

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Animal Control Services Update
DEPARTMENT: City Managers Office
PRESENTED BY: John Norris, Management Analyst

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

Since incorporation, the City of Shoreline has received animal control services through an interlocal agreement with King County. Due to budgetary constraints and ongoing concerns with operational issues at the King County Animal Shelter, King County will fundamentally alter how they provide animal control services to cities that continue to contract with them. Specifically, the County will close their Animal Shelter to cities by June 30, 2010 unless a regional strategy to provide Animal Control Services can be created, negotiated and implemented. As well, if Shoreline continues to contract with the County for animal control field and licensing services after June 30, 2010 as part of the regional strategy, the City's current contract must be renegotiated so that service costs will be paid for on a "full cost recovery" basis.

Given these upcoming changes in how animal control services may be provided if the City continues to contract with King County, the City Manager directed that an analysis be conducted of the various options for how the City could provide this service to the residents of Shoreline, and what the related costs would be. As part of this analysis, the City is participating with several other cities and King County in a staff work group looking at a regional animal services model. The work group's purpose is to develop a policy approach for a regional animal control system and a system model that identifies service expectations, costs, and cost allocation.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

As the analysis of the animal control service model options is not yet complete, it is undetermined at this time what the specific financial impact will be to the City. However, as King County is currently subsidizing the provision of this service from their general fund, it is anticipated that Shoreline's cost of providing this service, if provided in-house, provided regionally on a full cost recovery basis, or provided sub-regionally by a consortium of north King County cities, will most likely increase.

RECOMMENDATION:

No action is required. This report presents potential options for Council discussion and future consideration.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney _____

INTRODUCTION:

Since incorporation, the City of Shoreline has received animal control services through an interlocal agreement with King County. This agreement, which has never been amended or altered, provides the City with animal care and control services (field services), sheltering services at the County's animal shelter in Kent, and animal licensing services. To pay for these services, King County collects all revenue from animal licensing fees generated by Shoreline residents. Shoreline is not charged any additional cost however if these licensing fees do not cover the cost of the service provided.

Due to budgetary constraints at the County and past concerns with operational issues at the King County Animal Shelter, King County has decided to no longer provide this service to cities under their existing interlocal agreement. The County has been subsidizing Animal Control service to all cities in King County that contract with them by approximately \$1.5 million annually from their general fund, which is not sustainable for the County's operating budget.

To move forward with this change, on November 9, 2009, the King County Council passed Ordinance 2009-0594, which stated that by January 31, 2010, the County will no longer operate an animal shelter and that cities must find another option for the provision of animal sheltering services. The ordinance also stated that if the County continues to provide contract animal control field and licensing services to cities, by June 30, 2010, those services must be fully reimbursed by the cities on a "full cost recovery" basis. However, through ongoing discussion with King County, cities and the non-profit animal shelter providers in the community have worked with the new King County Executive to alter this initial County Council mandate.

Thus, the King County Council and Executive have placed the following newer mandates on cities that want to continue to contract with King County for animal control services:

- By June 30, 2010, a regional strategy to provide animal control service that includes both the County and a feasible number of cities must be created, negotiated and implemented.
 - To utilize the current King County Animal Shelter, which will most likely continue to be operated by the County, cities must be a part of the regional strategy.
 - In addition to the County's existing Animal Shelter, additional non-profit community shelter capacity is desired to be a part of the regional strategy.
- By June 30, 2010, as part of the regional strategy, animal control field and licensing services and shelter services must be paid for on a "full cost recovery" basis.

Given these upcoming changes in how Animal Control services may be provided, the City Manager directed that an analysis be conducted of the various options for how the City could provide this service to the residents of Shoreline, including the County-focused regional strategy, and what the related costs would be for these service delivery options. Although this analysis is still ongoing, the City Manager is interested in having staff provide an update to Council on this issue so that Council can be briefed on the larger issues related to animal control and have a chance to ask questions of staff.

CURRENT ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICE PROVISION:

On August 31, 1995, the City entered into an interlocal agreement with King County for animal control services. The interlocal agreement states that the County promises to "provide the same degree, type, and level of service as is customarily provided to residents of unincorporated King County." Other than this, the interlocal agreement is silent on the types of animal control services provided and the level of service provided in Shoreline. Although the interlocal does not spell out these services, the common practice of the King County Animal Care and Control Division is to provide three types of animal control services: animal control field services, animal sheltering services, and animal licensing services.

Animal Control Field Services:

The function of Animal Control Field Services is to proactively patrol the animal control service area in King County and respond to animal control calls for service. Animal Control officers provide service in King County from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. seven days a week, with emergency services provided 24 hours a day, seven days a week by on-call officers. To accomplish this, King County has 15 staff members working in field services; 12 Animal Control officers and three (3) staff members in the County's call center receiving calls for service. On occasion however, some of these Animal Control officers will be pulled into the King County Animal Shelter to assist with shelter operations.

Animal Control officers respond to the following types of requests:

- Animal cruelty investigations
- Injured animal rescues
- Response to bite reports and vicious animal complaints
- Pick-up for stay animals and loose livestock
- Leash law violations
- Response to barking dog complaints and petitions
- Assistance to Police Officers when requested
- "Dead-on-arrival" livestock/cats/dogs

Given King County Animal Care and Control's limited resources, to manage these response calls, Animal Control officers prioritize daily field operation responses. Priorities are identified on a 'higher priority' and 'lower priority' basis, with higher priorities calls relating to public safety and animal welfare. Specifically, higher priority calls include animal bites, vicious dogs, injured animals, requested police assistance, and animal cruelty.

In 2008, King County received a total of 509 calls for service from Shoreline residents. 33 of these calls were related to animal cruelty, 40 were related to vicious animals, 15 were related to animal bites, and 28 were related to an injured animal, with the rest related to other issues, such as a stray animals or barking dogs. Although staff has asked King County what the type of response was (call back, send Animal Control officer to scene, etc.) and what the response rate was (how often a response was provided) for these 509 service calls, the County has been unable to provide this data.

Furthermore, there have been concerns about the response times for calls for service to King County Animal Control. In 2009, using the County's data, the Seattle Times analyzed response time information to calls for service in cities that contract with King County for animal control services over a four and half year period. The following

results show the number of cases and the median response times for animal control response for animal cruelty, vicious animal, animal bite, and injured animal incidents (all high priority calls) from 2005 through May 2009 in Shoreline.

# of Animal Cruelty Cases	Median Animal Cruelty Response Time (hrs)	# of Vicious Animal Cases	Median Vicious Animal Response Time (hrs)	# of Animal Bite cases	Median Animal Bite Response Time (hrs)	# of Injured Animal Cases	Median Injured Animal Response Time (hrs)
135	19.4	169	22.9	50	23.6	89	1.1

These response times to Shoreline service calls mirror or exceed similar response times in other jurisdictions that contract with King County. Although not in violation of the current interlocal agreement with King County, as no level of service or response time performance measures are stated in the agreement, these long response times have been raised as an example of the lack of quality service that King County is currently providing under the existing interlocal agreement.

Animal Shelter Services:

As noted earlier, the King County Animal Shelter is located in the City of Kent, with a smaller satellite shelter in the City of Bellevue. The Animal Shelter houses roughly 11,000 animals per year, with the majority being dogs and cats, although other species of animals are also sheltered there. From January 1, 2009 to October 31, 2009, King County sheltered 150 animals that were attributable to the City of Shoreline. These animals were either stray animals picked up and dropped off by King County Animal Control officers or Shoreline residents, or were "owner surrender" animals that were dropped off by their owners for various reasons, including moving out of state, dogs not allowed in a new apartment building, pet no longer wanted, etc.

The following table outlines the number of shelter intakes from Shoreline for the years 2006 to 2009. If these numbers are annualized (for years 2006 and 2009 when full year data is not available) and averaged out over this four year period, the average number of Shoreline animals housed in the King County Animal Shelter has been 165 per year.

Year	Annual Shelter Intakes From Shoreline
2009 (January – October)	150
2008	148
2007	202
2006 (July – December)	65

The King County Animal Shelter has also been the target of concerns from members of the community in the recent past, most notably in 2007. At this time, community members and animal welfare activists worked with the County to identify deficiencies in the County's Animal Shelter system and potential solutions for the deficiencies. Of greatest concern was the euthanasia rate of dogs and cats at the Shelter. This work resulted in two King County Council mandates about operation of the shelter. Specifically, euthanasia rates for dogs and cats could not exceed 20% in 2008 and 15% in 2009, and a framework had to be established for the humane care of animals that focused on recommendations such as better adoption practices, increases in access to spay and neuter programs, and better shelter conditions.

Although it is generally understood that these mandates were well intentioned, given that no additional revenue was put into the system by the County, the unintended consequence of establishing hard guidelines for euthanasia rates and an increased level of shelter care was that additional human resources have been needed at the Shelter to meet these mandates. This resulted in the King County Animal Care and Control Division pulling Animal Control officers from the field and putting them into the shelter to meet these operational demands. This of course left fewer officers available for field services and has driven up response times as noted earlier.

Animal Licensing Services:

The King County Records and Licensing Services (RALS) Division (of which Animal Care and Control is a sub-division) provides licensing services to residents in King County. RALS licensing staff sells both dog and cat licenses, as well as other types of pet and animal licenses, such as kennel licenses, guard dog and guard dog training facility licenses, and exotic animal licenses, among others.

King County dog and cat licenses are required for all dogs and cats eight (8) weeks of age or older. Dog and Cat licenses can be purchased by mail, online or in-person, and are good for one year. In-person licenses can be purchased at various King County locations or locally at Shoreline City Hall.

In 2008 and 2009, the number of dog and cat licenses issued for Shoreline residents was 5,671 and 7,062. Of this amount, in 2009, 447 licenses were sold at Shoreline City Hall, with the vast majority of licenses sold online or through the mail.

According to King County estimates, the number of total licenses sold accounts for roughly 20% to 25% of the estimated dog and cat population that exists in the City. The table below outlines the number of issued licenses and the estimates of the percent of animals licensed:

Year	Total Pet Licenses Issued	Estimated Population	% County Total Population	Estimated Households
2008	5671	53440	4.54%	21376
2009	7062	53440	4.54%	21376
Year	Estimated Shoreline Dog Population (0.63 dogs per household)	Estimated Shoreline Cat Population (0.71 cats per household)	Estimated Number of Pets (Dogs and Cats Only)	Estimated Percent of Pets Licensed
2008	13510	15241	28,751	20%
2009	13510	15241	28,751	25%

In 2009, the King County Pet Licensing Program had its best year since 2003. In Shoreline, pet license sales were up roughly 25% over 2008 sales (1,391 additional licenses sold.) The major reason that license sales increased so dramatically in 2009 was the active licensing campaign that the County instituted in three contract cities, one being Shoreline. This program mainly consisted of County canvassers going door to door to speak with pet owners whose pet licenses had lapsed. Other factors that potentially contributed to the increase in license sales were the new off-leash dog parks in Shoreline, which have license requirements noted on the park signage, and the extra service contract that is managed by the Shoreline Parks and Recreation Department for

leash law enforcement in City parks. Although the off-duty Animal Control officer providing this service to the City was not hired for license enforcement purposes, when on patrol in City parks, he has also provided citizen education about license requirements as stated in the Shoreline Municipal Code.

COST AND REVENUE OF CURRENT ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICE PROVISION:

Cost:

It is unknown how much it is specifically costing King County to provide animal control services to Shoreline residents. Cities have been working with the County to obtain this data, but the County has not done a good job tracking these costs on a jurisdictional basis, and has not tracked overhead costs for administering these contracts for cities.

As noted earlier, the County has been subsidizing Animal Control service to all cities in King County that contract with them by approximately \$1.5 million annually from their general fund. Although it is assumed that much of the subsidy is being provided to other jurisdictions that have greater animal control needs than Shoreline, such as those cities in South King County, determining what portion of the subsidy is attributable to Shoreline is challenging.

The only data cities have been provided are very blunt numbers of the total system cost broken down by the percent of service calls (which are not response calls, only calls coming in for service; many of which were not officially responded to) and shelter intakes coming from these communities. Using this methodology, the chart below outlines what these costs looked like in 2008 for Shoreline:

2008 Field Service Calls	Percent of Total Field Calls	Field Cost	Animal Shelter Intake	Percent of Shelter Animals	Shelter Cost	Licensing Cost	Total Animal Care and Control Cost
509	4.36%	\$94,507	148	1.48%	\$34,533	\$48,462	\$177,502

It is important underscore again however, that this is not an accurate accounting of the total cost of service provided to Shoreline for the reasons mentioned above. These figures have been included in this report as a starting point only so that Council may get a sense of the magnitude of the costs. Under any service model, it is anticipated that Shoreline's cost of providing this service will be greater than these rough numbers. As the analysis of the animal control service models has not yet been completed, it is unknown at this time what system costs will realistically look like.

Revenue:

In 2008, the amount of license fee revenue collected by King County from Shoreline residents was \$97,010. In 2009, this amount increased to \$183,128, an 88.8% increase. The reasons for the significant increase in collected revenue between 2008 and 2009 relate to both an increase in license fees and the number of licenses collected, as just mentioned. In 2009, the fee for altered dog and cat licenses increased from \$20 to \$30, and unaltered dog and cat licenses increased from \$60 to \$90. For a breakdown of collected license fee revenue, please see Attachment A.

POTENTIAL ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICE PROVISION MODELS:

As King County first announced their intention to alter how animal control services have been provided to contract cities, staff felt that looking at options for how to provide this service going forward would provide the Council with the cost and benefit information necessary to make an informed decision. To begin this analysis, staff began researching not only how King County currently provides animal control services to cities, as is outlined in this report, but also how other jurisdictions provide this service. In King County, only the cities of Seattle, Renton, Des Moines and Normandy Park have their own Animal Control officers. In Snohomish County, some cities have their own in-house animal control service, such as the City of Edmonds, but others contract with Snohomish County or other entities for this service.

In reviewing how this service is provided around the region, five potential alternatives were initially determined to be potentially feasible for how the City could provide this service to our residents:

- Provide the service in-house
- Provide the service through a regional King County model
- Provide the service through a sub-regional consortium model of north King County cities (Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell and Woodinville)
- Provide the service through a contract with the City of Seattle
- Provide the service through a contract with the City of Edmonds

After further discussions with both the City of Seattle and the City Edmonds, it was determined that contracting with these jurisdictions would not be preferable. Although both the City of Seattle and Edmonds were very willing to share information and provide insight into how their animal control systems operate, working through the necessary authorizing environments to move a contract forward given the tight time frame cities are working under did not seem feasible.

The City Seattle for instance, as a jurisdiction that does not currently contract with any City for Animal Control services and does not typically provide contractual service across the policy spectrum, was very reluctant to begin any sort of contractual discussion. Similarly, the City of Edmonds, although potentially more willing to enter a contractual relationship, did not seem to have the capacity to take on a jurisdiction such as Shoreline which would more than double their service area. For all of these reasons, as well as limited staff capacity to provide a very broad analysis of all five options, the latter two options have been dropped from the analysis.

The remaining three options continue to be explored, with cost models built around each option. The general service models as currently conceived are as follows:

Provide Service In-House:

- Hire Shoreline Animal Control officer for field services work; administratively housed and supported in the Shoreline Police Department
- Utilize private sector pet licensing vendor or King County licensing service (if available as a stand-alone service) for pet licensing
- Contract with the Progressive Animal Welfare Society (PAWS), located in Lynnwood, for animal sheltering services

Provide Service through Regional King County Model:

- Contract with King County for a full cost recovery field services contract, which would most likely provide a dedicated King County Animal Control officer in a north county service area including the City of Shoreline
- Contract with King County for a full cost recovery animal licensing contract
- Contract with PAWS for animal sheltering services or have animal sheltering provided by King County on a full cost recovery basis

Provide Service through North King County Sub-regional Model:

- Hire Animal Control officers to provide service to north King County cities; determine governance and administrative needs of this consortium model
- Utilize private sector pet licensing vendor or King County licensing service (if available as a stand-alone service) for pet licensing
- Contract with the PAWS for animal sheltering services

Progressive Animal Welfare Society (PAWS):

It is plain to see that in all of these proposed service models, staff is recommending that animal sheltering be provided by PAWS. PAWS, which is located about a 20 minute drive north of Shoreline in Lynnwood, is a non-profit community shelter partner that shelters homeless animals, rehabilitates injured and orphaned wildlife, and provides community education and legislative action on animal welfare and care issues. PAWS was founded in 1967 and has a vision of being the leading voice for animals in Washington State and a recognized leader in the nation for their progressive outreach and education programs, legislative work, and premier wildlife rehabilitation and companion animal services.

Through staff investigation of the shelter providers in the area (of which there are three available to us – PAWS, the King County Animal Shelter in Kent, and the Seattle Humane Society Shelter in Bellevue), PAWS seems to have achieved their vision and has consistently ranked as a model service provider and organization. PAWS has an excellent reputation in the animal control and animal welfare communities, and also has experience contracting with municipalities for shelter services. Additionally, PAWS has provided us preliminary rate information for use of their shelter, which although not final, are extremely competitive with the other providers.

Even if the King County regional model is the desired model to use for the provision of animal control services, the County has stated that the capacity of their shelter would need to downgrade and that the non-profit shelter partners (PAWS and the Seattle Humane Society) would need to be a part of the regional animal shelter solution. Although it is still undetermined how sheltering will be structured in the regional model, and thus challenging to provide certainties at this point, staff is strongly recommending that the City continue to explore a contractual relationship with PAWS for sheltering services. Regardless of how field services and licensing services are provided going forward, staff is confident that the provider of these services will be able to coordinate with PAWS on systemic animal control issues if the regional model for animal control services is the preferred alternative.

CONTINUED ANALYSIS:

To continue moving this analysis forward, staff is engaging in multiple efforts to develop these system models that identify service levels and system costs. Specifically, staff is participating with several other cities and King County in a staff work group looking at the regional animal services model. The work group's purpose is to develop a policy approach for a regional animal control system and a system model that identifies service expectations, costs, and cost allocation. For the Purpose and Scope and Working Principles of this work group, please see Attachment B. In addition to this regional work group, staff is also meeting with staff from the cities of Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell and Woodinville to develop the outline of the sub-regional model, and is using information gained through both of these endeavors and earlier research to develop the in-house cost model.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

As the analysis of the animal control service model options is not yet complete, it is undetermined at this time what the specific financial impact will be to the City. However, as King County is currently subsidizing the provision of this service from their general fund, it is anticipated that Shoreline's cost of providing this service, if provided in-house, provided regionally on a full cost recovery basis, or provided sub-regionally by a consortium of north King County cities, will most likely increase.

RECOMMENDATION:

No action is required. This report presents potential options for Council discussion and future consideration.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – 2008 and 2009 Pet License Data and Associated Revenue

Attachment B – King County Staff Working Group Purpose and Scope Statement and Working Principles

Attachment A:

2008 and 2009 Pet License Data and Revenue Collected

Pet License Type	Dog/Cat	2008 Licensed	2008 Fee	2008 Total	2009 Licensed	2009 Fee	2009 Total
Altered	Dog	2,718	\$20	\$54,360	3,406	\$30	\$102,180
	Cat	1,555	\$20	\$31,100	1,932	\$30	\$57,960
Unaltered	Dog	167	\$60	\$10,020	186	\$90	\$16,740
	Cat	1	\$60	\$60	25	\$90	\$2,250
Juvenile	Dog	56	\$5	\$280	120	\$5	\$600
	Cat	26	\$5	\$130	46	\$5	\$230
Senior: New	*Dog	38	\$20	\$760	96	\$20	\$1,920
	Cat	25	\$12	\$300	104	\$12	\$1,248
Senior: Renew	Dog	549	\$0	\$0	601	\$0	\$0
	Cat	522	\$0	\$0	528	\$0	\$0
Service	Dog	12	\$0	\$0	15	\$0	\$0
	Cat	2	\$0	\$0	3	\$0	\$0
Total:	Dog	3,540		\$65,420	4,424		\$121,440
	Cat	2,131		\$31,590	2,638		\$61,688
Total:	Altered	4,273	\$20	\$85,460	5,338	\$30	\$160,140
	Unaltered	168	\$60	\$10,080	211	\$90	\$18,990
	Juvenile	82	\$5	\$410	166	\$5	\$830
	Senior	1,134	\$20/\$12	\$1,060	1,329	\$20/\$12	\$3,168
	Service	14	\$0	\$0	18	\$0	\$0
Total Dogs and Cats Licensed/Revenue Collected		5,671		\$97,010	7,062		\$183,128

Attachment B:

2010 King County/Cities Work Group for Regional Animal Services Purpose and Scope Statement *Adopted February 3, 2010*

The Animal Services Work Group will:

1. By February 10, 2010, develop a statement of interests and determine whether there is sufficient consensus represented to proceed to the next step.
2. By March 31, 2010, develop a recommended agreement in principle and process for contract development.
 - a. The recommended agreement in principle will include a policy approach for a regional system and system model identifying service expectations, costing information and cost allocation recommendations.
 - b. The recommended process for developing a contract will identify the steps necessary to develop a contract.
 - c. The agreement in principle and contract development process will be provided to the chief executive officers of all cities (other than Seattle) and the county by April 1, 2010, for review and assessment of interest in pursuing development of a contract based on the proposed model by April 30, 2010.
3. By April 1, 2010 begin developing a contract for regional animal services. By April 30, 2010, determine whether there is sufficient interest in pursuing development of a contract based on the proposed model.
4. By May 15, 2010, complete a consensus contract for distribution to the cities and county for a regional system of animal services from the County effective July 1, 2010. This contract will acknowledge the near term challenges created by the projected end of the useful life of the County's Kent animal shelter while also addressing the need for longer-term system sustainability.

The Work Group will convene a larger group of city stakeholders to review progress and issues.

The agreement in principle and form of contract will provide for a regional system for animal control, sheltering and licensing services in all areas of King County outside the City of Seattle, and will include action steps necessary for accomplishing a longer-term regional strategy. Sub-regional service options may be discussed by the Work Group and may be included in the regional services model and recommended regional strategy.

The agreement in principle, contract and longer-term strategy will incorporate recommendations for a regional model at least with respect to the following components and with appropriate incentives to support desired financial and program outcomes:

1. Animal sheltering and care service delivery and funding
2. Animal control service delivery and funding
3. Pet licensing services and funding

2010 King County/Cities Work Group for Regional Animal Services Working Principles

Adopted February 3, 2010

Work Group Participants

- King County
- Cities of Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, Redmond, Bellevue, SeaTac, Tukwila, and Kent

Discussions

The participants agree to meet every week with the goal of developing a potential regional animal services model for King County and individual cities to consider.

All participants agree that the approach to developing a potential regional model will be interest based and that if a regional model is to work, the solution must provide mutual advantage to King County and cities.

It is the mutual goal of the participants to conclude the discussions by March 31, 2010 with an agreement in principle for regional animal services, including a recommended model, services and service level, costs and cost allocation. A potential contract based on the agreement in principle will be developed by May 15, 2010.

The Work Group will consist of King County staff designated by the Executive's Office and city staff from several cities in each of the geographic regions (north, east and south); however, information generated by and for the Work Group will be provided by King County to all cities. The King County Executive's Office is the coordinator for this work effort and will keep all interested parties informed throughout the process.

It is understood that the participant cities have no authority to represent any other cities. The participants will reach out to non-Work Group cities as deemed necessary by the participants to help inform and seek feedback and input on the proposed models under discussion.

King County will convene meetings of non-Work Group cities, as the Work Group deems necessary, to provide updates and to seek feedback and input on proposed models under discussion. Regular briefings regarding the Work Group and its discussions may be provided to the King County Council, City Councils, city managers and other potential groups. Such briefings are beneficial to disseminating information and seeking feedback on the work of the group.

Work Group participants agree to inform and coordinate with other participants if press contacts are made.

It is understood that King County and each City will need to make a determination on their own about whether to participate in a regional animal services model. It is acknowledged that many cities are evaluating individual and/or sub-regional models at the same time that this work will occur to compare with a regional model, and these individual and/or sub-regional models may ultimately be part of a regional model.

Agendas will be set for each meeting at the conclusion of the previous meeting.

Support materials will be made available in advance of each meeting, so that all participants can review the documentation before discussion. Distribution by electronic mail is the preferred method.

Written meeting summaries will be sent to the Work Group for review, and Work Group members will be provided a one-day review period before the finalized written summaries are provided to the non-Work Group cities.

Work Group Participants

Cities			
John Norris	Shoreline	Management Analyst	City Manager's Office
David Cline	Lake Forest Park	City Administrator	Mayor's Office
Nina Rivkin	Redmond	Chief Policy Advisor	Mayor's Office
Diane Carlson	Bellevue	Director Intergovernmental Relations	City Manager's Office
Alison Bennett (alt)	Bellevue	Policy Advisor	City Manager's Office
Soraya Lowry	SeaTac	Program Manager	City Manager's Office
Shawn Hunstock	Tukwila	Director	Finance Department
Jeff Watling	Kent	Director	Parks, Recreation and Community Services
County			
Carrie Cihak	King County	Director of Strategic Initiatives	Office of King County Executive Dow Constantine
Kendall LeVan	King County	Program Analyst	Office of Strategic Planning and Performance Management
Karen Reed		Consultant	Working for King County