

## Board of County Commissioners Agenda Request 24

Date of Meeting: July 13, 2004

Date Submitted: July 7, 2004

To: Honorable Chairman and Members of the Board  
From: Parwez Alam, County Administrator  
Gary W. Johnson, Director, Growth and Environmental Management  
Subject: Updating the Wildlife Preservation Fund Policies and Procedures and  
Modifying the Wildlife Rehabilitation Distribution Formula

---

### **Statement of Issue:**

This item requests approval to modify the wildlife rehabilitation distribution formula (Attachment #1) and associated policies and procedures (Attachment #2) in preparation of the annual distribution of Wildlife Preservation Funds (WPF) to qualified wildlife rehabilitation groups.

### **Background:**

The WPF was established by the Leon County Board of County Commissioners on August 25, 1998, and designated by the Board as a funding source for wildlife preservation efforts. Priority status has been given to wildlife rehabilitation efforts. This fund receives 50 percent of assessed tree replanting costs as mitigation for not replanting trees required under the Environmental Management Act.

On November 24, 1998, the Board approved Policies and Procedures that provide guidelines on the method and criteria for distribution of funds from the WPF (Attachment #3). Since the inception of the WPF, three agencies have routinely applied for reimbursement funding: St. Francis Wildlife Rehabilitation Center, Florida Wild Mammals Association, and Goose Creek Wildlife Association. Last year a fourth group, Operation Wildlife Survival, also applied for reimbursement funding.

During the first WPF distribution cycle in 1999, the Board approved a policy to distribute these funds that was developed by the Wildlife Preservation Committee. Funds were distributed to groups categorized as small, medium and large. This method recognized the importance of the smaller rehabilitation providers by providing them baseline funding while rewarding larger rehabilitation providers by giving them more available shares from the fund to compensate them for their efforts.

This funding distribution method came into question as smaller rehabilitation groups grew in the number of animals they treated and crossed over minimum threshold for small and medium funding levels. This gave smaller rehabilitation groups a disproportional percentage of available

funds at the expense of the largest rehabilitation group when comparing the number of animals serviced.

Last year the Board adopted a distribution formula that distributed available funds based on the number of animals serviced divided by the available monies in the WPF. The end result was that the largest rehabilitation agency received more than eighty percent of available funds and the smallest group receiving less than one percent of the distributed funds. This decision was not unanimous, and during the Board discussion on the item, it was requested that staff work with the local wildlife rehabilitation groups to come up with a distribution method that was agreeable to the different groups.

The tables in Attachment #4 show the amount of WPFs distributed and the number of animals taken in for rehabilitation by the agencies who have applied for reimbursement funds over the preceding five years.

The deadline for applying for FY 04 Wildlife Rehabilitation Funding is August 1, 2004. Estimates indicate that approximately \$7,000 dollars will be available for distribution during this reimbursement cycle.

**Analysis:**

On November 17, 2003, staff met with representatives of the four agencies involved in last year's WPF distribution (Attachment #5). Consensus was reached in three different areas that should be used in distributing WPFs.

1. The number of native animals (as listed by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission) received except for animals that were dead on arrival.
2. Reimbursement should be limited to costs for food and medical expenses.
3. The formula should be weighted somewhat to receive a higher percentage of their reimbursement request in order to support and nurture a broader network of rehabilitation providers.

Consensus on these variables excluded current reimbursable expenses for cage construction and capture equipment. Caging expenses and construction costs are extremely variable, and tend to skew reimbursement requests when they are included. Also, it was agreed that capture equipment should not be included since any weighting added to the formula would compensate smaller groups to buy equipment as the organization grows. Larger groups already have a base level of equipment and did not feel that it needed to be included in the formula.

To develop a weighted distribution formula, Florida State University Professor, Ben Fusaro, Ph.D. was consulted and an equation developed. Examples were provided to the rehabilitation groups showing a ten, twenty and thirty percent weighting (Attachment #6). The examples used last year's reimbursement requests, minus the caging and equipment costs as agreed by the groups during the earlier meeting.

Conversations, with representatives of the groups indicate that the ten percent weighting would be acceptable as a methodology to distribute the formulas. The formula removes the most variable cost between the groups, caging, and provides minimal weighted distribution to the

smaller groups to allow them to recoup costs that should allow them to stay a part of the local wildlife rehabilitation network.

A revised strike through and underline version of the WPF Policies and Procedures is included as Attachment #2. This version excludes reimbursement for caging and capture equipment, clarifies reimbursement for native animals, updates the application criteria, and will include the new distribution formula if it is adopted by the Board.

If the new policy and distribution formula are approved the agencies will be sent applications for the FY 04 reimbursement period on July 14, 2004. Funds would then be allocated according to the new formula, and be authorized for disbursement by the County Administrator as the current policy allows. Attachment #1 shows what this year's distribution would be using the ten percent weighting factor, the estimated \$7000 dollars available for distribution this year, and the eligible reimbursement amounts using last years reimbursement request.

**Options:**

1. Approve the new Wildlife Preservation Fund Policies and Procedures and Distribution Formula and authorize the County Administrator to distribute the funds before the end of the fiscal year as stated in the policy.
2. Do not approve the new Wildlife Preservation Fund Policies and Procedures and Distribution Formula and authorize the County Administrator to distribute the funds utilizing the current policies and formula before the end of the fiscal year as stated in the policy.
3. Board Direction.

**Recommendation:**

Option #1

**Attachments:**

1. Estimated FY 04 Distribution Using New Weighted Formula
2. Proposed New Wildlife Preservation Fund Policies and Procedures
3. Current Wildlife Preservation Fund Policies and Procedures
4. Historical Fund Distribution and Number of Treated Wildlife Table
5. Minutes from November 17, 2003, Wildlife Rehabilitation Group Meeting
6. New Weighted Formula Examples

**Estimated FY 04 Distribution Using Weighted Wildlife Preservation Fund (WPF) Distribution Methodology Using 10% Weighting**

Organization	Amount Requested	Eligible Expenses after financial review*	Number of Animals Received and Treated (#AT)	Mean Cost of Food and Medicine (MC) = <u>Organization's Eligible Expenses</u> #AT	Weighted Mean Cost (WMC) = MC x Weighting Factor (WF)	Weighted Expense(WE) = WMC x # AT	Allocation Factor (AF)= Organization WE/ Total WE (\$58,225)	Allocation = AF x available funds \$7,000
St. Francis	\$37,918	\$37,918	2,736	\$37,918/2736 = \$13.85	13.85 x 1 = 13.85	13.85 x 2736 = 37,894	.65	\$4,550
Goose Creek	\$25,252	\$12,073	482	\$12,073/482 = \$25.04	25.04 x 1.09 = 27.29	27.29 x 482 = 13,153	.23	\$1,610
FL Wild Mammals	<del>\$8,091</del>	\$4,089	131	\$4,089/131 = \$31.21	31.21 x 1.10 = 34.33	34.33 x 131 = 4,497	.08	\$560
Operation Wildlife Rescue	\$3,414	\$2,416	30	\$2,416/30 = \$80.53	80.53 x 1.11 = 89.38	89.38 x 30 = 2,681	.04	\$280
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$74,675</b>	<b>\$56,496</b>	<b>3,379</b>			<b>\$58,225</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>\$7,000</b>

\* Eligible expenses are for food and medical expenses only. Other expenses such as caging, trap and office equipment have been excluded.

AF = Allocation Factor  
w = Weighting percentage  
n = # of animals for the specific organization  
AT = Animals Treated  
MC = Mean Cost  
WE = Weighted Expense  
WMC = Weighted Mean Cost

Formula for Deriving weighting Factors (WF)  
 $WF = 1 + [w/\#AT \text{ largest group} - \#AT \text{ smallest group} / (\#AT \text{ largest group} - n)]$

**Wildlife Preservation Fund:  
Policies and Procedures**

Background:

The Wildlife Preservation Fund was established by the Leon County Board of County Commissioners on August 25, 1998. These Withdrawal Policies and Procedures are designed to establish a methodology whereby staff may distribute the funds collected as part of the newly established Wildlife Preservation Fund. The Wildlife Preservation Fund receives 50% of all funds collected as assessed for the cost of mitigating not replanting trees required under newly the Environmental Management Act generated as a result of permit replanting requirements which could not reasonably be placed on site [Section 10-294(b) (3)] or were donated to the County as part of a plan for mitigating one or more violations of the Environmental Management Act..

Authorization for the "Wildlife Preservation Fund" is provided in Leon County Code of Laws, Section 10-294(b) (3), *Off-Site Replanting Agreements*, and states:

"If the total number of trees to be replanted based on the tree replanting schedule in subsection (b) (1), exceeds that which may be reasonably planted on the development site, the applicant may enter into an agreement with the County, as approved by the director, to plant the excess trees on an approved public site or to provide the monetary equivalent to the County for use in public landscaping projects, and which may, upon proper application, be provided to organizations for the purpose of wildlife protection and preservation."

General Guidelines:

The Wildlife Preservation Fund has been designated by the Board of County Commissioners, BOCC, as a funding source for wildlife preservation efforts. Priority status has been assigned to wildlife rehabilitation efforts. ~~For support~~ wildlife preservation efforts which may request funding will be directed to wildlife habitat enhancement. Additional guidelines will be added in order to prioritize the funding requests received by the Community Development Growth and Environmental Management Department. Generally, the guidelines are as follows:

1. ~~Withdrawals are for the purpose of promoting wildlife preservation with priority being given to the through the rehabilitation and release of injured and displaced wildlife, and secondarily to efforts related to the provision of enhanced wildlife habitat. Only native animals as listed by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission are eligible for rehabilitation reimbursement funds. Reimbursement funds will not be provided for species listed as exotic, nuisance or domesticated/farm animals.~~
2. Wildlife Preservation request are limited to the available fund balance for any given fiscal year.
3. Wildlife Preservation Withdrawal Requests are limited to one per agency per year.
4. Projects which serve a larger number of native/migratory wildlife will be given higher priority than those which serve fewer native/migratory.
5. Projects shall provide management and care standards consistent current wildlife

Wildlife Preservation Fund Withdrawal Policy and Procedures  
Page 2

rehabilitation permit requirements and standards as issued by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Florida Game and Freshwater Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

6. Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Requests shall be directed to the management and restoration of high quality natural areas or sites with potentially high value for wildlife habitat.
  - a. Management of remnant natural areas of highest quality.
  - b. Healing damage natural area and expanding the flora and fauna through ecological restoration and/or management.
7. In the provision of wildlife habitat, the use of appropriate native species is encouraged, and they are to be located on approved sites. An approved site is defined as:
  - a. Publicly owned property
  - b. Property owned by a private not-for-profit organization on which wildlife preservation efforts will provide a documented, substantial public benefit.
  - c. Private property on which wildlife preservation efforts will provide a documented and substantial public benefit.

The methodology for distribution of funds has been developed which will minimize staff time in reviewing and processing withdrawal requests and provide an effective expenditure of county funds. Funds shall be distributed on an annual basis and it will retain a minimum balance of \$1000. All requests for monies from this fund shall be submitted to the Growth and Environmental Management Director of Community Development or his designee by August 1, of each fiscal year. ~~Designated staff within the Community Development Department~~ The Tree Bank/Wildlife Committee will examine, review, prioritize and recommend the allocation of funds to the Director.

- Wildlife Withdrawal Request will be submitted on August 1 and actual reimbursement funds will be distributed by September 30.
- Funding of Wildlife Withdrawal request for wildlife rehabilitation will be directed to the reimbursement of approved expenses incurred during the previous 12 months prior to the submittal date and according to the established criteria.
- Funding of Wildlife Withdrawal Request for wildlife habitat enhancement will be designed to cover the costs of approved purchases to an identified vendor.
- When determined to be complete, all request by August 1, will be reviewed and recommendations made to the director within twenty (20) working days. The request may be approved, approved with conditions, or denied within ten (10) working days form receipt by the Director.
- Appeals of the Director's decision must be filed within ten (10) working days to the County Administrator for review. The County Administrator's decision shall be final.

Wildlife Preservation Fund Withdrawal Policy and Procedures  
Page 3

Withdrawal Procedures:

1. The person or agency interested in using proceeds deposited in the Wildlife Preservation Fund shall file a request using the Wildlife Preservation Fund Request Form (attached).
2. A. The wildlife rehabilitation request shall include:
  - a. Applicant name, phone number, address  
If agency or organization;
    - 1) Purpose statement
    - 2) Organizational goals
    - 3) History of agency or organization
  - b. Name, phone number and address of representative of the applicant
  - c. Wildlife rehabilitator seeking funding for expenses must possess and provide copies of current wildlife rehabilitation permits from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Florida Game and Freshwater Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
  - d. Copy of proceeding year's annual Wildlife Rehabilitation Reports to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services and Florida Game and Fresh Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
  - e. Request amount, description and narrative of expenditures to be reimbursed
    - Wildlife Food(bird of prey diet, fish, seed, milk replaces, etc)
    - Medical Expenses(cost, veterinary services and medications)
    - Rescues Equipment(bats, traps, catch poles, gloves, etc)
    - Hospital Supplies(syringes, bandages, towels and lab equipment)
    - Caging(hospital cages, food and water dishes)(attached expenditures receipts and any additional records documenting service provision)
  - f. Total number of native/migratory wildlife treated (picked up within County jurisdiction).
  - g. Total number of native/migratory wildlife release (picked up within Leon County jurisdiction).
  - h. Release protocol (hard vs. soft)
  - i. Protocol for selection of release sites

Wildlife Preservation Fund Withdrawal Policy and Procedures  
Page 4

2. B. The wildlife habitat enhancement request shall include:

- a. Applicant name, phone number, address  
If agency or organization;
  - 1) Purpose statement
  - 2) Organizational goals
  - 3) History of agency or organization
- b. Name, phone number and address of representative of the applicant
- c. Description of the public benefits of the proposed project
- d. Location and description of the site(s) and target translocation species.  
*Signed letter(s) of consent from landowner(s) whose properties will be involved in habitat restorations, whether as donor or recipient site(s). In each case, written agreements among parties shall be executed as specified in these guidelines.*
- e. Description of the scope of the project and cost of materials required by applicant, (provide formal documentation from material supplier).
- f. Wildlife habitat enhancement plan, including goals and objectives for characteristics of enhanced habitat, targeted species, number of targeted species present and the proposed carry capacity of the enhanced habitat area.
- g. Description and size of the area to be improved relative to the size of the property controlled by the applicant with a description of the surrounding habitats, within and beyond the control of the applicant.
- h. Identify any potential targeted or nontail species which have the potential to become nuisances to people or other wildlife
- i. Identify any maintenance practices which could potentially cause conflicts with surrounding land use (such as prescribed burns)
- j. Description, plan and responsible entity for insuring proper care and maintenance of wildlife habitat planting material for one (1) year or a longer length of time considered critical for the survival of the plant material

Note: Wildlife Preservation efforts directed toward wildlife habitat enhancement are to be located on approved public sites. For purpose of administering the Wildlife preservation Fund, a public site is defined as a) property owned by local, state, regional or federal agencies; b) property owned by a not-for-profit organization when the use of planting materials provides a documented, substantial public benefit; or c) other private property when the use of planting materials provides a documented, unique and substantial public benefit (e.g. needed Canopy Road tree canopy enhancement).

- 3. When determined to be complete, the request will be reviewed and recommendation made to the Director within ten (10) working days. The request may be approved, approved with conditions, or denied within twenty (20) working days from receipt of the complete application.
- 4. Appeals of the Director's decision must be filed with ten (10) working days to the Director. Appeals will be reviewed by the County Administrator

**Wildlife Preservation Fund:  
Policies and Procedures**

Background:

The Wildlife Preservation Fund was established by the Leon County Board of County Commissioners on August 25, 1998. These Withdrawal Policies and Procedures are designed to establish a methodology whereby staff may distribute the funds collected as part of the established Wildlife Preservation Fund. The Wildlife Preservation Fund receives 50% of all funds collected as assessed for the cost of mitigating not replanting trees required under newly the Environmental Management Act generated as a result of permit replanting requirements which could not reasonably be placed on site [Section 10-294(b) (3)] or were donated to the County as part of a plan for mitigating one or more violations of the Environmental Management Act..

Authorization for the "Wildlife Preservation Fund" is provided for in Leon County Code of Laws, Section 10-294(b) (3), *Off-Site Replanting Agreements*, and states:

"If the total number of trees to be replanted based on the tree replanting schedule in subsection (b) (1), exceeds that which may be reasonably planted on the development site, the applicant may enter into an agreement with the County, as approved by the director, to plant the excess trees on an approved public site or to provide the monetary equivalent to the County for use in public landscaping projects. and which may, upon proper application, be provided to organizations for the purpose of wildlife protection and preservation."

General Guidelines:

The Wildlife Preservation Fund has been designated by the Board of County Commissioners, BOCC, as a funding source for wildlife preservation efforts. Priority status has been assigned to wildlife rehabilitation efforts. Subsequent wildlife preservation efforts which may request funding will be directed to wildlife habitat enhancement. Additional guidelines will be added in order to prioritize the funding requests received by the Community Development Department. Generally, the guidelines are as follows:

1. Withdrawals are for the purpose of promoting wildlife preservation with priority being given to the rehabilitation and release of injured and displaced wildlife and secondarily to efforts related to the provision of enhanced wildlife habitat
2. Wildlife Preservation request are limited to the available fund balance for any given fiscal year.
3. Wildlife Preservation Withdrawal Requests are limited to one per agency per year.
4. Projects which serve a larger number of native/migratory wildlife will be given higher priority than those which serve fewer native/migratory
5. Projects shall provide management and care standards consistent current wildlife rehabilitation permits requirements and standards as issued by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Florida Game and Freshwater Fish Commission.

Wildlife Preservation Fund Withdrawal Policy and Procedures  
Page 2

---

6. Wildlife Habitat Enhancement Requests shall be directed to the management and restoration of high quality natural areas or sites with potentially high value for wildlife habitat.
  - a. Management of remnant natural areas of highest quality.
  - b. Healing damage natural area and expanding the flora and fauna through ecological restoration and/or management.
  
7. In the provision of wildlife habitat, the use of appropriate native species is encouraged, and they are to be located on approved sites. An approved site is defined as:
  - a. Publicly owned property
  - b. Property owned by a private not-for-profit organization on which wildlife preservation efforts will provide a documented, substantial public benefit.
  - c. Private property on which wildlife preservation efforts will provide a documented and substantial public benefit.

The methodology for distribution of funds has been developed which will minimize staff time in reviewing and processing withdrawal request and provide an effective expenditure of county funds. Funds shall be distributed on an annual basis and it will retain a minimum balance of \$1000. All requests for monies from this fund shall be submitted to Director of Community Development or his designee by August 1, of each fiscal year. Designated staff within the Community Development Department will examine, review, prioritize and recommend the allocation of funds to the Director.

- Wildlife Withdrawal Request will be submitted on August 1 and actual reimbursement funds will be distributed by September 30.
- Funding of Wildlife Withdrawal request for wildlife rehabilitation will be directed to the reimbursement of approved expenses incurred during the previous 12 months prior to the submittal date and according to the established criteria.
- Funding of Wildlife Withdrawal Request for wildlife habitat enhancement will be designed to cover the costs of approved purchases to an identified vendor.
- When determined to be complete, all request by August 1, will be reviewed and recommendations made to the director within twenty (20) working days. The request may be approved, approved with conditions, or denied within ten(10) working days form receipt by the Director
- Appeals of the Director's decision must be filed within ten (10) working days to the County Administrator for review. The County Administrator's decision shall be final.

Wildlife Preservation Fund Withdrawal Policy and Procedures  
Page 3

---

Withdrawal Procedures:

1. The person or agency interested in using proceeds deposited in the Wildlife Preservation Fund shall file a request using the Wildlife Preservation Fund Request Form (attached).
  
2. A. The wildlife rehabilitation request shall include:
  - a. Applicant name, phone number, address  
If agency or organization;
    - 1) Purpose statement
    - 2) Organizational goals
    - 3) History of agency or organization
  - b. Name, phone number and address of representative of the applicant
  - c. Wildlife rehabilitator seeking funding for expenses must possess and provide copies of current wildlife rehabilitation permits form U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Florida Game and Freshwater Fish Commission
  - d. Copy of proceeding year's annual Wildlife Rehabilitation Reports to U.S Fish and Wildlife Services and Florida Game and Fresh Fish Commission
  - e. Request amount, description and narrative of expenditures to be reimbursed
    - Wildlife Food(bird of prey diet, fish, seed, milk replaces, etc
    - Medical Expenses(cost, veterinary services and medications)
    - Rescue Equipment(nets, traps, catch poles, gloves, etc)
    - Hospital Supplies(syringes, bandages, towels and lab equipment)
    - Caging(hospital cages, food and water dishes)(attached expenditures receipts and any additional records documenting service provision)
  - f. Total number of native/migratory wildlife treated (picked up within

County

Wildlife Preservation Fund Withdrawal Policy and Procedures  
Page 4

---

2. B. The wildlife habitat enhancement request shall include:
- a. Applicant name, phone number, address  
If agency or organization;
    - 1) Purpose statement
    - 2) Organizational goals
    - 3) History of agency or organization
  - b. Name, phone number and address of representative of the applicant
  - c. Description of the public benefits of the proposed project
  - d. Location and description of the site(s) and target translocation species.  
Signed letter(s) of consent from landowner(s) whose properties will be involved in habitat restorations, whether as donor or recipient site(s). In each case, written agreements among parties shall be executed as specified in these guidelines.
  - e. Description of the scope of the project and costs of materials required by applicant, (provide formal documentation from material supplier).
  - f. Wildlife habitat enhancement plan, including goals and objectives for characteristics of enhanced habitat, targeted species, number of targeted species present and the proposed carry capacity of the enhanced habitat area.
  - g. Description and size of the area to be improved relative to the size of the property controlled by the applicant with a description of the surrounding habitats, within and beyond the control of the applicant.
  - h. Identify any potential targeted or coattail species which have the potential to become nuisances to people or other wildlife
  - i. Identify any maintenance practices which could potentially cause conflicts which surrounding land use (such as prescribed burns)
  - j. Description, plan and responsible entity for insuring proper care and maintenance of wildlife habitat planting material for one (1) year or a longer length of time considered critical for the survival of the plant material

Note: Wildlife Preservation efforts directed toward wildlife habitat enhancement are to be located on approved public sites. For purpose of administering the Wildlife preservation Fund, a public site is defined as: a) property owned by local, state, regional or federal agencies; b) property owned by a not-for-profit organization when the use of planting materials provides a documented, substantial public benefit; or c) other private property when the use of planting materials provides a documented, unique and substantial public benefit (e.g. needed Canopy Road tree canopy enhancement).

3. When determined to be complete, the request will be reviewed and Recommendation made to the Director within ten (10) working days. The request May be approved, approved with conditions, or denied within twenty (20) working days from receipt of the complete application.
4. Appeals of the Director's decision must be filed with ten (10) working days to the Director. Appeals will be reviewed by the County Administrator

**TABLE 1**

Dollar Amounts Distributed to Wildlife Rehabilitation Groups FY99 - 03

Group/Year	1999	2000 NFD*	2001	2002	2003	Total
St. Francis	\$2,610	0	\$32,054	\$22,572	\$28,372	\$85,608
Goose Creek	\$1,305	0	\$9,374	\$8,007	\$4,998	\$18,686
Florida Wild Mammals	\$206	0	\$3,866	\$3,950	\$1,358	\$9,380
Operation Wildlife Survival	0	0	0	0	\$311	\$311
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,121</b>		<b>\$45,294</b>	<b>\$34,529</b>	<b>\$35,038</b>	<b>\$113,985</b>

\* No funds distributed due to availability of funds

**TABLE 2**

Numbers of Leon County Animals Treated by Rehabilitation Groups FY 99-03

Group/Year	1999	2000 NFD*	2001	2002	2003	Total
St. Francis	1,623	0	1,968	2,870	2,736	9,197
Goose Creek	215	0	231	306	482	1,234
Florida Wild Mammals	16	0	97	116	131	360
Operation Wildlife Survival	0	0	0	0	30	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,854</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,296</b>	<b>3,292</b>	<b>3,379</b>	<b>10,821</b>

\* No funds distributed due to availability of funds

Wildlife Rehabilitation Group Meeting  
November 17, 2003  
Page 1 of 3

Wildlife Rehabilitation Organizations Meeting  
November 17, 2003

Topic: Distribution of Leon County Wildlife Preservation Funds

Attendees: Nani Beck – Goose Creek Wildlife; Jane Fleitman – Operation Wildlife Survival;  
John Johnson – St. Francis Wildlife

Facilitators: Will Sheftal – Tree Bank/Wildlife Committee Member (Leon County Agricultural  
Extension Office); Scott Ross - Committee Facilitator (Growth and Environmental Management)

- I. Overview – A brief overview concerning the intent of the meeting and a brief history of previous Wildlife Fund distributions was given by Scott Ross. During the September 2003 reimbursement distribution approved by the Board, staff was directed to meet with the groups to see if a consensus could be reached on the methodology for distributing the funds. The primary goal is to have the different groups agree on a fund distribution methodology when reimbursement requests are made, especially since the fund does not normally have enough revenue to cover all of the requested reimbursement costs.

Presently, the distribution formula approved by the Board allocates funds based on the number of animals received over a year from all groups, divided by the amount of money available for distribution. This gives a cost per animal that is multiplied by the number of animals received by each group to determine the amount eligible for reimbursement.

There was also some discussion on the different sizes of the organizations and the number of animals treated.

II. Group Discussion on Wildlife Fund Distribution Methodology

Will Sheftal directed the session to gain input on what the different organizations felt were the most important items to consider for reimbursement requests for rehabilitating wildlife.

The following list shows the items that the different groups considered important for reimbursement.

*Organization Input: Priority Factors*

- Number of Animal
  - 1) Native (FFWCC List)
  - 2) Taken in except DOA
- Medical Expenses depends on type of injury surgical and medical supplies
- Habitat restoration
- Caging
- New Facility support –start-up
- Education - "Orphaned" issued especially
- Rescue equipment

There was a brief discussion on the other sources of revenue provided to the groups to conduct their rehabilitation efforts.

The groups receive money through fund raising, donations, and the smaller groups like Operation Wildlife Survival pay for many costs out-of-pocket.

St. Francis does receive funding from the City of Tallahassee and Leon County, but the funding is for 24-hour, on-call emergency service. The City's funding was based on a government cost/minimum number of animal threshold to determine the contact amount, and the County's funding varies year to year. There is some reporting to each government entity regarding how many animals are picked up in a year. Jon Johnson reiterated that this service was separate from the rehabilitation efforts his organization does.

*Priority Factor Consensus*

The groups then reviewed the original list and achieved consensus on which variables should be considered for reimbursement.

The list included:

- Number of native animals received (Native is defined as listed by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission) except for animals that are dead on arrival.
- Food
- Medical Expenses – surgical and medical supplies
- There was also consensus that any distribution formula should be weighted somewhat to allow the smaller groups to receive a higher percentage of reimbursement. This is since the larger groups are more established and able to raise more private funds, and allows the smaller groups to establish themselves. This also allows the County to have a broader net of organizations to handle injured wildlife.

There was discussion about the wide variance in average cost to feed and medicate animals taken in by the four rehabilitators. Will Shefall cautioned against the tendency to use these data to compare rehabilitators for cost efficiency, since they do not present the total cost per animal treated as a pro rata unit of the entire operating budget.

There was agreement on this point, and furthermore, there was consensus among the rehabilitators that even the food and medical costs should vary widely, since some organizations specialize in larger animals (more food), animals needing longer rehab time (more food), animals requiring live mice or special diet items (more expensive food), animals fallen victim in large numbers to epidemics (more medical costs), "high value" animals with more severe injuries but worth the gamble on recovery (more medical costs + more food for longer rehab).

In fact, these specialties are well known, and animals are often passed from one organization to another to capitalize on the variation in caging and intensive labor available among the rehabilitator community. This sharing and specialization illustrate why they all support being reimbursed on a schedule that reflects justifiably variable actual expenses - rather than on a schedule that gives all animals taken in an equal reimbursement, as was the case in 2003.

Wildlife Rehabilitation Group Meeting  
November 17, 2003  
Page 3 of 3

All the groups in attendance supported the concept of weighting the formula for distributing funds toward the smaller organizations, to make sure they can survive, grow and continue to play valuable niche roles in the cooperative community of rehabilitators. This reality was accentuated by Jon Johnson's statement that St Francis, the largest of the 4 rehabilitators, was near maximum size for efficient operation, and that as the county grows and more wildlife are displaced and injured, the other 3 organizations - plus others yet to be established - would need to grow to meet the increase in need, and should be given reimbursement disproportionate to their current size and animal in-take numbers in order to ensure their evolution to larger, more mature organizations with better fund-raising capability

Also, weighting the formula somewhat to the smaller groups will allow them to utilize the weighting to purchase start up equipment and caging. Caging is the most variable cost among the groups in the current reimbursement criteria, and there was consensus that it should not be included in routine reimbursement requests.

The Wildlife Committee will use the amount of eligible expenses (food and medical) divided by the animals rescued by each organization to determine each groups average cost to feed and medicate the types of animals it treats, according to its specialization.

The rehabilitation groups all felt it was important to use the number of animals received and not the rehabilitation success rate that the committee recommended during the last fund distribution.

Will Sheftal and Scott Ross will use last year's available amount of revenue for distribution, and determine different weight factors that could be considered for distributing the funds. These different examples will then be distributed to the rehabilitation groups for comment.

**Weighted Wildlife Preservation Fund (WPF) Distribution Methodology Using 10% Weighting**

Organization	Amount Requested	Eligible Expenses after financial review*	Number of Animals Received and Treated (#AT)	Mean Cost of Food and Medicine (MC) = <u>Organization's Eligible Expenses</u> #AT	Weighted Mean Cost (WMC) = MC x Weighting Factor (WF)	Weighted Expense (WE) = WMC x # AT	Allocation Factor (AF) = Organization WE/ Total WE (\$58,225)	Allocation = AF x available funds \$35,050
St. Francis	\$37,918	\$37,918	2,736	$\$37,918/2736 = \$13.85$	$13.85 \times 1 = 13.85$	$13.85 \times 2736 = 37,894$	.65	\$22,782
Goose Creek	\$25,252	\$12,073	482	$\$12,073/482 = \$25.04$	$25.04 \times 1.00 = 27.29$	$27.29 \times 482 = 13,154$	.22	\$7,711
FL Wild Mammals	\$8,091	\$4,089	131	$\$4,089/131 = \$31.21$	$31.21 \times 1.10 = 34.33$	$34.33 \times 131 = 4,497$	.08	\$2,804
Operation Wildlife Rescue	\$3,414	\$2,416	30	$\$2,416/30 = \$80.53$	$80.53 \times 1.11 = 89.33$	$89.33 \times 30 = 2,680$	.05	\$1,753
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$74,675</b>	<b>\$56,496</b>	<b>3,379</b>			<b>\$58,225</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>\$35,050</b>

\* Eligible expenses are for food and medical expenses only. Other expenses such as caging, trap and office equipment have been excluded.

AF = Allocation Factor  
w = Weighting percentage  
n = # of animals for the specific organization  
AT = Animals Treated  
MC = Mean Cost  
WE = Weighted Expense  
WMC = Weighted Mean Cost

Formula for Deriving weighting Factors (WF)  
 $WF = 1 + [w/\#AT \text{ largest group} - \#AT \text{ smallest group} (\#AT \text{ largest group} - n)]$

### Weighting Calculations at 10%

St. Francis

$$WF = 1 + [.1/2,736-30 (2,736-2,736)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [.1/2,706 (0)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00004 (0)]$$

$$WF = 1$$

Goose Creek

$$WF = 1 + [.1/2,706 (2736-482)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [.1/2706 (2254)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00004 (2254)]$$

$$WF = 1 + .09$$

$$WF = 1.09$$

FWMA

$$WF = 1 + [0.00004 (2736 - 131)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00004 (2605)]$$

$$WF = 1 + .10$$

$$WF = 1.10$$

OWLS

$$WF = 1 + [0.00004 (2736-30)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00004 (2706)]$$

$$WF = 1 + .11$$

$$WF = 1.11$$

Weighted Wildlife Preservation Fund (WPF) Distribution Methodology Using 20% Weighting

Organization	Amount Requested	Eligible Expenses after financial review*	Number of Animals Received and Treated (#AT)	Mean Cost of Food and Medicine (MC) = <u>Organization's Eligible Expenses</u> #AT	Weighted Mean Cost (WMC) = MC x Weighting Factor (WF)	Weighted Expense(WE) = WMC x # AT	Allocation Factor (AF) = Organization WE/ Total WE (\$59,710)	Allocation = AF x available funds \$35,050
St. Francis	\$37,918	\$37,918	2,736	$\$37,918/2736 = \$13.85$	$13.85 \times 1 = 13.85$	$13.85 \times 2736 = 37,894$	.63	\$22,081
Goose Creek	<del>\$23,252</del>	<del>\$12,073</del>	482	<del><math>\\$12,073/482 = \\$25.04</math></del>	<del><math>25.04 \times 1.17 = 29.29</math></del>	<del><math>29.29 \times 482 = 14,118</math></del>	.24	<del>\$8,412</del>
FL Wild Mammals	\$8,091	\$4,089	131	$\$4,089/131 = \$31.21$	$31.21 \times 1.18 = 36.82$	$36.82 \times 131 = 4,823$	.08	\$2,804
Operation Wildlife Rescue	\$3,414	\$2,416	30	$\$2,416/30 = \$80.53$	$80.53 \times 1.19 = 95.83$	$95.83 \times 30 = 2,875$	.05	\$1,753
Total	\$74,675	\$56,496	3,379			\$59,710	1.00	\$35,050

\* Eligible expenses are for food and medical expenses only. Other expenses such as caging, trap and office equipment have been excluded.

AF = Allocation Factor  
w = Weighting percentage  
n = # of animals for the specific organization  
AT = Animals Treated  
MC = Mean Cost  
WE = Weighted Expense  
WMC = Weighted Mean Cost

Formula for Deriving weighting Factors (WF)  
 $WF = 1 + [(w/\#AT \text{ largest group}) - (\#AT \text{ smallest group} / \#AT \text{ largest group} - n)]$

6

Attachment # 3  
Page 19 of 22

### Weighting Calculations at 20%

St. Francis

$$WF = 1 + [.2/2,736-30 (2,736-2,736)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [.2/2,706 (0)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00007 (0)]$$

---

$$WF = 1$$

Goose Creek

$$WF = 1 + [.2/2,706 (2736-482)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [.2/2706 (2254)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00007 (2254)]$$

$$WF = 1 + .167$$

$$WF = 1.17$$

FWMA

$$WF = 1 + [0.00007 (2736 - 131)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00007 (2605)]$$

$$WF = 1 + .18$$

---

$$WF = 1.18$$

OWLS

$$WF = 1 + [0.00007 (2736-30)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00007 (2706)]$$

$$WF = 1 + .19$$

$$WF = 1.19$$

**Weighted Wildlife Preservation Fund (WPF) Distribution Methodology Using 30% Weighting**

Organization	Amount Requested	Eligible Expenses after financial review*	Number of Animals Received and Treated (#AT)	Mean Cost of Food and Medicine (MC) = <u>Organization's Eligible Expenses</u> #AT	Weighted Mean Cost (WMC) = MC x Weighting Factor (WF)	Weighted Expense(WE) = WMC x # AT	Allocation Factor (AF)= Organization WE/ Total WE (61,273)	Allocation = AF x available funds \$35,050
St. Francis	\$37,918	\$37,918	2,736	$\$37,918/2736 = \$13.85$	$13.85 \times 1 = 13.85$	$13.85 \times 2736 = 37,894$	.62	\$21,731
Goose Creek	\$25,252	\$12,073	482	$\$12,073/482 = \$25.04$	$25.04 \times 1.25 = 31.30$	$31.30 \times 482 = 15,087$	.25	\$8,762
FL Wild Mammals	\$8,091	\$4,089	131	$\$4,089/131 = \$31.21$	$31.21 \times 1.26 = 39.32$	$39.32 \times 131 = 5,151$	.08	\$2,804
Operation Wildlife Rescue	\$3,414	\$2,416	30	$\$2,416/30 = \$80.53$	$80.53 \times 1.30 = 104.69$	$104.69 \times 30 = 3,141$	.05	\$1,753
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$74,675</b>	<b>\$56,496</b>	<b>3,379</b>			<b>\$61,273</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>\$35,050</b>

\* Eligible expenses are for food and medical expenses only. Other expenses such as caging, trap and office equipment have been excluded.

AF = Allocation Factor  
w = Weighting percentage  
n = # of animals for the specific organization  
AT = Animals Treated  
MC = Mean Cost  
WE = Weighted Expense  
WMC = Weighted Mean Cost

Formula for Deriving weighting Factors (WF)

$WF = 1 + [w/\#AT \text{ largest group} - \#AT \text{ smallest group} (\#AT \text{ largest group} - n)]$

### Weighting Calculations at 30%

#### St. Francis

#### FWMA

$$WF = 1 + [.3/2,736-30 (2,736-2,736)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00011 (2736 - 131)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [.3/2,706 (0)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00011 (2605)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00011 (0)]$$

$$WF = 1 + .26$$

---

$$WF = 1$$

$$WF = 1.26$$

#### Goose Creek

#### OWLS

$$WF = 1 + [.3/2,706 (2736-482)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00011 (2736-30)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [.3/2706 (2254)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00011 (2706)]$$

$$WF = 1 + [0.00011 (2254)]$$

$$WF = 1 + .30$$

$$WF = 1 + .25$$

$$WF = 1.30$$

$$WF = 1.25$$