

This document is an extract of a larger publication.

civilgrandjury.org is a project of UnGovr.org, a US-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to government transparency and public accountability.



IMPROVING SCHOOL SHOOTING PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TRAINING IN MONTEREY COUNTY

During the last two years, how many of those Guidance Counselors have completed training addressing each of the following areas:

- 13.A Suicide prevention _____
- 13.B Anti-bullying (including tolerance, harassment and conflict resolution) _____
- 13.C When, how, why, and to whom they should report issues of violence concern _____
- 13.D How to assess and mitigate potential threats of violence _____
- 13.E Other, please describe _____

14.a How many **School Psychologists** work at your school? _____

During the last two years:

- 14.b How many of those School Psychologists have completed the ½ day ALICE training? _____
- 14.c How many of those School Psychologists have completed the 1 day ALICE training? _____
- 14.d How many of those School Psychologists have completed the 2 day ALICE certification training? _____
- 14.e How many of those School Psychologists completed some other type of active shooter training? _____

During the last two years, how many of those School Psychologists have completed training addressing each of the following areas:

- 14.A Suicide prevention _____
- 14.B Anti-bullying (including tolerance, harassment and conflict resolution) _____
- 14.C When, how, why, and to whom they should report issues of violence concern _____
- 14.D How to assess and mitigate potential threats of violence _____
- 14.E Other, please describe _____

IMPROVING SCHOOL SHOOTING PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TRAINING IN MONTEREY COUNTY

Additional Categories of School Personnel (insert number of people in each cell):

	School Bus Drivers	Cafeteria Workers	School Nurses	Custodial Personnel	Maintenance Personnel	Clerical Personnel
# at School	15.a:	16.a:	17.a:	18.a:	19.a:	20.a:
# who have completed ½ day ALICE training	15.b:	16.b:	17.b:	18.b:	19.b:	20.b:
# who have completed 1 day ALICE training	15.c:	16.c:	17.c:	18.c:	19.c:	20.c:
# who have completed 2 day ALICE certification training	15.d:	16.d:	17.d:	18.d:	19.d:	20.d:
# who have completed another type of active shooter training	15.e:	16.e:	17.e:	18.e:	19.e:	20.e:
# who have completed suicide prevention training	15.A:	16.A:	17.A:	18.A:	19.A:	20.A:
# who have completed anti-bulling training	15.B:	16.B:	17.B:	18.B:	19.B:	20.B:
# who have completed violence reporting training	15.C:	16.C:	17.C:	18.C:	19.C:	20.C:
# who have competed violence assessment & mitigation training	15.D:	16.D:	17.D:	18.D:	19.D:	20.D:
Other - # & describe	15.E:	16.E:	17.E:	18.E:	19.E:	20.E:

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

SUMMARY

Elections form the backbone of our individual participation in the representative democracy that we all enjoy as American citizens. It is the way we communicate our preferences for candidates and initiatives. Our confidence in this process plays a key part in our confidence in our government. Recent national news stories alleging outside influence in the U.S. elections process have heightened the attention paid to elections.

Technology changes are revolutionizing the means by which data and information are collected and distributed across all aspects of modern life. These changes have already added to the ways in which voters are educated about candidates and issues, votes are cast and tabulated, and outcomes are announced. Implementation of technology changes impacts the security around the election process, the timeliness of communicating results, and the cost of the election process.

In this environment, the Monterey County Civil Grand Jury launched an investigation into the elections process in Monterey County. Two main areas were at the center of the investigation:

1) NOVEMBER 2018 ELECTION

Were there noteworthy issues, either in process or outcome, with Monterey County's 2018 election process? Were there any problems with the execution of the election that would generate recommendations for improvements in future elections? Were sufficient resources available to conduct the election?

2) FUTURE ELECTIONS

Can new technology and procedures improve the efficiency and reduce the relative cost of future elections? What resources are available to the Elections Department to support new technology? How prepared is Monterey County for the eventual replacement of its existing voting and vote tabulation equipment? What can be done today to prepare both the county and voters for the changes to come?

Our investigation found that the current process for conducting elections is secure. It was also cost-effective relative to other counties. The Elections Department staff is very conscious of its role in supporting county voters and makes every effort to ensure a smooth voting process given available resources. The current election process, with its dependence on older equipment and volunteer-supported polling places, ran smoothly in the November 2018 election but is vulnerable to shortages and breakdowns in future elections.

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

We also found that the planning and budgeting processes for acquiring equipment in the future are lacking. They fail to take full advantage of the central Information Technology (IT) resources of the county in preparation for election process changes. This is consistent with other county departments that maintain their own separate mini-IT departments.

As today's younger, more tech-savvy voters become a larger share of the county electorate, they will expect more convenient, mobile voting processes that are more flexible, faster, and rely less on large numbers of volunteer-staffed polling places.

Our recommendations call on the county to start preparing now for the transition to more technology-enabled, less labor-intensive elections. Current mobile voting systems used by military personnel stationed outside the US provide a useful starting place that can be expanded in future elections.

Changes to the county-wide budgeting process that set aside funds for future equipment investments would allow for the anticipation of needed replacements and plans for migration to new technology.

Finally, integrating the resources of the IT Department across all county departments would improve not only Elections Department operations, but county operations overall.

BACKGROUND

Much of the Monterey County election process is regulated at the state level by the Office of the Secretary of State¹. Ballots and educational materials are mailed to all registered voters a month before an election. Voters have the option of returning their completed ballots by mail or going to a polling place in their community to submit their ballots. Voters use paper ballots to make selections, which are then delivered to the Elections Department in Salinas. The votes are tabulated using machines that scan the marks on the ballot. The results of the election are certified by the Secretary of State after all ballots are counted and any recounts take place.

The cost of elections is dictated by the voting process. Costs include the printing and distribution of ballots, the staffing of polling places, and the capital and maintenance costs of acquiring and maintaining tabulating equipment. These expenses are borne by the county.

¹ <https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/voting-systems/laws-and-standards/>

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

There are many positive aspects to the existing process. It has created elections with results that have been determined in a relatively timely manner and have the general confidence of the voters. A secure paper trail is created which documents each individual vote in case there is any question as to the accuracy of the vote count.

Given the age of existing voting and tabulation equipment and the continuing development of innovations in technology and communications, changes of one kind or another in the future are inevitable. The decisions that are made in the coming years will have an impact on our method of choosing officials and approving initiatives for decades to come.

There are other approaches to the election process and vote tabulation. If one were to design a new voting system with today's technology, computing power, and Internet connectivity, one would have to consider the use of new processes in the design of elections. There are risks – both real and perceived – to transitioning into the execution of elections using new approaches. Regardless of the choices made, there are real costs associated with maintaining existing systems as well as implementing a next generation of election equipment.

Monterey County needs to confront those choices today, while we have time to have an informed discussion and evaluation. What can Monterey County learn from new approaches? What can we do to prepare for future elections in which our citizens increasingly expect more convenient voting processes and faster results, with no loss of security or confidence?

APPROACH

The Civil Grand Jury interviewed senior officials from the Elections Department, as well as county management, to understand the current state of the elections process and plans for future elections.

Several jury members observed the November 2018 election at polling places throughout the county. We also toured the Elections Department facility at 1441 Schilling Place in Salinas.

We conducted literature searches of reports of external influence on the 2018 elections, new approaches to voting, including technologies, in other jurisdictions, and changes to California law as it pertains to future elections.

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

DISCUSSION

The facts listed below are the result of interviews conducted as a part of the grand jury investigation process, unless noted otherwise by footnotes.

GENERAL INFORMATION

- 1) Elections are legally mandated activities. Therefore, the costs of elections are not considered to be discretionary spending for Monterey County. Any costs associated with testing or purchasing new equipment would be considered discretionary.
- 2) There are 12 full-time employees of the Monterey County Elections Department and a few part-time employees. During an election year, the Elections Department adds temporary employees and about 900 poll workers.
- 3) Monterey County elections use paper ballots. Since 1968, ballots have been printed in both Spanish and English. This is mandated in Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by the federal government².
- 4) There were 84 polling places in the county for the November 2018 election.
- 5) There are three Information Technology (IT) specialists within the Elections Department that provide IT support for the elections process.
- 6) The involvement of the county IT Department personnel with the Elections Department operations is limited to providing network support and security assessments. They are not involved in the support of the election ballot collection or tabulation process. This is consistent with the county's decentralized approach to IT.

ELECTION COSTS

- 1) The annual budget for the Election Department ranges from \$4.5 to \$5.5 million (depending on whether there is a general election that year). Budgets are submitted for review and final approval by the Board of Supervisors under the auspices of the Chief Administrative Office (CAO). The budget is allocated as follows: printing ballots and voter guides (38%), salaries and benefits (43%), IT (11%), and overhead and administrative costs (8%).
- 2) Using data from a California Association of Clerks and Election Officials (CACEO) study of the 2012 presidential election, Monterey County election costs

² <https://elections.cdn.sos.ca.gov/ccrov/pdf/2016/december/16333ji.pdf>

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

were compared to four other comparable counties (Santa Barbara, Solano, Sonoma and Santa Cruz). Monterey County elections were the least expensive on a cost per registered voter basis. Sonoma County costs were 50% higher, Santa Barbara and Solano Counties were 100% higher, and Santa Cruz County was 200% higher. Out of the 27 California counties whose data were included in the study, only Sutter, El Dorado and Yuba counties spent less per registered voter in 2012 than Monterey County.³

- 3) The Elections Department has consistently managed its costs to come in under budget during recent years. The Elections Department is not viewed as a current problem by county IT or CAO management. Relative to the size of the overall county government budget, the Elections Department budget is small.
- 4) In November 2018, 30.8% of Monterey County votes were cast at polling places. The remaining votes were mailed in.
- 5) In 2020, California counties can choose to have “vote-by-mail only” elections⁴.
- 6) The current conduct of elections is highly dependent on the availability of volunteers to staff polling places and vote processing and tabulation. The Elections Department had a difficult time finding enough volunteers for the November 2018 election.
- 7) The purchase or lease of new equipment and related capital costs are not included in the Elections Department operating budget. Any capital requests for equipment must be submitted to the Resource Management Agency and compete with other county equipment requests from other departments for approval.
- 8) Paid return postage will be included with the ballot return envelope in 2020. This new election expense is expected to be reimbursed by the state⁵.

³ <http://results.caceoelectioncosts.org>

⁴ Cal. Elec. Code §3017, 4005-4008

⁵ Cal. Elec. Code §3010

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

ELECTION REGULATIONS

- 1) The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA)⁶ requires states to designate state government agencies and offices that provide public assistance or services to people with disabilities at voter registration agencies.
- 2) The California Secretary of State and Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) established the Motor Voter Program⁷ to increase the opportunities for voter registration to those who qualify by enabling voter registration during the driver's license application process.

VOTER REGISTRATION AND VALIDATION

- 1) A California voter must be a U.S. citizen; a resident of California; not in prison or on parole for the conviction of a felony; at least 18 years of age on the date of the election; and cannot have been determined to be mentally incompetent by a court. Citizens who are 16 and 17 years old may pre-register to vote.⁸
- 2) Voters assert their right to register by signing their driver's license applications under penalty of perjury that their eligibility information is true and correct.
- 3) Newly registered local voter information is sent to the Statewide Voter Registration Database⁹ and compared to records from the DMV. It is checked and compared against databases and validated to ensure the registration is legal.
- 4) People who are incarcerated or on parole cannot vote, but once they have completed their sentence, they are entitled to vote again.
- 5) Any Monterey County citizen who can provide a mailing address (either general delivery at a post office, a post office box or a street address) and is otherwise legally qualified to vote may register to vote. The U.S. Postal Service provides general delivery service free of charge.

ELECTION SECURITY

- 1) All Election Department staff must take a certification course and training in security.

⁶ <https://www.justice.gov/crt/national-voter-registration-act-1993-nvra>

⁷ <https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/california-motor-voter/>

⁸ <https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/pre-register-16-vote-18/>

⁹ <https://www.sos.ca.gov/administration/regulations/current-regulations/elections/statewide-voter-registration-database>

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

- 2) Tabulation equipment is air-gapped (not connected to any outside network, including the Internet) to prevent outside access.
- 3) There are external security cameras in the Elections Department building, along with security guards available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. A second line of defense includes interior cameras and an alarm system. Records are kept of all who enter the facility (including employees).
- 4) The only Internet-enabled voting currently permitted in Monterey County is the system for military personnel stationed overseas¹⁰. They use an Internet web site with a link to a service that creates a hard copy of a ballot that is then faxed to the Elections Department. The expanded use of this system by disabled and handicapped voters has been discussed for the 2020 elections.

ELECTION EQUIPMENT

- 1) The Elections Department uses eight small tabulator machines that are provided by Dominion Voting Systems. These tabulators are in the second year of a six-year lease.
- 2) The Elections Department uses an automated mail opener and sorter for use with mail-in ballots. It has a laser beam that cuts open a window and compares the signature with the one on file. Ballots are extracted from the envelope manually, and then taken to the tabulators for scanning and counting the votes.
- 3) Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) equipment, located at each polling place, is used by handicapped voters. This equipment has reached the end of its useful life. In some cases, replacement parts are no longer available. The DRE equipment needs to be replaced. Replacement before the 2020 election depends on the availability of \$1.1 million in matching fund reimbursement for previous equipment purchases.
- 4) All voting equipment must be certified by the Secretary of State's office before it can be considered for use in any California county election.

ELECTION TABULATION PROCESS

- 1) Mail-in ballots begin to be tabulated 10 days before an election.
- 2) An unregistered voter may conditionally register at the Elections Department on Election Day and cast a provisional ballot for inclusion in that election. About 600 provisional ballots were cast in the November 2018 election. The provisional

¹⁰ www.fvap.gov

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

ballots were counted after elections officials confirmed the validity of the voter's registration.

- 3) November 2018 election results were certified on November 27, 2018, which was earlier than planned. There are 187,286 voters currently registered in Monterey County and 62.81% of registered voters cast ballots. The number of persons who voted at their polling place was 28,284 and 89,347 cast vote-by-mail ballots. There were no reports of unusually long waits (over 10-15 minutes).
- 4) The first November 2018 election partial vote totals were released within 15 minutes of polls closing. Regardless of what may be reported on county web sites, on television or in newspaper reports, election results are not final until they have been certified. Certification generally takes place several weeks after the election. Declarations of a winner, or concessions by a loser, have no legal impact on final election results.
- 5) The ballots for the November 2018 election were scheduled to be sent out a month before the election. The ballots for the voters in the city of Gonzales were delivered a week late. This problem was the result of issues with an outside agency that handles ballot printing and distribution. It was not discovered until voters inquired why they had not received ballots.

OTHER FUNCTIONS

- 6) The county IT department manages the delivery and storage of sensitive information on its computers and networks while maintaining data security and integrity.
- 7) The Elections Department makes its own recommendations for the acquisition of new technology equipment. The county IT Department only reviews new technology purchases for security. IT is not involved in the budget process or in determining what equipment is selected or when equipment needs to be replaced.
- 8) The county Resource Management Agency sets priorities for capital spending and determines what Elections Department equipment purchases are placed into the annual operating budget. Monterey County does not accrue reserves for future capital expenditures by using depreciation expensing in its accounting. It operates on a cash budget basis. Recently, the county has begun capitalizing and expensing depreciation costs associated with buildings.

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

FINDINGS

- F1) Elections in Monterey County are generally conducted in a cost-effective, efficient manner, considering the small staff size and labor-intensive election process used.
- F2) Costs for elections are in line with, or less than election costs at similar sized counties in the state. There are no obvious places for cost reduction given the existing tabulation process.
- F3) The Elections Department staff is genuinely interested in conducting a reliable election process and make reasonable efforts to reach out to voters to support their ability to vote.
- F4) Funds are not reserved for the replacement of equipment that has reached the end of its useful life, or for the acquisition of new equipment needed to support future elections.
- F5) There is no process for capitalizing and depreciating capital equipment in the Elections Department.
- F6) The CAO's office has begun the process of depreciating the cost of buildings and accruing funds for future replacement needs in their accounting processes.
- F7) With existing resources, efforts to register new voters are reasonable and effective.
- F8) Volunteers to support County election activity are becoming more difficult to find, which makes capital-labor substitution (automation) more important going forward.
- F9) The biggest immediate concern to the current election process involves the management of outside agencies that provide support services for the Elections Department. This includes all firms involved with the printing, distribution, and delivery of ballots and voter information, including the U.S. Postal Service (USPS).
- F10) The addition of prepaid postage to be processed by the USPS for return ballot envelopes creates a new set of concerns starting in 2020. The USPS will be responsible for the timely delivery, billing, and collection of postage for these returned ballots.

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

- F11) Vote-by-mail is cost-effective relative to traditional voting at local polling stations. However, even with vote-by-mail elections, in-person voting stations must be provided to provide access to the voting process for some voters.
- F12) There was no evidence of any significant level of voter fraud or external influence in the outcome of the November 2018 elections.
- F13) The county IT Department currently manages and stores sensitive data for other county agencies. Internet voting ballots could be stored electronically with equal security and lower cost compared to the current system of storing paper ballots after an election.
- F14) As access to the Internet is not universally available throughout the county, alternative voting methods (like mail-in or voting station options) would have to augment any Internet-enabled voting system in the foreseeable future.
- F15) Internet-enabled voting would allow voters to vote using computers or smart phones in future elections. This would require the use of virtual private secure networks to communicate between voters and the Elections Department.
- F16) A transition to Internet-enabled voting would require infrastructure that is not present in the current Elections Department.
- F17) The Grand Jury did not find any evidence of a risk assessment of Internet-enabled voting relative to current voting processes.
- F18) The resources of the IT Department are not fully utilized by the Elections Department because of the decentralized approach to IT throughout the county. Currently, each department maintains its own IT resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- R1) The Elections Department should implement a process of closer supervision and tracking of all levels of activity of outside agencies for the 2020 elections. This will minimize the reoccurrence of problems such as the one that occurred last November in Gonzales and any future problems related to the new prepaid postage mailing ballot system.
- R2) The Elections Department should evaluate and test new means to accommodate more voters in an efficient and cost-effective manner that is less dependent on volunteers starting in 2022.
- R3) The Elections Department should expand the Internet-enabled voting program now used by overseas military residents to the general voting public on a gradual

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

basis starting in 2022. Testing this process on a limited basis will be necessary for the information and planning needed to support a potential broader rollout of Internet-enabled voting in the future. Planning must begin for changes to vote tabulation processes in anticipation of needed equipment necessary to process larger volumes of Internet-enabled votes.

- R4) During the next budget cycle, the Chief Administrative Office should work with the Board of Supervisors to expand the practice of depreciating and expensing capital equipment to include the equipment needed by the Elections Department. This would create a process for the replacement of aging existing equipment and the evaluation of new equipment needed to support future election processes. This could serve as a model for broader implementation of sound financial planning in other departments throughout the county.
- R5) The Elections Department should immediately start taking a leadership role in working with the Secretary of State to evaluate and recommend new voting systems. Through its direct involvement, the Elections Department can better prepare Monterey County voters with access to tools for future elections.
- R6) The Elections Department should immediately increase the level of coordination and involvement with the IT Department in the evaluation and planning for future elections. The county's current decentralized approach to managing technology transformation does not exploit the expertise of the IT Department to evaluate and deploy new technologies. With closer coordination between the IT Department and the Elections Department, we believe that a new, more effective model for managing and implementing technology in Monterey County can be achieved.
- R7) By 2022, the Elections Department should start taking steps to modernize the election process by upgrading equipment used in vote tabulation to accommodate Internet-enabled voting.

INVITED RESPONSES

- Monterey County Registrar of Voters: F1-F18 and R1-R7
- Chief Administrative Officer: F1-F18 and R1-R7

MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS – TODAY AND TOMORROW

- Director of the Information Technology Department:
F13-F18; R3, R4, R6, R7

Reports issued by the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code section 929 requires that reports of the Civil Grand Jury not contain the name of any person or facts leading to the identity of any person who provides information to the Civil Grand Jury

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE



An Illegal Rooster Keeping Operation in North Monterey County

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

SUMMARY

Monterey County has an ordinance regulating rooster keeping operations in its unincorporated areas but has failed to enforce it. The Rooster Keeping Ordinance No. 5249, (hereafter known as The Ordinance)¹, passed by the Board of Supervisors (BoS) in 2014, is designed to "...establish a comprehensive approach to the keeping of five or more roosters that balances promotion of agriculture and agricultural education with prevention of rooster keeping operations that are unsanitary, inhumane, environmentally damaging or conducive of illegal cockfighting."²

The BoS had good intentions in their fight to eliminate illegal rooster keeping operations. Unfortunately, Monterey County agencies are operating under a process, created by Environmental Health Bureau, that effectively modifies the implementation and enforcement of The Ordinance. As a result, agencies are confused about their roles, have been poorly trained, and the public does not know where to turn to have their concerns addressed. The current process for implementation and enforcement must be revised to reflect the intent of The Ordinance in order to be effective. Policy makers need to reevaluate the way this ordinance is implemented.

The restrictions contained in the ordinance are legal and justified. The mechanism for enforcement is weak and illegal rooster keeping operations in Monterey County continue with impunity. The methodology used to implement and enforce The Ordinance is insufficient to bring about the intended change for rooster keeping practices.

The Ordinance has been upheld in the Sixth Appellate District Court of Appeals putting to rest the idea that the policy is overreaching.³ Nevertheless, since its passage, this ordinance has been left to languish while the number of illegal rooster keeping operations has flourished in Monterey County.

The reasons for this failure are complex. The Monterey County Civil Grand Jury (MCCGJ) found that implementation and enforcement of the ordinance failed due to three main reasons:

1. Lack of leadership and oversight from the BoS and the Health Department,

¹ [Link to: Rooster Keeping Ordinance 5249](#)

² <https://www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showdocument?id=16498>

³ <https://caselaw.lexroll.com/2019/02/21/perez-v-county-of-monterey-no-h044364-cal-app-2-14-2019/>

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

2. The hindrance to implementation and enforcement created by a process developed by Environmental Health Bureau, and
3. The unwillingness of multiple agencies to enforce it.

Monterey County needs to enforce its rooster keeping operations ordinance. All agencies involved must coordinate their efforts to end illegal rooster keeping and the associated crime and disease. Monterey County has a legal ordinance. Monterey County should enforce it with equanimity and impartiality.

The MCCGJ agrees with this quotation from the summary of *Perez V. County of Monterey*.⁴ "The County has an interest in establishing humane and sanitary standards for the keeping of roosters." It is the recommendation of the MCCGJ that The Ordinance should be immediately implemented and enforced in Monterey County.

GLOSSARY

ACS – Animal Control Services

ACO – Animal Control Officer

Agricultural Commissioner – Office of the Agricultural Commissioner

BoS – Board of Supervisors

CDFA – California Department of Food and Agriculture

County Code –The law in Monterey County which contains ordinances passed by the BoS

Environmental Health Bureau – The Environmental Health Bureau is a division within the Monterey County Health Department.

HSUS – Humane Society of the United States- A private non-profit, national agency, headquartered in Sacramento, California

The Ordinance – Ordinance No. 5249, which amended Chapter 8.04 of Title 8 and added Chapter 8.50 to Title 8 of the Monterey County Code

Process – A series of steps, operations, created by Environmental Health to implement and enforce The Ordinance

SPCA of Monterey County – Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals- a private non-profit, agency in Monterey County

⁴ <https://www.law.com/therecorder/static/daily-opinion-services/?download=021919CDS.pdf&slreturn=20190418133513>

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

RMA – Resource Management Agency, also known as Code Enforcement, which includes Code Compliance, Building Services, and Planning

SHARK – Showing Animals Respect and Kindness – An animal rights advocate group

Title 8 – Animal Control Code of Monterey County

Title 21- Zoning Ordinance of Monterey County applicable only to the unincorporated areas outside of the Coastal Zone in Monterey County

Virulent Newcastle Disease - formerly known as Exotic Newcastle Disease, is a contagious and fatal viral disease affecting the respiratory, nervous, and digestive systems of roosters and poultry. The disease is so virulent that many roosters and poultry die without showing any clinical signs.⁵

Zoonotic Disease – A disease spread between animals and people. Zoonotic diseases can be caused by viruses, bacteria, parasites, and fungi.⁶

BACKGROUND

Why we Investigated

The role of the MCCGJ is to shine light on the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of publicly funded agencies and to examine policies and procedures in order to ensure wise use of taxpayer funds. (CA Penal Code section 925).⁷ The MCCGJ received a complaint from a resident who discovered a well-established, alleged illegal rooster keeping operation in Monterey County during June of 2018. Unsure of where to turn, the complainant contacted four different County agencies and reported alleged animal abuse and animal cruelty including cockfighting. The complainant's concerns were not given sufficient consideration.

The MCCGJ investigated:

1. The restrictions and provisions set forth in The Ordinance
2. The duties and responsibilities of each of the agencies the complainant contacted for remedy
3. The reasons for the failure of The Ordinance to eliminate illegal rooster-keeping operations in Monterey County

⁵ <https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/animalhealth/animal-disease-information/avian/virulent-newcastle/vnd>

⁶ <https://www.cdc.gov/parasites/animals.html>

⁷ https://california.public.law/codes/ca_penal_code_section_925

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

4. What other counties are doing about the issue of illegal rooster keeping operations
5. What recommendations can be made by the MCCGJ to resolve this issue

The MCCGJ initially chose to review this complaint because of the alleged non-response of County agencies to address the concerns of the complainant. Our focus turned to the responses of the agencies named in The Ordinance as well as the agencies contacted by the complainant. The fundamental issue was the non-responsiveness on the part of multiple agencies with whom the issue was raised.

What we Investigated

Keeping five or more roosters without a permit in Monterey County is against the law. Obtaining a permit for the keeping of five or more roosters in Monterey County is part of The Ordinance. The MCCGJ found that The Ordinance is not being implemented or enforced. We learned that, with the exception of Animal Control Services (ACS), agencies required to understand this ordinance reported never having completely read it. We wanted to understand what made the ordinance so difficult to implement and enforce.

SUMMARY INTRODUCTION TO THE ORDINANCE STATES:

“This ordinance adds Chapter 8.50 to the Monterey County Code to regulate rooster keeping operations. The ordinance also adds new defined terms to Chapter 8.04. The purpose of this ordinance is to establish a comprehensive approach to the keeping of five or more roosters that balances promotion of agriculture and agricultural education with prevention of rooster keeping operations that are unsanitary, inhumane, environmentally damaging, or conducive of illegal cockfighting. The ordinance requires a permit, issued by the Monterey County Animal Control Officer, to keep five or more roosters per single property within unincorporated Monterey County. The ordinance sets standards for the feeding and housing of roosters and for waste disposal and other matters to address the health and environmental impacts of raising five or more roosters. The ordinance allows students participating in FFA, 4-H, and other school sponsored educational projects to raise five or more roosters if they obtain an exemption from the Animal Control Officer through a streamlined exemption process. Commercial poultry operations and poultry hobbyist activities may obtain an exemption if approved by the Agricultural Commissioner. Permits will not be issued to persons convicted of illegal cockfighting or animal cruelty crimes, and persons keeping roosters are required to attest that they will not be made available for illegal cockfighting. Compliance with these standards is enforced through inspection by the Monterey County Animal Control Officer and the enforcement provisions of the Monterey County Code.”

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

Agencies Involved in Enforcement of The Ordinance

The relationship between the agencies involved in the enforcement of The Ordinance is problematic as outlined in this report. The BoS passed The Ordinance and designated the Agricultural Commissioner to accept, review, approve, or deny Poultry Operations and Poultry Hobbyist exemption permit applications. ACS is designated in The Ordinance to accept permit applications for rooster keeping operations with five or more roosters as well as exemptions for 4H and FFA. ACS is the enforcement agency. The Monterey County Sheriff's Office (MCSO) is called in to accompany and or assist when needed.

The MCGGJ heard testimony from staff within multiple agencies and learned there was insufficient training to implement The Ordinance. Staff within the Environmental Health Bureau instructed ACS Officers to not enforce The Ordinance. Although rooster keeping permits must be renewed annually, no permit is current in Monterey County as of the writing of this report. The only citation issued was forwarded to the District Attorney's Office for prosecution but subsequently returned by the DA's Office to an unknown recipient. (See Appendix D.) Additionally, an employment settlement for a lawsuit against the Environmental Health Bureau was taken from the ACS Salaries and Wages budget which left Monterey County ACS severely understaffed and weakened staff morale.

What Led Up to This Investigation

The complainant, who had become aware of an illegal rooster keeping operation and possible dog fighting ring in North Monterey County, tried to no avail to bring this issue to the attention of four different Monterey County agencies. Between June 21, 2018 and August 10, 2018, the complainant contacted, by phone and email, the following County agencies multiple times: District 2 Supervisor; ACS; RMA Code Enforcement; MCSO; and two non-County agencies: the SPCA and the HSUS. The complainant voiced concerns of animal abuse, cruelty, and illegal cockfighting.

The complainant then called The Monterey County Weekly who published an article on August 30, 2018.⁸ The publication of the article became the catalyst that brought the problem of illegal rooster keeping to the attention of the agencies who are tasked to understand or enforce this law.

⁸ http://www.montereycountyweekly.com/blogs/animal_blog/animal-rights-group-posts-video-of-supposed-cockfighting-operation-in/article_ae0add72-acb0-11e8-81f1-97fc21e5c826.html

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

The MCCGJ learned that the owner of a known illegal rooster keeping operation in District 2 was used as a primary resource to write The Ordinance. After the passage of The Ordinance, Environmental Health created a multi-step process for implementation and enforcement that does not align with the ordinance that was passed by the BoS on December 16, 2014. The resulting confusion caused by this process added to an already difficult work environment between ACS staff and the Environmental Health Bureau.

The Ordinance names the ACO 53 times with specific authority, duties, and responsibilities. It names the Agricultural Commissioner 17 times with duties and authority. While the ACO was well versed with the requirements of The Ordinance, the Agricultural Commissioner had not once read The Ordinance in its entirety. Although the text of The Ordinance names the ACO as the enforcement agency, the MCCGJ discovered that ACS's authority to enforce the provisions of The Ordinance were prohibited by the Environmental Health Bureau. Therefore, it became impossible to implement or enforce The Ordinance. It must be noted that in November of 2018, while the MCCGJ was conducting this investigation, the leadership and oversight of ACS was transferred out of Environmental Health and made its own division within the Monterey County Health Department.

The MCCGJ investigated the alleged non-response by County agencies and a County ordinance that was not being enforced. We evaluated the conditions relating to the complaint site and the lack of communication and coordination between agencies to learn what might be done to resolve the problem. We looked at the purposes of rooster keeping operations, animal welfare as related to the complaint, and the copious amount of debris left in the wake of such vast operations.

An Illegal rooster keeping operation will often include hundreds of roosters kept in makeshift enclosures. Property owners frequently sublet their private property to multiple rooster owners, where they have easy access to their roosters. It is common for each rooster owner to have 50 or more roosters. The result is excessive noise, environmental pollution, health and safety issues, unsightly debris, building code violations, and the possibility of the spread of Viral Newcastle Disease, as well as other avian Zoonotic Diseases.⁹ Illegal rooster-keeping operations commonly involve illegal cockfighting or the sale of roosters for illegal cockfighting. Neighborhoods with abandoned illegal rooster keeping operations suffer depreciation of property values.

⁹ <https://ucanr.edu/sites/poultry/Resources/dz/>

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

While not the focus of our investigation, cockfighting is a magnet for prostitution, gambling, illegal drugs, firearms activity, and organized crime. Cockfighting in Monterey County is one of the primary reasons for the passage of The Ordinance. Cockfighting is considered a blood sport.¹⁰ It is an organized fight between two roosters, often to the death. These roosters are called gamecocks. They are bred and conditioned for increased strength and stamina. They are often injected with steroids and other drugs to increase their metabolism making them stronger and harder to kill. Small knives are attached to their legs so that when they attack another rooster in a cock pit, blood will be quickly drawn. Wagers are often placed on the roosters and a winning purse can easily reach \$50,000. Purses of \$100,000 are not unusual.¹¹

From 2010 to November 2018, ACS was managed and directed by the Environmental Health Bureau. The Environmental Health Bureau is under the administration and leadership of the Monterey County Health Department. Since 2010, ineffective leadership and direction, as well as poor communication has resulted in a drastic reduction in personnel and morale at ACS. In 2010 there were six full time ACOs and a dedicated dispatcher on staff. By the Fall of 2018 there were only two remaining ACOs and no dispatcher. Open staff positions have not been filled and this has left ACS without the necessary human resources needed to effectively do their jobs.

ACS is now its own division within the Health Department. New leadership at ACS, coupled with better communication between ACS and the Health Department has been positive. Better policies are beginning to be implemented. This change in leadership has brought back a higher level of morale and confidence among staff.

¹⁰ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/blood%20sport>

¹¹ <https://suffolkspca.org/fight-animal-cruelty/cock-fighting/>

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE



A Monterey County illegal rooster keeping operation showing roosters tethered to makeshift housing

APPROACH

After first interviewing the complainant and making the determination that the complaint was within our jurisdiction, the inquiry became an investigation. The MCCGJ soon began to understand the importance of the issue. The MCCGJ studied The Ordinance. From the text of The Ordinance, we determined which agency had responsibility for implementation and enforcement. The MCCGJ conducted multiple interviews with individuals from all agencies identified in the complaint and in The Ordinance. Emails

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

between principals were obtained, as well as statistics pertaining to permits issued. Drone footage, ordinance text, expert testimony from animal welfare organizations and comparable California county ordinances were studied. Members of the MCCGJ visited the original site of the complaint three times to observe progress on cleanup and to obtain photographs for evidence.

Over a period of nine months, the Civil Grand Jury:

1. Interviewed 20 witnesses, (some of them twice),
2. Interviewed prior employees from agencies who had moved away from Monterey County,
3. Interviewed individuals from each of the agencies identified in the formal complaint,
4. Studied the Monterey County Rooster Keeping operation requirements, verified that it was written to mirror the Monterey County Kennel Keeping permit application,
5. Obtained copies of all rooster keeping permits issued,
6. Inspected the site of the original complaint on three different occasions (See Appendix C for site report.),
7. Drafted a supplemental investigative report on our observations,
8. Documented the site with photographs and measurements,
9. Viewed drone footage of the site,
10. Viewed drone footage of several other illegal rooster keeping operations in Monterey County,
11. Viewed the PowerPoint presentation created by The Ordinance author, which was used to train personnel during the initial roll-out,
12. Reviewed emails sent between multiple agencies about the complainant site,
13. Reviewed the unpublished and unofficial memo describing how to implement and enforce The Ordinance sent outlining the procedure that effectively modified The Ordinance passed by the BoS,
14. Examined the way in which the Environmental Health Bureau instructed staff to implement The Ordinance and compared it to the way staff perceived how they were trained,
15. Studied and evaluated Supervisorial District boundaries to learn where the problem of illegal rooster keeping is most prevalent in Monterey County,
16. Studied Google Earth imagery in target areas of Monterey County and found dozens of rooster keeping operations,
17. Surveyed rooster keeping ordinances from other counties in California and compared elements of each ordinance to the ordinance in Monterey

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

County,^{12 13}

18. Examined complaint logs from several agencies to understand policies and procedures for addressing complaints made by the public about rooster noise, operation debris, and cruelty to roosters,
19. Learned the difference between reactive and proactive agency response,
20. Reviewed California Penal Code Section 597, which applies to animal abuse and cruelty,
21. Sought out and interviewed subject matter expert testimony from private agencies and a federal agency, and
22. Researched the serious and very real possibility of the spread of Viral Newcastle disease as well as other Zoonotic Diseases in Monterey County.

DISCUSSION

The facts in this report are the result of multiple interviews conducted by the MCGJ during the investigation process or in documentation footnoted separately.

The Ordinance was originally created to address the issue of environmental damage caused by roosters and the illegal activity that typically accompanies rooster keeping. This includes animal cruelty, gang activities, organized crime, prostitution, illegal drug activity, and excessive traffic. The debris and waste left when a rooster-keeping operation is shut down can result in property devaluations and blight across rural unincorporated areas in the County.

Not all counties in California have specific policies or ordinances regulating the keeping of roosters. Of the 58 California counties, the counties of Los Angeles, Solano, Napa, Monterey, San Diego, Merced, Santa Clara, San Bernardino, Riverside, San Benito, and San Joaquin have rooster keeping ordinances that restrict rooster keeping by number, by parcel size, or by permit requirements. California law strictly forbids cockfighting in all counties.¹⁴ Prior to 2014, Monterey County did not have a rooster keeping ordinance. Numerous expert witnesses testified that today, in Monterey County, there are an estimated one thousand known illegal rooster keeping operations housing thousands of roosters.

¹² <https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/SolanoCounty/>

¹³ <http://animalcare.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Press-Release-09-25-18-Final-Rooster-Ordinance.pdf>

¹⁴ https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=597

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

New Rooster Keeping Standards

Based upon numerous complaints received, the BoS knew a change needed to be made specific to the rooster keeping operations. Illegal rooster keeping operations are more common in certain Supervisorial Districts of Monterey County. These operations are more common in District 2 (North County), District 3 (South County), and District 5 (Carmel Valley). (See Appendix B for district maps.)

The Monterey County BoS passed The Ordinance on December 16, 2014, with a vote of 3 Ayes and 2 Noes. The Ordinance amended Chapter 8.04 of Title 8 and added Chapter 8.50 to Title 8 of the Monterey County Code. Title 8 contains standards related to Animal Control. The amended chapter added definitions and the new added chapter created a regulatory permit, inspection, exemption, and appeal process for keeping five or more roosters within unincorporated Monterey County. The ACO is primarily responsible for the implementation and enforcement of Chapter 8.50. Training to make counties aware of cockfighting is available from the HSUS at little or no charge but has not been utilized by the Health Department.

How The Ordinance Was Written

At the time of the writing of this ordinance, ACS was under the management of the Environmental Health Bureau. Environmental Health was tasked with writing the ordinance without having the necessary qualifications and expertise in animal welfare, domestic or livestock. The author's background is in hazardous waste management. The author used an individual from a known local illegal rooster keeping operation as the resource for writing The Ordinance. ACS was never consulted or included during The Ordinance writing process.

The kennel keeping permit application was used as a framework for this ordinance. The requirements and needs of poultry compared to domestic animals are vastly different. An example would be the requirement to hose down and use sanitizer on the floors of all kennel enclosures daily. Roosters are not kept on solid flooring but are kept on dirt floors, so this required sanitation process is not possible.

How Is It Working?

The Ordinance hasn't solved the problem of noise, environmental waste, disease, or cockfighting because it is not enforced. It neither guarantees the humane treatment of roosters nor are there follow-up review processes to address the effectiveness of the permitting process.

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

Each agency knew little about which had jurisdiction or how to enforce The Ordinance. The MCSO could not make an arrest unless a cockfight was in progress. ACS reported that they were prohibited from issuing citations by the Director of the Environmental Health Bureau. RMA could not issue citations for illegal rooster keeping but could issue citations for code violations for inadequately constructed animal enclosures. The SPCA could not issue citations for illegal rooster keeping but could issue citations for cruelty and neglect of roosters, which could lead to possible prosecution by the District Attorney.

Although some of the agencies contacted by the complainant already knew of this illegal operation as well as other illegal operations in the County, they said they could do nothing about it.

Thwarted Authority

The Ordinance is not complicated. It has just not been properly implemented or enforced. The authority to enforce The Ordinance lies with the Monterey County ACO. ACS is now under the Administrative arm of the Monterey County Health Department; however, until very recently ACS was overseen by the Environmental Health Bureau. The creation, implementation, and direction of The Ordinance resided with the Environmental Health Bureau. Upon passage, the Health Department/Environmental Health issued 14 permits between September 28, 2015 and July 20, 2016. Nine applicants were charged a permit fee. Five applicants had their permit fee waived at the discretion of the Director of Environmental Health.

Roadblocks to Leadership and Oversight

Although the text of The Ordinance passed by the BoS on December 16, 2014, names ACO as the implementation and enforcement agency, the MCCGJ discovered that ACO's authority to enforce the provisions of The Ordinance was prohibited by an onerous process created after The Ordinance was passed and made law. ACO's, who are highly skilled animal care professionals, were neither consulted nor advised during the creation of the process.

The Ordinance gave a definitive timeline of 31 days from its adoption to become effective and 180 days to be fully implemented. The Environmental Health Department created a one-year "soft rollout" before fully implementing or enforcing it. At the end of the soft roll out year it was still not fully implemented or enforced and four years later, The Ordinance is still not being implemented or enforced.

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

Two other factors were involved in The Ordinance not being fully implemented. First, Staff were inadequately trained to implement The Ordinance. Second, the Environmental Health Bureau issued the following multi-step process for implementation which conflicted with The Ordinance:

1. *Mail out initial "informational letter" with 30-day response time.*
2. *Mail out second reminder "informational letter" with 20-day response time.*
3. *Mail out "notice of violation" letter with 15-day response time.*
4. *Advise EH Director of failure to comply. After review, Director will approve issuance of compliance notice.*
5. *Mail out "compliance notice" per Title 21, if no response by date indicated on "notice of violation" work with Code Enforcement to ensure we follow process as required.*
6. *County Counsel to be advised and consulted prior to sending out notice.*
7. *No staff will issue any infraction notice to any rooster operation. We will utilize Title 21. (Code Enforcement)*
8. *What to do if owner/operator threatens to release or abandon roosters?*
9. *Inform them we will refer them to SPCA humane officers for animal abandonment or cruelty citations.*
10. *Manager will inform SPCA of identified rooster operation not in compliance with ordinance to prevent release or abandonment of animals. We will need to meet with SPCA.¹⁵*

Agencies Involved in The Multi-Step Process

The process created by the Environmental Health Bureau that was used for implementation and enforcement created a dysfunctional structure. No agency was identified as the coordinating agency. Multiple agencies were not informed about their role in the process. For example, RMA was not referred to in The Ordinance, but was given a role in the process. RMA Code Enforcement can issue citations for non-compliant animal enclosures. They can ask owners to move their roosters, but they do not issue citations for illegal rooster keeping. They can give multiple extensions to remove roosters and debris from property. They do not contact ACS when animals are involved. Although the complaint occurred within the Coastal zone, RMA Code Enforcement did not contact the Coastal Commission.

Another example: the MCSO will make arrests for illegal activity if cockfighting is in progress, but cannot issue a citation or make an arrest for illegal rooster keeping operations in general. According to the process, County Counsel must be consulted and

¹⁵ *Unpublished interagency memo*

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

advised prior to any notice of violation. As a result there is no coordinated effort between agencies, no shared database for information about permit applications, illegal rooster keeping operations or other illegal rooster keeping activities.

Ordinance Circumvented

The Environmental Health Bureau created a multi-step process that modified the provisions originally outlined. The author of that process injected three additional agencies into the ordinance process that were not named in the original text. The oversight of County Counsel is required to enforce the policy. These layers were outside the parameters of The Ordinance passed on December 16, 2014. The new agencies added by Environmental Health are:

- RMA (Code Enforcement),
- SPCA
- County Counsel

The Ordinance reads: *"Persons or entities keeping five or more roosters on a single property shall become subject to the requirements of this chapter one hundred eighty days (six months) after the effective date of Ordinance 5249 enacting this chapter."* Section 4 of the Ordinance stipulates that it (the Ordinance) *"shall" become effective on the thirty-first day following its adoption* (emphasis added).

However, in a PowerPoint presentation created by the Environmental Health Bureau, the process's "soft roll-out" was defined as a one-year period and left enforcement entirely out of the picture. The first permit was issued on 09/28/15, more than nine months after the ordinance was passed. Four permits for rooster keeping were issued during 2015. Ten permits were issued during 2016. No permits were issued after July 13, 2016. To date, no permits for rooster keeping are in effect. After the soft rollout, the Environmental Health Bureau still would not allow ACOs to enforce the law by issuing citations for violations of illegal rooster keeping. The only citation issued for illegal rooster keeping is dated March 31, 2016.

Permitting Process

The permit application process can be completed in person or online. A required fee of \$270.00, renewable annually, must be submitted. Zoning allowance verification for applicant's property must be obtained from RMA to ensure no outstanding code violations exist or bans on poultry keeping are in place. (An example of the latter would be property located in the Coastal Commission jurisdiction.) ACS must also verify that the applicant does not have convictions for cockfighting. It was learned that it frequently

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

took days to weeks to get the necessary information from other county agencies, in part because there wasn't a designated contact person assigned in other agencies to respond to ACS requests for information. In the event of violations, the permit process stops until violations are resolved. The applicant may correct violations and request to be re-inspected. A fee of \$135.00 an hour is charged for re-inspection. The Ordinance permit process is lengthy and unnecessarily onerous.

An Increased Risk of Contracting Diseases Specific to Avian Species

Viral Newcastle disease is common worldwide, and currently California is experiencing a severe outbreak which is rapidly spreading to Northern California counties. As of the end of 2018, there were six million documented cases in Los Angeles County alone.¹⁶ During the week of March 25th, 2019, the Salinas Valley Fair, the Monterey County Fair, and the California Mid State Fair canceled all poultry exhibitions due to this disease.¹⁷ Highly contagious, it is an acute respiratory disease that is spread easily among avian populations both wild and domestic. This disease kills poultry and the primary way this disease spreads is by moving roosters that have the disease.¹⁸ Particularly devastating to domestic poultry, it has been known to wipe out whole commercial poultry operations. This disease is also transmittable to humans via clothing and avian contact resulting in conjunctivitis and influenza-like symptoms. Known as the poultry "Grim Reaper", California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) recommends not moving roosters or other roosters to different locations. Viral Newcastle disease can be present in roosters before symptoms are present.

An Issued Citation Not Processed

The MCCGJ discovered what appeared to be a missing and unaccounted for citation. This is the only known citation issued for illegal rooster keeping. The citation was scanned into the District Attorney's computer system and a request was made by the reviewing attorney for additional information to proceed with the prosecution. This request for information was never received by the ACS Officer involved with issuing the citation. The citation was issued but was subsequently never processed nor were fines levied. (See Appendix D.)

¹⁶ <https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/poultry-virulent-newcastle-disease-quarantine-bird-13715501.php>

¹⁷ <https://www.ksbw.com/article/outbreak-of-poultry-disease-cancels-chicken-exhibit-at-the-salinas-valley-fair/26901028>

¹⁸ <http://wp.sbcounty.gov/cao/countywire/?p=4207>

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

The Role and Duty of The Animal Control Officer

The role of the Animal Control Officer (ACO) is crucial to the success of this policy implementation and enforcement. Named 53 times in The Ordinance, The ACO is authorized by the BoS to fulfill the following responsibilities and functions for implementing and enforcing The Ordinance:¹⁹

- Accepts applications with the required fee for Rooster Keeping Operations.
- Accepts information from the applicant which is deemed necessary to decide on the issuance of the permit.
- Reviews the application and associated documents and require additional information to complete the application.
- Specifies conditions and restrictions in the Rooster Keeping Operations permit process.
- Conducts an initial site survey and issues a Rooster Keeping Operation permit.
- Verifies, via inspection, Rooster Keeping Operations.
- Issues a Rooster Keeping permit provisionally.
- Maintains compliance oversight and verification by performing additional inspection(s).
- Notifies applicants of denied applications and the reasons therefore.
- Notifies the holder of a Rooster Keeping Ordinance permit the expiration date of the permit and offer the opportunity to renew the permit.
- Inspects Rooster Keeping Operations seeking renewal of an issued permit.
- Verifies that Rooster Keeping Operations maintain standards prescribed by the ordinance.
- Upon expiration of an existing Rooster Keeping Operations permit, ACO inspects the single property and verifies the operation has been dismantled and is no longer operative.
- Upon transfer of a Rooster Keeping Operations permit, ACO verifies, by inspection, the single property continues to meet the standards prescribed in The Ordinance.
- Inspects at determined intervals each Rooster Keeping Operation in which a permit has been issued.
- Upon complaint or notice of violations responds to such complaint, responds to an emergency, or accompanies or assists law enforcement personnel.
- Inspects using biosecurity protocols.
- Reviews plans for new or remodeled Rooster Keeping Operations facilities.

¹⁹ <https://www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showdocument?id=16498>

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

- Maintains records of exemptions granted to a Poultry Operation or Poultry Hobbyist.
- Notifies the holder of an exemption of the expiration date of the exemption and requirement to either apply for a Rooster Keeping Operation permit or to reapply for an exemption.
- Maintains records of denied exemptions and the Agricultural Commissioner's approval determination of a Poultry Operation or Poultry hobbyist exemption. He/she shall maintain records of denied exemptions.
- Verifies compliance provisions for those applicants whose request for an exemption was denied but wish to maintain a Rooster Keeping Operation.
- Maintains suspension of permits unless correction of violations has been verified by inspection.
- Revokes a Rooster Keeping Operation permit due to violations verified by inspection.
- Determines appropriate penalties for verified violations.
- Serves as the Enforcement Official in the event of appeal of a suspension or revocation of a Rooster Keeping Operation permit.
- Establishes guidelines and procedures to implement The Ordinance.
- Issues notice of violation(s)
- Imposes fines, penalties and collects administrative costs.

RMA Code Enforcement

RMA personnel were not previously familiar with The Ordinance and had not been trained or instructed by the Environmental Health Bureau on their role with enforcement. Subsequent to contact by the complainant, the responding RMA code enforcement inspector began to familiarize himself with The Ordinance. RMA inspected the site of the complaint and asserted jurisdiction regarding building code violations. RMA bypassed Animal Control Services and contacted the SPCA regarding the possibility of animal cruelty. RMA rarely deals with ACS. There is no written policy for working with ACS, nor is there a written policy for addressing illegal rooster keeping.

Monterey County employees are not mandated to report conditions of animal abuse, as is required in the case of child or elder abuse. Other illegal rooster keeping operations are located on the same road in North Monterey County. The complaint site is within the Coastal Zone, where rooster keeping is not allowed and where permits are prohibited. RMA did not notify the Coastal Commission. RMA's stated goal is 'voluntary compliance' which is determined by subjective criteria: RMA asks "Are they 'making an effort' to comply?" RMA gave multiple extensions to rooster owners to remove their roosters. RMA Code Enforcement mandated owners remove roosters without

MONTEREY COUNTY'S UNENFORCED ROOSTER KEEPING ORDINANCE

knowledge of the possibility of Viral Newcastle Disease. RMA has given multiple extensions to property owners to remove rooster enclosure debris. RMA is aware that rooster keeping permits come through Animal Control Services and the Agricultural Commissioner but is not required to ask to see permits. There is no coordination between RMA, Environmental Health, ACS or The Coastal Commission.

SPCA of Monterey County

The SPCA of Monterey County is a private non-profit organization and is not affiliated with the American SPCA or the County of Monterey. The organization is fully versed on Title 8 of the County Code and its amendments, Chapter 8.04 and Chapter 8.50. They receive over a thousand calls per year regarding both domestic and livestock animals. The SPCA has jurisdiction where animal cruelty or neglect is apparent. They interface with the Monterey County District Attorney's Office for possible prosecution of perpetrators of crimes against animals.

Although named in the multi-step process established by the Director of Environmental Health, the SPCA was not contacted, trained, or otherwise made aware of their involuntary inclusion in this process. The SPCA Humane Officers are sworn deputies in the State of California and have jurisdiction in Monterey County solely pertaining to cases of animal cruelty. It was after contact by the complainant that the SPCA began contacting county agencies to resolve the complaint, only to discover that no one was enforcing The Ordinance. The Environmental Health Bureau provided information that indicated that no one had been issued a permit since July 2016. After the complainant called the SPCA, the SPCA went to the property at the request of RMA but found no evidence of animal cruelty nor did they find any evidence of cockfighting.

District Supervisor

The Ordinance was passed before many of the current Monterey County Supervisors were in office and, upon multiple interviews, it was noted that Supervisors were only vaguely familiar with The Ordinance. The Supervisors were not aware there was a problem with illegal rooster keeping, except within the Boronda area of North Monterey County. Communication logs are kept by staff that record complaints by constituents, and the Supervisors did not recall any complaints regarding roosters. The BoS does not have any written policy or procedure in place requiring progress reports on the effectiveness of new ordinances. The Supervisors were unaware an ordinance they passed was not being enforced.