

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Animal Control Implementation Plan Follow-up Discussion – Regional Animal Services of King County Interlocal Agreement
DEPARTMENT:	City Manager’s Office Community Services Division
PRESENTED BY:	John Norris, CMO Management Analyst Rob Beem, Community Services Manager
ACTION:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution <input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

On March 19, staff presented an animal control service ‘in-house implementation plan’ for Council consideration. Also presented on the 19th was information on the extended Regional Animal Services of King County (RASKC) interlocal agreement. Based on previous Council direction, this information was shared as a secondary option to the in-house implementation plan. The staff report for March 19 can be found here: <http://cosweb.ci.shoreline.wa.us/uploads/attachments/cck/Council/Staffreports/2012/Staffreport031912-8b.pdf>.

Given that the Mayor had some specific questions regarding the RASKC interlocal agreement, this report provides answers to those questions and clarifications from King County staff regarding the proposed interlocal agreement extension. Although the City has already communicated to RASKC that it is unlikely that the City will participate in RASKC model, the City has until May 1st to change course and communicate to King County that we are interested in contracting with RASKC.

RESOURCE/FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The estimated 2013 net direct cost to provide animal control services using the Shoreline in-house model is \$56,228. If indirect costs are also considered, this annual cost increases to \$149,122. The estimated 2013 net direct cost to provide animal control services using the RASKC model is \$47,882. However, the service levels of these two models are drastically different, with the most important difference being the five-day a week service model proposed by RASKC, as opposed to the seven-day a week service proposed in the in-house model.

RECOMMENDATION:

No formal action is required. Staff is providing follow-up information to Council on the proposed RASKC interlocal agreement extension. However, if the Council has concerns with moving forward with the in-house implementation plan, staff recommends

that Council move that the City Manager communicate to King County the City's nonbinding statement of interest in participating in the RASKC model by May 1. Then staff would return later this year with an interlocal agreement for the Council to consider and approve.

Approved By: City Manager *JU* City Attorney ____

BACKGROUND - RASKC INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT EXTENSION

As was noted at the Council meeting on March 19, RASKC and the King County Executive Office staff decided to re-open the current RASKC contract to amend the contract terms and cost model when the City of Auburn communicated that they would leave the model at the end of 2012. As part of this contract renegotiation process, RASKC provided a timeline for when cities needed to communicate their “serious interest” in staying in the regional animal control system. Given Council’s direction to bring back an in-house implementation plan and Council’s approval of the 2012 budget for animal services transition funding, on February 14, staff communicated to the County that “it is unlikely that the City of Shoreline will participate in the animal control services contract extension at this time.”

Although Shoreline has been removed from the RASKC model, given that our participation in the RASKC model will decrease the costs of other participating cities, King County will allow Shoreline back in the model if Council were to provide this direction by May 1. As of February 14, Auburn, Kirkland and Shoreline are the only cities that have asked to be removed from the RASKC model. However, it is staff’s understanding that other cities, most notably Bellevue, are still weighing whether to continue with the RASKC model or provide service on a sub-regional level. Obviously, other cities’ non-participation in the model would affect Shoreline’s cost if we were to participate.

As was provided on March 19, the RASKC cost model (which includes Shoreline but excludes Auburn and Kirkland) is attached to this staff report as *Attachment A* for reference.

ANSWERS AND CLARIFICATIONS REGARDING THE RASKC MODEL

The following answers to Council questions regarding the proposed RASKC interlocal agreement extension were provided by Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives at the King County Executive’s Office. Ms. Carlson has served as one of the County’s lead staff on negotiating and managing the interlocal agreement extension process.

1. Comparison of costs for the regional model versus the City of Shoreline Animal Control Implementation Plan – clarifying the \$100,000 difference

A: The estimated 2013 net cost to Shoreline in the RASKC model is \$14,702 (based on the draft interlocal agreement with Shoreline included) The estimated PAWS cost is an additional \$33,000, for a total City net cost of \$47,702 in 2013 if Shoreline remains in the RASKC program.

This compares to an in-house model net cost of \$149,122. As we understand it, this true cost of the in-house model includes existing Shoreline staff whose time will be shifted or re-assigned to animal control functions. The RASKC model requires minimal Shoreline staff involvement – both in terms of direct service provision (staff in the field) and internal support (i.e. legal, human resources, risk management, finance) and thus does not necessitate re-assigning existing staff. If the City remains in the regional system, these Shoreline staff would be available to focus on core City services.

2. *Regional model – What is the intended longer term focus for the County on building a regional funding source and working with other shelter providers?*

A: The draft interlocal agreement represents a bridge to sustainability. Throughout the discussions with cities, there has been clear consensus to collaborate on increasing revenues and achieving system sustainability at the end of the three (3) years. The focus areas cities and the County have identified include increasing licensing and donation revenues, seeking out entrepreneurial revenues, and also pursuing the concept of a regional levy to help support the RASKC system. An important part of this dialogue will be working with the other shelter providers, including the City of Seattle. This approach will ensure a high level of care for all animals with effective field services, while reducing or eliminating the dependence on significant ongoing subsidies from each community's limited general fund resources. While there is work to be done to develop such an approach, the relationships we have with our fellow shelter providers, offers a great foundation for this effort.

Ms. Carlson also provided the following clarifications about the RASKC model.

1. *Enhanced Service Options*

The enhanced service options are changing under the draft interlocal agreement for RASKC. The change is probably best characterized as a new option for cities, in addition to the option currently available. The draft ILA provides the same option that currently exists for cities to purchase a full animal services officer (as Shoreline is presently doing with Lake Forest Park and Kenmore) AND it provides an option to purchase smaller amounts of time at a lower per hour cost. This new option gives cities the flexibility to purchase enhanced services throughout the year in targeted amounts of time without having to commit to a full year agreement and without paying overhead costs.

2. *License Revenue Support*

The licensing support proposed for 2013 (\$19,450) under the model with Kirkland and Auburn out of the system, establishes a target revenue amount that the County will guarantee if actual license revenues are not achieved. Cities and the County may enter into separate agreements for the licensing support assistance in 2014 and 2015 subject to cities providing additional in-kind support and the County's ability to recover costs and/or provide resources for the services.

3. *Weekend Service*

An important concern of cities has been the ability for regular field services to be provided on weekend days when the service needs are greater than some week days. The current agreement provides 5-day field service during the week days. RASKC will begin shifting the 5-day service to include weekend coverage starting in 2012. RASKC just negotiated weekend field services coverage with the bargaining unit—beginning next month. It is anticipated this will continue with the new agreement.

4. Control Officers in Field

Another issue raised by cities that is being addressed in the new agreement is to have field officers placed at satellite locations within the districts rather than a home base of Kent. The draft interlocal agreement includes a provision for RASKC to establish field locations for officers so they will have more time within the districts they are serving. Shoreline is considered one of our best options to site this satellite.

Finally, Ms. Carlson also stated that King County remains committed to providing effective service in Shoreline and would like to collaborate on designing the service to meet our needs. It should also be stated that the draft RASKC interlocal agreement will be available in early April. Staff will provide the draft interlocal to Council as soon as it has been distributed by the County.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE RASKC MODEL

As was noted on March 19, there are definitely some improvements to the proposed RASKC interlocal agreement over the current agreement. However, there are also some shortcomings, most of which already exist in the current agreement and are likely to continue under the extended agreement. There are also some benefits to continuing to partner with RASKC. The following section highlights some of the advantages and disadvantages of the new RASKC model:

Extended RASKC Interlocal Agreement Improvements:

- Cost allocation formula more heavily weighted toward system use than before - 80% system use/20% jurisdiction population cost allocation, versus the old formula of 50% use/50% population.
- Staffing plan model that includes both weekend days; exact weekly staffing plan still being finalized by RASKC.
- Satellite location where Animal Control Officer will report to could potentially be in Shoreline; this will allow for more time in the service district than the current model, where Animal Control Officers report to the RASKC Animal Shelter in Kent.
- Overall reduction in RASKC system costs from 2012 to 2013.
- Commitment from the County to increase system revenues through additional partnerships and collaboration.
- Commitment from the County that capital costs for RASKC Shelter replacement will not be considered as part of this three year extension.

Current and Future RASKC System Concerns:

- Continued lack of local control of the system.
- Continued lack of high-quality law enforcement coordination, system marketing and system responsiveness; although RASKC has improved in these areas and provides adequate coordination and responsiveness, staff feels these service aspects could be improved if the City moves away from the RASKC model.
- Continued lack of proactive service delivery outside the purchase of enhanced services.
- Cost of purchasing enhanced services (\$78,567 for fully loaded half time FT (20 hours per week) or \$51 per hour if purchased on a target hourly basis) would increase the direct costs of the RASKC model greatly, likely making the net direct

cost of the RASKC model greater than the net direct cost of bringing the service in-house.

- Proposed service area covered by RASKC will be divided into two service districts covered by five Animal Control Officers, with the northern service district covering all of north and east King County; this is a significantly larger district than before, potentially increasing response times.
- Continued sheltering charge for the RASKC Shelter, which is not Shoreline's primary shelter.

RASKC System Benefits:

- The unfunded overhead costs of the in-house model, also noted as 'soft costs' during the March 19 Council discussion (monetized at \$92,894), would not be an issue as all overhead and support costs are provided by RASKC as part of the base contract model.
- Transition funding allocated in the 2012 budget for animal control could be reprogrammed in 2012 for another purpose, put back into the general fund, or saved if the Council wishes to implement the in-house model at a future time
- All animal related citizen issues, inquiries, media communication, public disclosure requests, and advocacy concerns will continue to be handled by RASKC.
- Due to the 2013 licensing support credit, the 2013 net direct cost for the RASKC model (including PAWS) is estimated to be \$8,346 less than the Shoreline in-house model. If the City enters into a separate agreement with the County for licensing support assistance in 2014 and 2015, which would necessitate the provision of in-kind support, RASKC system costs would continue to be reduced through the licensing support credit.
- Depth of service is not an issue with the RASKC model; if a RASKC Animal Control Officer is out of duty for an extended period of time due to injury, illness or some other type of long term leave, RASKC will provide a back-up Animal Control Officer to fulfill the service requirements of the contract.

RESOURCE/FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The estimated 2013 net direct cost to provide animal control services using the Shoreline in-house model is \$56,228. If indirect costs are also considered, this annual cost increases to \$149,122. The estimated 2013 net direct cost to provide animal control services using the RASKC model is \$47,882. However, the service levels of these two models are drastically different, with the most important difference being the five-day a week service model proposed by RASKC, as opposed to the seven-day a week service proposed in the in-house model.

RECOMMENDATION:

No formal action is required. Staff is providing follow-up information to Council on the proposed RASKC interlocal agreement extension. However, if the Council has concerns with moving forward with the in-house implementation plan, staff recommends that Council move that the City Manager communicate to King County the City's nonbinding statement of interest in participating in the RASKC model by May 1. Then staff would return later this year with an interlocal agreement for the Council to consider and approve.

ATTACHMENT: RASKC Interlocal Agreement Cost Model

**Regional Animal Services of King County
Precommitment 2013 Estimated Payment Calculation**

Allocation Method: Population = 20%, Usage = 80% Control Districts 200 and 220 combined into one (420), with 240 and 260 consolidated to District 500, costs to districts 50%, 50%. Usage and Licensing Revenue based on 2011 Preliminary Year End. Credits allocated to jurisdictions with shelter intakes per capita above the system average.

OPTION # Kirkland and Auburn out
5 ACO's - 2 Districts

	Control	Shelter	Licensing	Total Allocated Costs (1)	2011 Licensing Revenue (est)	Estimated Net Cost
Budgeted Total Allocable Costs	\$1,668,818	\$2,817,635	\$667,091	\$5,153,544		
Budgeted Non-Licensing Revenue	\$80,040	\$112,507	\$13,265	\$205,812		
Budgeted Net Allocable Costs	\$1,588,778	\$2,705,128	\$653,826	\$4,947,731	\$2,272,689	-\$2,675,042

DRAFT

Animal Control District Number	Jurisdiction	Estimated Animal Control Cost Allocation (2)	Estimated Sheltering Cost Allocation (3)	Estimated Licensing Cost Allocation (4)	Estimated Total Animal Services Cost Allocation	2011 Licensing Revenue (Estimated)	Estimated Net Cost Allocation	2013-2015 Transition Funding (Annual) (5)	2013 Credits (Annual) (6)	Estimated Net Costs with Transition Funding and Credits	Estimated Revenue from Proposed Licensing Support (7)	Estimated Net Final Cost (8)	
420	Carnation	\$4,709	\$3,649	\$1,350	\$9,708	\$4,752	-\$4,956	\$552	\$0	-\$4,404	\$1,819	-\$2,585	
	Duvall	\$12,892	\$15,888	\$5,829	\$34,609	\$21,343	-\$13,266	\$0	\$0	-\$13,266	\$10,391	-\$2,875	
	Kenmore	\$43,389	\$12,633	\$16,797	\$72,819	\$58,602	-\$14,217	\$0	\$0	-\$14,217	\$7,893	-\$6,324	
	Kirkland	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Lake Forest Park	\$26,202	\$7,666	\$13,183	\$47,051	\$48,504	\$1,453	\$0	\$0	\$1,453	\$5,024	\$6,477	
	Redmond	\$43,577	\$57,653	\$35,170	\$136,400	\$116,407	-\$19,993	\$0	\$0	-\$19,993	\$0	-\$19,993	
	Sammamish	\$40,639	\$47,015	\$33,896	\$121,550	\$117,649	-\$3,901	\$0	\$0	-\$3,901	\$0	-\$3,901	
	Shoreline	\$105,904	\$32,342	\$41,596	\$179,841	\$145,689	-\$34,152	\$0	\$0	-\$34,152	\$19,450	-\$14,702	
	Woodinville	\$14,070	\$6,651	\$8,395	\$29,115	\$29,220	\$105	\$0	\$0	\$105	\$3,036	\$3,141	
	Beaux Arts	\$84	\$182	\$269	\$535	\$930	\$395	\$0	\$0	\$395	\$0	\$395	
	Bellevue	\$137,151	\$169,980	\$81,922	\$389,053	\$273,931	-\$115,122	\$0	\$0	-\$115,122	\$44,446	-\$70,676	
	Clyde Hill	\$1,805	\$3,355	\$2,125	\$7,285	\$7,170	-\$115	\$0	\$0	-\$115	\$0	-\$115	
	Estimated Unincorporated King County	\$255,977	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Issaquah	\$51,338	\$48,429	\$17,716	\$117,484	\$55,947	-\$61,537	\$0	\$0	-\$61,537	\$1,507	-\$60,030	
	Mercer Island	\$13,140	\$19,452	\$15,082	\$47,674	\$49,962	\$2,288	\$0	\$0	\$2,288	\$0	\$2,288	
	Newcastle	\$15,867	\$13,002	\$5,066	\$33,934	\$15,271	-\$18,663	\$0	\$0	-\$18,663	\$3,074	-\$15,589	
	North Bend	\$15,237	\$16,890	\$4,495	\$36,622	\$15,694	-\$20,928	\$1,376	\$586	-\$18,966	\$6,833	-\$12,133	
Snoqualmie	\$11,804	\$11,790	\$7,335	\$30,929	\$25,065	-\$5,864	\$0	\$0	-\$5,864	\$0	-\$5,864		
Yarrow Point	\$604	\$611	\$828	\$2,043	\$2,700	\$657	\$0	\$0	\$657	\$0	\$657		
SUBTOTAL FOR CITIES IN 420 (excludes unincorporated area)		\$538,412	\$467,187	\$291,053	\$1,296,652	\$988,836	-\$307,816	\$1,928	\$586	-\$305,302	\$103,473	-\$201,829	
500	Kent	\$247,401	\$818,205	\$75,548	\$1,141,153	\$253,944	-\$887,209	\$110,495	\$495,870	-\$280,844	\$0	-\$280,844	
	SeaTac	\$74,937	\$190,492	\$14,484	\$279,912	\$47,232	-\$232,680	\$7,442	\$116,611	-\$108,627	\$0	-\$108,627	
	Tukwila	\$46,650	\$114,242	\$10,042	\$170,934	\$32,705	-\$138,229	\$5,255	\$61,987	-\$70,987	\$0	-\$70,987	
	Auburn	\$0	NA	NA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
	Black Diamond	\$7,597	\$14,848	\$2,923	\$25,369	\$10,185	-\$15,184	\$1,209	\$3,263	-\$10,712	\$2,262	-\$8,450	
	Covington	\$49,333	\$85,153	\$13,759	\$148,245	\$48,982	-\$99,263	\$5,070	\$36,409	-\$57,784	\$0	-\$57,784	
	Enumclaw	\$39,236	\$58,483	\$7,535	\$105,253	\$25,307	-\$79,946	\$11,188	\$28,407	-\$40,351	\$0	-\$40,351	
	Estimated Unincorporated King County	\$290,499	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Maple Valley	\$38,736	\$70,917	\$16,420	\$126,073	\$56,628	-\$69,445	\$6,027	\$6,867	-\$56,551	\$8,354	-\$48,197	
	SUBTOTAL FOR CITIES IN 500 (excludes unincorporated area)		\$503,890	\$1,352,341	\$140,710	\$1,996,940	\$474,983	-\$1,521,957	\$146,686	\$749,414	-\$625,857	\$10,616	-\$615,241
TOTAL FOR CITIES		\$1,042,302	\$1,819,527	\$431,762	\$3,293,592	\$1,463,819	-\$1,829,773	\$148,614	\$750,000	-\$931,159	\$114,089	-\$817,070	
Total King County Unincorporated Area Allocation		\$546,476	\$885,600	\$222,063	\$1,654,139	\$808,870	-\$845,269					-\$845,269	
		\$1,588,778	\$2,705,128	\$653,826	\$4,947,731	\$2,272,689	-\$2,675,042						

Source: Regional Animal Services of King County

Date: Feb 28, 2012 (Draft)

Numbers are estimates only for the purpose of negotiation discussions. The numbers and allocation methodology are subject to change while negotiations are underway.