establish the nation’s first comprehensive shelter medicine program, many veterinary schools have added classes, externships, rotations or post graduate residencies in shelter medicine. Peer reviewed shelter medicine articles have been featured in the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association and other professional periodicals. The first textbook on shelter medicine has been published. Many animal welfare and veterinary organizations have established shelter medicine tracks at national conferences, and there is talk of creating a Board Certification program in shelter medicine.

Helped foster shelter accountability by emphasizing quantitative goals, defined terms and measurable results. Many shelters now report their intake, adoptions and deaths, as well as progress towards numerical goals. Such reporting allows an organization’s members and the broader community to judge accomplishment in an objective manner and to have a yardstick for measuring the organization or the community against others. The news media has embraced this accountability structure and uses it to better assess the problems or progress of community animal shelters.

Created successful models. Each year, Maddie’s community collaborative projects have met or exceeded goal in almost every category. Through the Maddie’s Fund website, animal welfare organizations worldwide have been able to follow the progress of these models, copying bits and pieces applicable to their own communities. Yearly project reports and evaluations from The Foundation for Interdisciplinary Research & Education Promoting Animal Welfare (FIREPAW) have provided insight into what worked and what didn’t. Strategies for problem solving methods and goal attainment have also served as helpful tools.

With successful projects in various rural and urban settings and in different geographic and socio-economic areas, Maddie’s Fund broke stereotypes about what could be accomplished and where.
Strengthened organizations. With ongoing evaluation and rigorous performance standards for continued funding, Maddie’s Fund encouraged grantee organizations to excel. To help groups succeed, Maddie’s provided funded partners with strategic planning, technical assistance and problem-solving consultations.

Expanded the safety net of care for companion animals. The sheer abundance of Maddie’s Fund monies focused national attention on Maddie’s grant guidelines and the requirements of collaboration and community-wide lifesaving. Even shelters that didn’t qualify for a Maddie’s Fund grant used the guidelines and their methods (data collection, definitions and categories, numerical goals, strategic planning and performance measurement) as a way to focus their own lifesaving efforts and goals.

Influenced veterinary attitudes. Maddie’s spay/neuter programs and Maddie’s shelter medicine programs provided thousands of veterinarians with a new awareness of and insight into pet population issues, persuading many private practitioners to get more involved in supporting and participating in animal welfare initiatives. In fact, Maddie’s spay/neuter programs exposed more than a thousand veterinarians to this issue for the very first time.

Shifted the focus to community-wide goals. Animal welfare organizations have traditionally measured their success by looking at individual performance. Maddie’s Fund helped animal welfare groups realize that individual shelter success is hollow if large numbers of animals are dying community-wide.
No More Homeless Pets in Utah

Utah

Year 4

The Utah collaboration is a statewide coalition led by No More Homeless Pets in Utah, in conjunction with Best Friends Animal Society. Partners include 28 rescue groups, 54 animal control agencies, one traditional shelter, and 51 private practice veterinary hospitals. No More Homeless Pets in Utah serves a population of more than two million people, from the highly-populated urban areas around Salt Lake City to the state’s sparsely populated southern counties.

Total Anticipated Funding: $10,710,567
Funding through September 1, 2004: $7,430,174

In its fourth project year, No More Homeless Pets in Utah (NMHPU) increased adoptions by 10,827 (59%) over the baseline year and reduced deaths by 9,788 (21%).

Adoptions continued to rise thanks to an ever-expanding roster of activities:

• The annual spring and fall Super Adoptions in Salt Lake City resulted in the placement of 934 cats and dogs.

• The new Paws Across Utah campaign launched small adoption fairs around the state. Events in Tooele, St. George, Vernal and Sandy netted 385 new homes.

• Furwubia shopping mall adoption centers in Salt Lake City and Park City expanded placements for a total of 2,501 adoptions in Year Four.

• Individual partners started their own adoption events this year, including The Utah Pet and Adoption Expo and the Happy Howlidays Pet Adoption, which found homes for nearly 300 deserving pets.

• In Year Four, even the small grassroots efforts by partners advertised with ads on the internet, and a billboard campaign (10 billboards up for six months) directed more browsers to the NMHPU and partner websites.

• A new Transportation Program helped move animals from areas with low demand to highly populated urban areas with strong demand.

Fundraising. The annual Lintroller Party and Strut Your Mutt events raised $140,000, greatly exceeding the previous year’s donations.

Spy/Neuter. TV PSA’s recorded by BigP’s Todd and Erin. Senator Orrin Hatch and Olympian Tristan Gale helped raise awareness for spay/neuter.

Cause Marketing played a big role in Year Four:

• Help Lick Euthanasia at Ben & Jerry’s Free Cone Day: 5,000 Ben and Jerry’s patrons took advantage of an opportunity to donate to NMHPU in lieu of paying for their ice cream cones, giving $2,500 in support of Utah’s lifesaving efforts.

• Chasing Tail Golden Ale: 5 cents was donated to NMHPU for every Squatters’ Chasing Tail Ale bottle cap returned to Squatters Pub Brewery.

• Midas Value Cards: Eight Midas locations offered value cards with discounts on such things as oil changes and brake pads, the $1 cost of which was donated to NMHPU.

Utah Achievements
(Baseline = Above Baseline Performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>% of Annual Goal</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>% of Annual Goal</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>% of Annual Goal</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>% of Annual Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impounds</td>
<td>84,493</td>
<td>83,977</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>86,353</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>83,485</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>85,299</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddie Adoptions**</td>
<td>3,815</td>
<td>8,436</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>8,725</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>10,524</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>12,947</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adoptions</td>
<td>18,297</td>
<td>24,135</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>25,089</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26,787</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>29,124</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Deaths</td>
<td>13,306</td>
<td>15,808</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>11,183</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>10,287</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9,646</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Deaths</td>
<td>45,909</td>
<td>41,371</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>40,718</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>37,424</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>36,121</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Adoptions performed by funded project partners.

Utah: Comparative Annual Progress on Goals

Maddie’s Spay/Neuter Project in Utah
Total Anticipated Surgeries: 93,142
Total Anticipated Funding: $2,600,000
In its fourth project year, Maddie’s Pet Rescue Project in Lodi increased adoptions over the baseline year by 437 (42%) and reduced deaths by 468 (51%).

Two new Saturday cat adoption sites helped boost placements in Year Four, while additional foster families increased organizational capacity. The Animal Friends facility extended hours for cat adoptions to bring in more traffic, and the facility itself was remodeled to be more people friendly.

Tableting sites at street fairs, farmers markets and various school events were added to enhance visibility and showcase animals awaiting adoption. A volunteer recruitment drive increased the volunteer base by 20%. Over 100 volunteers are currently on the roster.

Animal Friends emphasized organizational development in Year Four. Staff and board members recruited influential community leaders to be on an advisory committee. Nearly twenty individuals, including financial planners, professors, and doctors came forward to lend a hand. A strategic planning committee was assembled and work started on one, five and ten-year Strategic Plans.

A fundraising committee was organized. Plans to establish an endowment were introduced, and organizational memberships were offered for the first time. Donations resulting from the annual fundraisers, Bowl for Pets, Garden Tour, Jig a Dog and Fiesta Dinner, greatly exceeded the previous year. A recycling program for used computer cartridges raised a good sum, thanks to donations from Lodi Memorial Hospital and to the county’s Department of Human Services donating all of its cartridges.

Lodi Achievements
(Baseline + Above Baseline Performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>% of Annual Goal</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>% of Annual Goal</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>% of Annual Goal</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>% of Annual Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impounds</td>
<td>2,722</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddie Adoptions</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adoptions</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Deaths</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>308%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>256%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>122%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Deaths</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>157%</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adoptions performed by funded project partners.

Total progress after four years:

- 5,941 total adoptions
  (1,813 above baseline and 4,128 baseline adoptions for all participating agencies)
- 3,920 spay/neuter surgeries
  (thanks to Maddie’s Spay/Neuter Project)
- 1,592 fewer shelter animal deaths
Maddie’s Pet Rescue Project in Alachua County, Florida

Alachua County, Florida

**Year 2**

The Alachua County collaboration is led by the Alachua County Humane Society, working with Alachua County Animal Services, Gainesville Pet Rescue, Hialeah’s Angels Pet Rescue, Helping Hands Pet Rescue and Puppy Hill Farm. Alachua County, population 233,000, is located in North Central Florida. The county seat is Gainesville.

Total Anticipated Funding: $2,502,520
Funding through September 1, 2004: $953,220

In its second project year, Maddie’s Pet Rescue Project in Alachua County increased adoptions by 1,474 (58% over baseline) and reduced deaths by 2,854 (35%). Deaths of healthy shelter animals dropped by 2,683 (73%).

These outstanding numbers were posted in spite of internal turmoil in the first six months of Year Two. Outside mediators successfully ended the disagreements. Subsequent to mediation, a county management review of Animal Services acknowledged that the agency was under-funded, and recommended a budget increase of $400,000. And, the County Director overseeing Animal Services made a concerted effort to improve partner relations by including the partners in a community needs assessment of animal welfare issues.

Adoptathons were increased to boost placements, and the events became bigger and more elaborate: 266 animals were adopted from Parade of Pets, Home for the Holidays, Lucky Pet Adoptathon, Smitten With Kittens and Oldies but Goldies Special Needs Adoptathon. Several groups experimented with their own mini-adoptathons. Individual organizations also increased hours, staff, space and office locations to augment monthly adoption totals.

The Adopt a Pet from Your Vet program, which places healthy cats in the lobbies of private practice veterinarians, generated dozens of placements. Internet adoptions were also a big factor in the adoption increase.

A public awareness event, Make Maddie’s Day, was inaugurated to celebrate Year Two successes and publicize Year Three goals. A newly produced PSA successfully promoted the project’s mission.

The project established a new advisory committee comprised of representatives from each of the six participating animal welfare organizations, a representative of the private practice veterinary community, and a representative from the University of Florida College of Veterinary Medicine. Partners were given assistance in management, fundraising, and strategic planning to support their organizational development.
The Maricopa collaboration is led by the Arizona Animal Welfare League. Project partners include seven rescue groups (Arizona Animal Rescue and Sanctuary, Foothills Animal Rescue, HALO, Pause 4 Paws, SOAR, Sun Cities 4 Paws Rescue, and Sun Cities Animal Rescue), the Arizona Humane Society and Maricopa County Animal Care and Control. Encompassing Phoenix and 25 other municipalities, Maricopa County is the fastest-growing county in the nation. The current population is over 3,000,000.

Total Anticipated Funding: $3,481,250
Funding through September 1, 2004: $1,034,390

In its second project year, Maddie’s Pet Rescue Project in Maricopa County increased adoptions by 2,018 (6% over the baseline year) and reduced deaths by 8,243 (15%). Deaths of healthy shelter animals dropped 3,913 (69%) compared to baseline.

Public awareness of the project’s mission and goals was enhanced by a new weekly “Pet Adoption Monitor” in the Arizona Republic. The graphic allows the community to chart the collaboration’s adoption, intake and reduction of euthanasia progress.

Great publicity during the holiday season boosted the groups’ adoption efforts. Several of the organizations partnered with various PETSMARTS for holiday Santa photos.

A ten-day promotion urging community members to adopt at their local shelters was very successful. More than 5,000 flyers plotting the locations of participating shelters were distributed in various neighborhoods, and the campaign was supported by good publicity. As an added bonus, visitors to participating shelters were offered raffle prizes, including two round-trip tickets on Southwest Airlines. As a result, over 150 additional animals were adopted.

Eight new Pet-Ark kiosks were unveiled in participating shelters. The touch screen kiosks provide potential adopters with a comprehensive database of adoptable pets throughout the community, virtually linking the partners. Statistics to date look promising. In a preliminary test, each kiosk averaged 20 visitors, 2.4 printouts and 6 adoptions per day.

Several partners increased staff, hours, and locations to enhance their adoption efforts. Greater internet exposure and an increase in foster homes were other adoption-builders.

In mid-year, two new lead agency project staff were hired and a new Project Coordinator was hired in August to replace the departing Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maricopa County Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Baseline = Above Baseline Performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddie Adoptions***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adoptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Deaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Deaths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Total progress after two years:

- 74,488 total adoptions
  (5,396 above baseline and 69,092 baseline adoptions for all participating agencies)
- 2,622 spay/neuter surgeries
  (thanks to AZVMA Maddie’s Spay/Neuter Project)
- 21,032 fewer shelter deaths

Maricopa County: Comparative Annual Progress on Goals

Maddie’s Spay/Neuter Project in Maricopa County
Total Anticipated Surgeries: 39,942
Total Anticipated Funding: $2,400,000
In its third year, Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Program at the UC Davis School of Veterinary Medicine continued to make significant progress in areas of research, training and continuing education:

- Infectious disease continued to be the primary research focus. Study areas included virulent systemic feline calicivirus, upper respiratory infection and viral infections in cats. Behavioral research to improve the adoptability of long-term housed dogs was also initiated.
- Five articles were published in scientific literature, and shelter medicine personnel also contributed to articles in a variety of magazines and newsletters.
- The shelter medicine elective course proved popular once again. Nearly a quarter of the freshman class enrolled.
- Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Externship was developed for senior students.
- Over thirty continuing education lectures were presented by shelter medicine personnel at regional and national shelter and veterinary conferences.
- Shelter medicine personnel responded to over 200 information requests on such topics as infectious disease, spay/neuter and behavior.
- New diagnostic testing services were developed for shelter populations.
- Dr. Kate Hurley graduated as the world’s first certified Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Resident.

Grant award over three years: $833,436
Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Program at Iowa State University

Inaugurated a fifteen week Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Course to introduce students to different shelter models and to the medical and behavioral problems commonly found in each.

Worked with Maddie’s Summer Scholars to investigate: “Parasitism in Shelters” and “The Effects of Fostering on Family Pets,” with the research culminating in two posters that were displayed at the College of Veterinary Medicine Research Day.

Awarded Maddie’s Externships to senior students to observe medical and behavioral programs at the San Francisco SPCA and Best Friends Animal Sanctuary.

Presented shelter medicine topics at regional and local conferences.

Collaborated with the Iowa Federation of Humane Societies to open new lines of communication with local and state shelter directors.

Created a comprehensive Maddie’s Shelter Medicine website at www.vetmed.iastate.edu/services/vth/maddies.

Grant award: $49,500

Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Program at Auburn University

In only two months, Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Program at Auburn University

College of Veterinary Medicine:

Hired staff to implement the program, including a Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Clinician, a Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Technician, and a Maddie’s Research Assistant.

Selected their first core shelter, the Muscogee Humane Society in Columbus, Georgia.

Initiated research on treating coccidia and ringworm in shelter pets.

Surveyed over 150 Alabama animal shelters to determine the medical services they provided, with help from Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Summer Fellow.

Introduced their first elective course, “Shelter Medicine, Behavioral Considerations.”

Designed shelter medicine lectures for student core curriculum and established a “Shelter Medicine Special Problems” class to provide student research experience.

Presented at national conventions, conferences and on-line forums.

Launched an official Maddie’s Shelter Medicine website at www.aumaddiessheltermedicine.org.

Year One funding: $250,000
Total anticipated funding over six years: $1,500,000
Completed Projects

Veterinary Medical Association (VMA) Projects

Alabama VMA – Maddie’s Big Fix
Surgery Performed: 36,046
Total Funding: $2,534,723

California VMA – Feral Cat Altering Program, and Pet Altering Program for Low-Income Caregivers
Surgery Performed: 324,682
Total Funding: $12,807,943

Dane County VMA – Maddie’s Spay/Neuter Project
Surgery Performed: 3,825
Total Funding: $37,867

Texas VMA – Maddie’s Spay/Neuter Project
Surgery Performed: 5,964
Total Funding: $567,794

Utah VMA – Maddie’s Spay/Neuter Project
Surgery Performed: 4,820
Total Funding: $566,765

Community Collaborations

Pet Rescue Project in Centre County, PA
Above Baseline Adoptions: 830
Above Baseline Surgeries: 3,313
Total Funding: $552,400

Maddie’s Pet Project in Austin, TX
Above Baseline Adoptions: 2,541
Above Baseline Surgeries: 5,595
Total Funding: $407,000

Shelter Medicine Programs

Maddie’s Shelter Medicine Program at Western University, Pomona, CA
Total Funding: $250,000

Capital

Pet Network, Incline Village, NV
Total Funding: $750,000

Oakland SPCA, Oakland, CA
Total Funding: $1,466,989

Tony La Russa’s Animal Rescue Foundation, Walnut Creek, CA
Total Funding: $1,400,000

Additional Grants

$66,814

Angel’s Wish, Inc.

ASPCA

Cornell University

Country Animal Haven

Dane County Humane Society

Doing Things for Animals

East Bay Botanical & Zoological Society

Fine Feathered Friends Sanctuary

German Shepherd Rescue of Northern California

Greater Huntsville Humane Society

Humane Society of Chilton County

International Wildlife Education and Conservation

Lake Tahoe Humane Society

Lindsay Wildlife Museum

Marine Mammal Center

Montgomery Humane Society

Nevada Humane Society

PAWS Program

Pet Network

Pet Saver Foundation

Polk County SPCA

Return to Freedom

SPCA of Monmouth County, NJ

Suffolk County SPCA

Tompkins County SPCA

Tony La Russa’s Animal Rescue Foundation

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Utah Pioneer Award

Valley Humane Society

Whisker City

Wiregrass Humane Society

Where is Maddie’s Fund?*

Since 1999, Maddie’s Fund has spent $33 million to support lifesaving projects in:

- 13 states
- 211 counties
- 1,804 cities

Grants have gone to:

- 360 animal welfare organizations (including 160 rescue groups)
- 1,457 private practice veterinary hospitals
- 5 universities
- 7 veterinary medical associations
2005 and Beyond

Certain principles form the very core of Maddie’s Fund®. Because of their importance, we’ve built them into every aspect of our work: our applications, funded projects, presentations, website information and written communications. These principles are:

- Collaboration
- Uniform definitions
- Data collection
- Performance measurement
- Published outcomes
- Honesty, integrity and mutual respect

Maddie’s Fund believes that measuring organizational performance, openly publishing the outcomes and comparing performance to others drives lifesaving achievement. Collaboration and mutual respect expedite and enhance the effort.

When we started advocating these ideals five years ago, their controversial nature drew few adherents. But today, we’re at the beginning of a new era. Within the closing months of 2004, some of the most influential leaders in the animal welfare movement came together to create and promote the Asilomar Accords, a document based on collaboration, mutual respect, uniform definitions, data collection and transparency. To read the Asilomar Accords, see the Appendix on page 28.

The Asilomar Accords
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I. Preface

In August of 2004, a group of animal welfare industry leaders from across the nation convened at Asilomar in Pacific Grove, California, for the purpose of building bridges across varying philosophies, developing relationships and creating goals focused on significantly reducing the euthanasia of healthy and treatable companion animals in the United States.

Through hard work, lively discussion and brainstorming, a common vision for the future was adopted. The leadership of the following organizations participated in the original, and/or subsequent meetings, and were involved in the drafting of the “Asilomar Accord”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martha Armstrong</td>
<td>The Humane Society of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Avanzino</td>
<td>Maddie’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Burns</td>
<td>Hawaiian Humane Society &amp; The National Council on Pet Population Study &amp; Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Fina</td>
<td>North Shore Animal League and The Pet Savers Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Goldstein, D.V.M.</td>
<td>San Diego Humane Society and SPCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Lewis</td>
<td>Fort Wayne Animal Care &amp; Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Loftus</td>
<td>Pet-Ark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane McCall</td>
<td>Dubuque Humane Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan McHugh-Smith</td>
<td>Humane Society of Boulder Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven McHugh</td>
<td>Unison Business Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy McKenney</td>
<td>Humane Society for Seattle/King County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Morrison</td>
<td>Southeast Area Animal Control Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nagy</td>
<td>Dumb Friends League &amp; the Society of Animal Welfare Administrators (SAWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Naumann</td>
<td>Arizona Humane Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rohde</td>
<td>Dumb Friends League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Sayres</td>
<td>American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Snyder</td>
<td>The Humane Society of the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Terpstra</td>
<td>Pasadena Humane Society &amp; SPCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Tiscornia</td>
<td>SPCA of Monterey County &amp; the Society of Animal Welfare Administrators (SAWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Belew Wheatley</td>
<td>American Humane Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Guiding Principles

1. The mission of those involved in creating the Asilomar Accord is to work together to save the lives of all healthy and treatable companion animals.

2. We recognize that all stakeholders in the animal welfare community have a passion for and are dedicated to the mutual goal of saving animals’ lives.

3. We acknowledge that the euthanasia of healthy and treatable animals is the sad responsibility of some animal welfare organizations that neither desired nor sought this task. We believe that the euthanasia of healthy and treatable animals is a community-wide problem requiring community-based solutions. We also recognize that animal welfare organizations can be leaders in bringing about a change in social and other factors that result in the euthanasia of healthy and treatable animals, including the compounding problems of some pet owners’/guardians’ failure to spay and neuter, properly socialize and train, be tolerant of, provide veterinary care to, or take responsibility for companion animals.

4. We, as animal welfare stakeholders, agree to foster a mutual respect for one another. When discussing differences of policy and opinion, either publicly or within and among our own agencies, we agree to refrain from denigrating or speaking ill of one another. We will also encourage those other individuals and organizations in our sphere of influence to do the same.

5. We encourage all communities to embrace the vision and spirit of these Accords, while acknowledging that differences exist between various communities and geographic regions.

6. We encourage the creation of local “community coalitions” consisting of a variety of organizations (e.g., governmental animal control agencies, nonprofit shelters, grassroots foster care providers, feral cat groups, funders and veterinary associations) for the purpose of saving the lives of healthy and treatable animals. We are committed to the belief that no one organization or type of organization can achieve this goal alone, that we need one another, and that the only true solution is to work together. We need to find common ground, put aside our differences and work collaboratively to reach the ultimate goal of ending the euthanasia of healthy and treatable companion animals.

7. While we understand that other types of programs and efforts (including adoption, spay and neuter programs, education, cruelty investigations, enforcement of animal control laws and regulations, behavior and training assistance and feral cat management) play a critical role in impacting euthanasia figures, for purposes of this nationwide initiative we have elected to leave these programs in the hands of local organizations and encourage them to continue offering, and expanding upon, these critical services.

8. In order to achieve harmony and forward progress, we encourage each community coalition to discuss language and terminology which has been historically viewed as hurtful or divisive by some animal welfare stakeholders (whether intentional or inadvertent), identify “problem” language, and reach a consensus to modify or phrase out language and terminology accordingly.

9. We believe in the importance of transparency and the open sharing of accurate, complete animal-sheltering data and statistics in a manner which is clear to both the animal welfare community and the public.

10. We believe it is essential to utilize a uniform method for collecting and reporting shelter data, in order to promote transparency and better assess the euthanasia rate of healthy and treatable animals. We determined that a uniform method of reporting needs to include the collection and analysis of animal-sheltering data as set forth in the “Animal Statistics Table.” These statistics need to be collected for each individual organization and for the community as a whole and need to be reported to the public annually (e.g., web sites, newsletters, annual reports). In addition, we
determined that each community’s “Live Release Rate” needs to be calculated, shared and reported annually to the public, individually by each organization and jointly by each community coalition. Both individual organizations and community coalitions should strive for continuous improvement of these numbers. The “Animal Statistics Table” and formulas for calculating the “Live Release Rate” are set forth in Section IV of these Accord.

11. We developed several standard “definitions” to enable uniform and accurate collection, analysis and reporting of animal-sheltering data and statistics. We encourage all communities to adopt the definitions which are set forth in Section III, and implement the principles of these Accord.

12. While we recognize that many animal welfare organizations provide services to companion animals other than dogs and cats, for purposes of this nationwide initiative we have elected to collect and share data solely as it relates to dogs and cats.

13. We are committed to continuing dialogue, analysis and potential modification of this vision as needs change and as progress is made toward achieving our mission.

14. Those involved in the development of the Asilomar Accords have agreed to make a personal commitment to ensure the furtherance of these accord, and to use their professional influence to bring about a nationwide adoption of this vision.

In order to facilitate the data collection process and assure consistent reporting across agencies, the following definitions have been developed. The Asilomar participants hope that these definitions are applied as a standard for categorizing dogs and cats in each organization. The definitions, however, are not meant to define the outcome for each animal entrusted to our care.

**Healthy**

The term “healthy” means and includes all dogs and cats eight weeks of age or older that, at or subsequent to the time the animal is taken into possession, have manifested no sign of a behavioral or temperamental characteristic that could pose a health or safety risk or otherwise make the animal unsuitable for placement as a pet, and have manifested no sign of disease, injury, a congenital or hereditary condition that adversely affects the health of the animal or that is likely to adversely affect the animal’s health in the future.

**Treatable**

The term “treatable” means and includes all dogs and cats who are “rehabilitatable” and all dogs and cats who are “manageable.”

**Rehabilitatable**: The term “rehabilitatable” means and includes all dogs and cats who are not “healthy,” but who are likely to become “healthy,” if given medical, foster, behavioral, or other care equivalent to the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring pet owners/guardians in the community.

**Manageable**: The term “manageable” means and includes all dogs and cats who are not “healthy” and who are not likely to become “healthy,” regardless of the care provided, but who would likely maintain a satisfactory quality of life, if given medical, foster, behavioral, or other care, including long-term care, equivalent to the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring owners/guardians in the community, provided, however, that the term “manageable” does not include any dog or cat who is determined to pose a significant risk to human health or safety or to the health or safety of other animals.

**Unhealthy and Untreatable**

The term “unhealthy and untreatable” means and includes all dogs and cats who, at or subsequent to the time they are taken into possession,

1. have a behavioral or temperamental characteristic that poses a health or safety risk or otherwise makes the animal unsuitable for placement as a pet, and are not likely to become “healthy” or “treatable” even if provided the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring pet owners/guardians in the community; or

2. are suffering from a disease, injury, or congenital or hereditary condition that adversely affects the animal’s health or is likely to adversely affect the animal’s health in the future, and are not likely to become “healthy” or “treatable” even if provided the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring pet owners/guardians in the community; or

3. are under the age of eight weeks and are not likely to become “healthy” or “treatable,” even if provided the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring pet owners/guardians in the community.
IV. Annual Animal Statistics & Live Release Rate Formulas

1. Annual Animal Statistics Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dog</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEGINNING SHELTER COUNT (date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I/T</td>
<td>IN/TAKE (Live Dogs &amp; Cats Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>From the Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming Transfers from Organizations within Community/Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incoming Transfers from Organizations outside Community/Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>From Owners/Guardians Requesting Euthanasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Intake ((A + B + C + D + E))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Untreatable Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUSTED TOTAL INTAKE ([F – G])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADOPTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>OUTGOING TRANSFERS to Organizations within Community/Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td>OUTGOING TRANSFERS to Organizations outside Community/Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>RETURN TO OWNER/GUARDIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOGS &amp; CATS EUTHANIZED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Treatable – Rehabilitable (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Treatable – Manageable (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unhealthy &amp; Untreatable (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Euthanasia ([M + N + O + P])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Untreatable Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUSTED TOTAL EUTHANASIA ([Q – R])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>DIED OR LOST IN SHELTER/CARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL OUTCOMES ((T + U)) Excludes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Untreatable Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENDING SHELTER COUNT (date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To check the accuracy of the shelter data you’ve compiled, the Beginning Shelter Count \((A)\) plus the Adjusted Total Intake \((H)\) should equal the Total Outcomes \((V)\) plus the Ending Shelter Count \((W)\): \(A + H = V + W\)

2. Annual Live Release Rate Formulas

The Annual Live Release Rate is calculated by dividing total live outcomes (adoptions, outgoing transfers, and return to owner/guardian) by total outcomes (total live outcomes plus euthanasia not including owner/guardian requested euthanasia or died/lost in shelter/care). NOTE: The Annual Live Release Rate Formula is different for an individual agency and a coalition or community due to transfers between agencies.

**Calculation for an individual agency:**

Adoptions + All Outgoing Transfers + Return to Owner/Guardian divided by Total Outcomes excluding owner/guardian requested euthanasia which were unhealthy and untreatable, and dogs and cats that died or were lost in the shelter/care.

**Annual Live Release Rate** = \((I + J + K + L) / (T - U)\) * 100 = _____%

When reporting the Annual Live Release Rate for an individual agency, you should include the following statement: The Annual Live Release Rate does not include _____ owner/guardian requested euthanasia which were unhealthy & untreatable [see Line R] and _____ dogs and cats that died or were lost in the shelter/care [see Line U].

**Calculation for community or coalition:**

Adoptions + Return to Owner/Guardian divided by Total Outcomes excluding all outgoing transfers, owner/guardian requested euthanasia (unhealthy and untreatable), and dogs and cats that died or were lost in the shelter/care.

**Annual Live Release Rate** = \((O + R) / (T - P)\) * 100 = _____%

When reporting the Annual Live Release Rate for the community or a coalition, you should include the following statement: The Annual Live Release Rate does not include _____ owner/guardian requested euthanasia which were unhealthy & untreatable [see Line R] and _____ dogs and cats that died or were lost in the shelter/care [see Line U].
3. Example of Data to Publish for an Individual Agency

**Annual Live Release Rate: 59%**
The Annual Live Release Rate does not include 4,000 owner/guardian requested euthanasia which were unhealthy & untreatable and 200 dogs and cats that died or were lost in the shelter/care. (See following table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Annual Animal Statistics Table</th>
<th>Dog</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A BEGINNING SHELTER COUNT (1/1/03)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTAKE (Live Dogs &amp; Cats Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B From the Public</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Incoming Transfers from Organizations within Community/Coalition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Incoming Transfers from Organizations outside Community/Coalition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E From Owners/Guardians Requesting Euthanasia</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Total Intake</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Unentreatable Only)</td>
<td>-1,800</td>
<td>-2,200</td>
<td>-4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ADJUSTED TOTAL INTAKE [F minus G]</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ADOPTIONS</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J OUTGOING TRANSFERS to Organizations within Community/Coalition</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K OUTGOING TRANSFERS to Organizations outside Community/Coalition</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L RETURN TO OWNER/GUARDIAN</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M DOGS &amp; CATS EUTHANIZED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Healthy (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Treatable – Rehabilatble (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Unhealthy Unentreatable (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Total Euthanasia (M + N + O + P)</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Unentreatable Only)</td>
<td>-1,800</td>
<td>-2,200</td>
<td>-4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S ADJUSTED TOTAL EUTHANASIA [Q minus R]</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T SUBTOTAL OUTCOMES (I+J+K+L+5) Excludes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Unentreatable Only)</td>
<td>23,300</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U DIED OR LOST IN SHELTER/CARE</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V TOTAL OUTCOMES (T + U) (Excludes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Unentreatable Only)</td>
<td>23,375</td>
<td>20,825</td>
<td>53,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W ENDING SHELTER COUNT (12/31/03)</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Live Release Rate Calculation for Individual Agency**

\[
\text{Live Release Rate} = \frac{\text{Euthanasia} + \text{Died in Shelter/Care}}{\text{Total Intake} + \text{Euthanasia} + \text{Died in Shelter/Care} + \text{Total OUS}} \\
\times 100 \\
\]

**Data Check:** [5,000 + 54,000] = [53,200 + 3,800]; 57,000 = 57,000

---

4. Example of Data to Publish for Your Community or Coalition

**Annual Live Release Rate: 49.5%**
The Annual Live Release Rate does not include 7,000 owner/guardian requested euthanasia which were unhealthy & untreatable and 380 dogs and cats that died or were lost in the shelter/care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Annual Animal Statistics Table</th>
<th>Dog</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A BEGINNING SHELTER COUNT (1/1/03)</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTAKE (Live Dogs &amp; Cats Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B From the Public</td>
<td>36,100</td>
<td>45,900</td>
<td>82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Incoming Transfers from Organizations within Community/Coalition</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Incoming Transfers from Organizations outside Community/Coalition</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E From Owners/Guardians Requesting Euthanasia</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Total Intake</td>
<td>40,450</td>
<td>51,750</td>
<td>92,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Unentreatable Only)</td>
<td>-3,150</td>
<td>-3,850</td>
<td>-7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ADJUSTED TOTAL INTAKE [F minus G]</td>
<td>37,600</td>
<td>47,700</td>
<td>85,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ADOPTIONS</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>32,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J OUTGOING TRANSFERS to Organizations within Community/Coalition</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K OUTGOING TRANSFERS to Organizations outside Community/Coalition</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L RETURN TO OWNER/GUARDIAN</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M DOGS &amp; CATS EUTHANIZED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Healthy (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Treatable – Rehabilatble (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
<td>4,875</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Unhealthy Unentreatable (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Total Euthanasia (M + N + O + P)</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Unentreatable Only)</td>
<td>-3,150</td>
<td>-3,850</td>
<td>-7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S ADJUSTED TOTAL EUTHANASIA [Q minus R]</td>
<td>17,450</td>
<td>23,750</td>
<td>41,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T SUBTOTAL OUTCOMES (I+J+K+L+5) Excludes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Unentreatable Only)</td>
<td>36,650</td>
<td>47,450</td>
<td>84,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U DIED OR LOST IN SHELTER/CARE</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V TOTAL OUTCOMES (T + U) (Excludes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy &amp; Unentreatable Only)</td>
<td>36,790</td>
<td>47,690</td>
<td>84,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W ENDING SHELTER COUNT (12/31/03)</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>5,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Live Release Rate Calculation for Community or Coalition**

\[
\text{Live Release Rate} = \frac{\text{Euthanasia} + \text{Died in Shelter/Care}}{\text{Total Intake} + \text{Euthanasia} + \text{Died in Shelter/Care} + \text{Total OUS}} \\
\times 100 \\
\]

**Data Check:** [5,200 + 85,200] = [84,480 + 5,920]; 90,400 = 90,400
5. Glossary of Terms

A) Beginning Shelter Count (date): The number of dogs and cats in your shelter or in your care including fosters at the beginning of the reporting period. The reporting period is annual—either a calendar year or a fiscal year. (date) refers to the first day of the reporting period written in the following format: month/day/year.

Intake (live Dogs & Cats Only): This table only deals with live dogs and cats for which your shelter or animal group assumed responsibility. Dogs and cats categorized as “dead on arrival” or DOA are not included in these statistics. For intake animals, status is determined at the time paperwork is initiated.

B) From the Public: The number of live dogs and cats your shelter or animal group received from the public. This includes dogs and cats turned in or surrendered by their owners/guardians; stray dogs and cats turned in by the public; stray dogs and cats picked up in the field; and dogs and cats impounded for cruelty investigation, custody care, and statutory/ordinance impoundment.

C) Incoming Transfers from Organizations within Community/Coalition: The number of dogs and cats your shelter or animal group received from other animal organizations participating in your collaborative group. (This only applies if the reporting organization is working collaboratively with other shelters/groups in their area.) NOTE: On the community or coalition level, j) (Outgoing Transfers to Organizations within Community/Coalition) should equal c) (Outgoing Transfers from Organizations within Community/Coalition).

D) Incoming Transfers from Organizations outside Community/Coalition: The number of dogs and cats your shelter or animal group received from animal organizations that are not participating in your collaborative group. NOTE: If you are not part of a collaboration that is compiling statistics, then all your incoming transfers would be listed here.

E) From Owners/Guardians Requesting Euthanasia: The number of dogs and cats turned in or surrendered to your shelter or animal group by their owners/guardians for the purpose of euthanasia. This includes all categories of dogs and cats (healthy, treatable-rehabilitatable, treatable-manageable, unhealthy & untreatable). (See M, N, O, P for definitions of healthy, treatable-rehabilitatable, treatable-manageable, unhealthy & untreatable.)

F) Total Intake: The sum of lines B through E. This includes all live dogs and cats for which your shelter or animal group assumed responsibility.

G) Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy & Untreatable Only): The number of unhealthy and untreatable dogs and cats your shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians and the number of dogs and cats ordered to be euthanized by legislative, judicial or administrative action. Do not include any dogs and cats you shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians and who were considered to be healthy, treatable-rehabilitatable or treatable-manageable at the time of death. (See M, N, O, P for definitions of healthy, treatable-rehabilitatable, treatable-manageable, unhealthy & untreatable.)

H) Adjusted Total Intake: Lines F minus G. Total Intake minus the number of unhealthy & untreatable dogs and cats your shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians.

I) Adoptions: The number of dogs and cats your shelter or animal group placed with members of the public. Do not include dogs and cats in foster homes or dogs and cats transferred to other animal welfare organizations.

J) Outgoing Transfers to Organizations within Community/Coalition: The number of dogs and cats your shelter or animal group turned over to other animal organizations within your collaborative group. (This only applies if the reporting organization is working collaboratively with other shelters/groups in their area.) NOTE: On the community or coalition level, j) (Outgoing Transfers to Organizations within Community/Coalition) should equal c) (Outgoing Transfers from Organizations within Community/Coalition).

K) Outgoing Transfers to Organizations outside Community/Coalition: The number of dogs and cats your shelter or animal group turned over to animal organizations that are not part of your collaborative group. NOTE: If you are not part of a collaboration which is compiling statistics, then all your outgoing transfers would be listed here.

L) Return to Owner/Guardian: The number of stray dogs and cats your shelter or animal group reunited with their owners/guardians and the number of dogs and cats reclaimed by their owners/guardians.

M) Healthy (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia): The number of healthy dogs and cats that your shelter or animal group euthanized including the number of healthy dogs and cats your shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians.

The term “healthy” means and includes all dogs and cats eight weeks of age or older that, at or subsequent to the time the animal is taken into possession, have manifested no signs of a behavioral or temperamental characteristic that could pose a health or safety risk or otherwise make the animal unsuitable for placement as a pet, and have manifested no sign of disease, injury, or congenital or hereditary condition that adversely affects the health of the animal or that is likely to adversely affect the animal’s health in the future.

N) Treatable – Rehabilitatable (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia): The number of treatable – rehabilitatable dogs and cats that your shelter or animal group euthanized including the number of treatable – rehabilitatable dogs and cats your shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians.

The term “treatable” means and includes all dogs and cats who are “rehabilitatable” and all dogs and cats who are “manageable.” The term “rehabilitatable” means and includes all dogs and cats who are not “healthy,” but who are likely to become “healthy.” If given medical, foster, behavioral, or other care equivalent to the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring pet owners/guardians in the community. (These conditions are generally considered to be curable.)

O) Treatable – Manageable (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia): The number of treatable – manageable dogs and cats that your shelter or animal group euthanized including the number of treatable – manageable dogs and cats your shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians.

The term “treatable” means and includes all dogs and cats who are “rehabilitatable” and all dogs and cats who are “manageable.” The term “manageable” means and includes all dogs and cats who are not “healthy” and who are not likely to become “healthy,” regardless of the care provided, but who
would likely maintain a satisfactory quality of life, if given medical, foster, behavioral, or other care, including long-term care, equivalent to the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring pet owners/guardians in the community, provided, however, that the term “managable” does not include any dog or cat who is determined to pose a significant risk to human health or safety or to the health or safety of other animals. (These conditions are generally considered to be chronic.)

P) Unhealthy & Unatable (Includes Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia): The number of unhealthy & unatable dogs and cats that your shelter or animal group euthanized including the number of unhealthy & unatable dogs and cats your shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians and the number of dogs and cats ordered to be euthanized by legislative, judicial or administrative action.

The term “Unhealthy and Unatable” means and includes all dogs and cats who, at or subsequent to the time they are taken into possession, (1) have a behavioral or temperamental characteristic that poses a health or safety risk or otherwise makes the animal unsuitable for placement as a pet, and are not likely to become “healthy” or “treatable” even if provided the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring pet owners/guardians in the community; or (2) are suffering from a disease, injury, or congenital or hereditary condition that adversely affects the animal’s health or is likely to adversely affect the animal’s health in the future, and are not likely to become “healthy” or “treatable” even if provided the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring pet owners/guardians in the community; or (3) are under the age of eight weeks and are not likely to become “healthy” or “treatable,” even if provided the care typically provided to pets by reasonable and caring pet owners/guardians in the community.

Q) Total Euthanasia: Sum of lines M through P. This includes all dogs and cats your shelter or animal group euthanized (Healthy, Treatable – Rehabilitable, Treatable – Manageable, and Unhealthy & Unatable). [See M, N, O, P for definitions of healthy, treatable-rehabilitable, treatable-manageable, unhealthy & unatable.]

R) Owner/Guardian Requested Euthanasia (Unhealthy & Unatable Only): The number of unhealthy & unatable dogs and cats that your shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians and who were considered to be healthy, treatable-rehabilitable or treatable-manageable at the time of death. [See M, N, O, P for definitions of healthy, treatable-rehabilitable, treatable-manageable, unhealthy & unatable.]


T) Subtotal Outcomes: Sum of lines I through L plus S. This includes the number of dogs and cats that your shelter or animal group adopted, transferred, returned to owner/guardian. Do not include the number of dogs and cats who died or were lost while in your shelter or in your care, or the number of unhealthy & unatable dogs and cats that your shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians or the number of dogs and cats ordered to be euthanized by legislative, judicial or administrative action. [See P for definition of unhealthy & unatable category.]

U) Died or Lost in Shelter/Care: The number of dogs and cats for which your shelter or animal group assumed responsibility and who died or could not be accounted for. This includes the number of dogs and cats who died of medical complications (and were not euthanized), died in foster care or in transit, or were lost or stolen from the shelter.

V) Total Outcomes: Sum of lines T and U. This is the total number of dog and cat outcomes which includes the number of dogs and cats your shelter or animal group adopted, transferred, returned to owner/guardian plus the number of dogs and cats for which your shelter or animal group assumed responsibility and who died of medical complications (and were not euthanized) or were lost or stolen (from the shelter or foster care). Total outcomes do not include the number of unhealthy & unatable dogs and cats that your shelter or animal group euthanized at the request of their owners/guardians or the number of dogs and cats ordered to be euthanized by legislative, judicial or administrative action. [See P for definition of unhealthy & unatable category.]

W) Ending Shelter Count (date): The number of dogs and cats in your shelter or in your care including foster at the end of the reporting period. The reporting period is annual – either a calendar year or a fiscal year. (date) refers to the last day of the reporting period written in the following format: month/day/year.

Special Note: To calculate the Annual Live Release Rate for your community or coalition, each participating shelter or animal group will need to fill out the Annual Animal Statistics Table for their individual organization. The reporting organization for the community/coalition will then compile this information for all the groups in one table and follow the instructions for calculating the community/coalition rate.