

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Animal Control Service Options and Contract
DEPARTMENT: CMO
PRESENTED BY: John Norris, Management Analyst

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

King County will be terminating the City's existing contract for animal control services effective June 30, 2010. To determine how to provide animal control services after this date, 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. Three service and cost models were analyzed and are described in this report: a Regional King County model, a Sub-regional Consortium model of North King County cities, and an In-house service delivery model. These three models have also been evaluated by the following evaluation criteria to help the Council provide guidance on which service delivery model to implement: cost, level of service, depth of service and ease of implementation.

By April 30, the City must inform King County if we are interested participating in the Regional King County model. The Council also has the option of entering into a six month transitional contract with King County until another service delivery model can be implemented. Staff is requesting that the Council provide direction on whether the City should participate in the Regional King County model. If however the direction is not to participate in this model or to use the six month transition option, staff is also requesting that Council determine which alternative service delivery model to implement.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Although the financial impact of any of the models analyzed in this report will vary with both the future use of the system and the future number of pet licenses sold, the net cost figures provided in the Cost Model Analysis section of this staff report provide the best estimation of the financial impact of the analyzed service delivery models on the City's General Fund.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council direct the City Manager to pursue the King County Regional model for animal control. However, if enough cities in the current Regional model decide not to participate in the model, therefore making the model much less affordable for the City of Shoreline or removing this as a feasible option altogether, staff recommends that City Council direct the City Manager to pursue the North Sub-regional model as a secondary option. Council will have another opportunity however to revisit this secondary decision if necessary.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney _____

INTRODUCTION:

On February 22, 2010, staff provided a briefing to the City Council on how animal control services are currently provided in Shoreline. The briefing also noted that the interlocal agreement between the City and King County that establishes this contract service will be terminated effective June 30, 2010 as per the King County Council (the City Manager received notice of this termination on March 26, 2010.)

Also stated during this briefing was information regarding a Regional animal control system that could potentially supplant the existing County service model. This model, which would have to be created, negotiated and implemented by June 30th, would provide animal control services to both the County and a feasible number of cities participating in the system, and would be paid for by all parties on a "full cost recovery" basis. Additionally, it was stated that staff would conduct an analysis of the other options for how the City could provide this service to the residents of Shoreline and what the related costs would be. This would provide the Council with cost model information in order to compare the Regional King County model with the other proposed service delivery models. The options that were identified include:

- providing the service through a Regional King County model,
- providing the service through a Sub-regional Consortium model of North King County cities (Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell and Woodinville), or
- providing the service in-house.

The following staff report provides this analysis and identifies the costs associated with each of these models. Also included in this report is information regarding the City's contract with the Progressive Animal Welfare Society (PAWS) and evaluation criteria that Council may want to consider when making a decision about which service delivery model to implement.

PROGRESSIVE ANIMAL WELFARE SOCIETY (PAWS):

As noted in the prior staff report on animal control, all three service delivery models utilize PAWS as the animal shelter provider for Shoreline residents. PAWS has an excellent reputation in the animal control and animal welfare communities, and also has experience contracting with municipalities for animal shelter services. Additionally, PAWS has provided us an animal intake rate of \$145 per animal for use of their shelter, which is extremely competitive with the other shelter providers in the region.

For these reasons, the City has entered into a contract with PAWS for animal shelter services which will formally begin on May 1, 2010. The contract, which runs through the remainder of 2010, is structured as a fee for service contract, where the City is only charged a \$145 intake fee if a Shoreline animal enters the facility. Given that this contract was not brought to Council for 2010, the contract has a "do not exceed" amount of \$50,000 for this year only. Staff is hopeful that this initial pilot term of the contract will go well, and that we will be bringing back a longer term multi-year shelter contract to the City Council near the end of this year for Council's consideration and adoption. The PAWS contract Scope of Work can be provided upon request.

PAWS has also asked that all five cities in North King County that will be contracting with them begin to use their facility in a phased approach, as the middle of summer is their busy season and adding animals from five new contract cities will take some adjustment time. Messaging regarding this change in the City's shelter provider has

been provided in the April edition of *Currents*, and staff will continue to provide this information to the public through our standard communication channels throughout and after this transition process.

PAWS Costs:

Given Shoreline's past animal shelter usage with King County and the \$145 PAWS intake fee, initial estimates for the cost of using PAWS was around \$22,000 per year. However, given the closer proximity of the PAWS shelter to Shoreline and the familiarity that many people in the region have with PAWS, staff felt that past shelter intake numbers probably would not capture actual shelter usage rates going forward. Thus, if this usage number is increased by 30%, the cost of the PAWS shelter contract would actually be \$28,369 per year (see table below).

Shelter (PAWS) Cost			
2-Year Average (08-09) of Number of Shoreline Animal Intakes into King County Shelter	30% Estimated Increase in Shelter Population Due to PAWS Proximity and Familiarity in the Community	PAWS Shelter Rate	PAWS Shelter Cost
151	196	\$145	\$28,369

It should be noted however that this 30% estimated increase in usage is based on anecdotal information, and may vary greatly once Shoreline begins using PAWS as a shelter partner. Thus, it is very difficult to know at this point what actual shelter usage numbers will look like in the future. If the City were to be more conservative and project a 50% increase in shelter usage over the past usage numbers, costs would rise to \$32,734 per year.

ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS:

In reviewing how animal control services are provided around the region, five initial alternatives were determined to be potentially feasible for how the City could provide this service to our residents. These include the three service delivery models identified as options in this staff report and contract models with the City of Seattle and the City of Edmonds. After further discussions with both the City of Seattle and the City of Edmonds, it was determined that contracting with these jurisdictions would not be feasible. The following sections of this staff report describe the remaining service delivery models and provide one-time and ongoing cost information for them.

Regional King County Model:

Beginning in the fall of 2009, staff began participating with several other cities and King County staff to look at how animal control is provided in King County and what the systemic issues are with the current way service is provided. After much of this introductory work, staff began working with a smaller work group that included King County staff and a few cities that were geographically dispersed throughout the County. This smaller work group, which began meeting at the beginning of this year, developed the Regional King County model, which includes service expectations, system costs, and a cost allocation methodology. A Purpose and Scope and Working Principles document of this work group were included in the February 22 staff report.

The Regional King County model would be administered and operated by the King County Animal Care and Control Division and would provide animal control field

services, sheltering services and licensing services to 30 cities in King County and to residents of unincorporated King County. This proposed model is anticipated to field between 10,000 and 11,000 service calls per year, shelter around 7,500 animals per year, and license almost 120,000 animals per year at a total system cost of roughly \$5.6 million.

Regional Interlocal Agreement:

To buy into the Regional model, cities would have to enter into a new interlocal agreement with King County that would have an initial two and half year term (July 1, 2010-December 31, 2012), but would also have an six month termination clause that could be used by cities on day one of the contract. This six month clause would provide cities transition coverage while another service delivery option is being implemented.

Also as part of the Interlocal Agreement, cities would have to purchase all three animal control services from the County under this model (field, shelter and licensing), except for the North King County cities, which would have their shelter provided by PAWS. The caveat to this "no sheltering" charge for North end cities, including Shoreline, is that these cities would have to pay a regional sheltering charge for the King County Shelter in Kent that is equal to one-half the population-based sheltering charge identified in the cost allocation. This charge serves to cover some of the regional benefits of having a region animal control shelter, such as felony animal cruelty case necropsies, as well as share in some of the system costs. This cost share potentially keeps the regional model viable for cities in South King County.

Additionally, the County has also provided transitional funding for those cities with high net costs per capita and low license revenue per capita to keep the model viable for those cities. This transitional funding, which will begin in full in 2011 and step down on an annual basis until 2014, is primarily is targeted at South King County cities, with some funding going to cities in East King County. Shoreline will receive no transitional funding in this model.

Regional Field and Licensing Services:

The following section describes how field services and licensing services will be provided in the Regional King County model:

Staffing - To provide animal control field services, the County would be divided into four districts, each staffed by a dedicated King County Animal Control Officer (ACO), five days a week, eight hours a day. To see a map of the four animal control field service districts, please see Attachment A. Two additional on-call ACOs would be available to cover sick leave, vacation and other coverage issues, and an Animal Control Sergeant would provide oversight of and back-up for the ACOs. Finally, the system would provide for an animal cruelty expert who would investigate and prepare cruelty cases across the County.

Service Call Response - Three dedicated staff members would answer calls for service in the system call center five days a week, eight hours a day. High priority calls received by the call center staff, such as emergent animal bites, emergent vicious dogs, emergent injured animals, police assist calls, emergent loose livestock calls, and animal cruelty calls, would be dispatched to the appropriate ACO and receive a physical response by an ACO with a median response time of four hours (response times would

be dependent on the type of call, location, and time of year.) This has been an issue in the past, as many of the calls for service from Shoreline residents have received a very high response time or no response at all.

Enhanced Animal Control Service in North King County - To receive a higher level of service than we have been receiving historically, all north end cities had pushed for at least two ACOs (80 hours per week) per district in the Regional King County model. However, at the request of other cities to keep the cost of the model as low as possible, it was agreed that just one ACO (40 hours per week) would provide field services per district, as can be seen in the base staffing model above. To consent to this staffing model, North King County cities asked the County for the ability to have an “enhanced services contract” with the County for an extra ACO that the cities would pay for. The County agreed with this request if all cities in a contiguous area would be willing to share the cost of an additional ACO. The five North King County cities have shown interest in this, and thus, this cost is being included as an add-on to the cost model.

Licensing - The regional licensing system will be provided by roughly six King County staff members who will focus on license renewals, the management of license sales partners, license incentive and marketing programs, on-line pet license sales, pet owner education, and overall license administration. New to this model that is not in place currently would be a Sales and Marketing Manager, who would be dedicated to increasing licensing rates system-wide through marketing campaigns and partnerships in the community.

For tables that outline the pieces of the regional system, including the King County sheltering service, and for the outline of the terms of an Agreement in Principle that will be the basis of a Regional King County animal control interlocal agreement, please see Attachment B.

Regional Model Costs and Cost Allocation:

To divide up the total \$5.6 million Regional model cost, the King County staff work group spent a great deal of time creating an allocation model that was both fair and had the best chance at making the Regional model viable; i.e., keeping the “high cost” cities, which are predominately located in South King County, in the model. The outcome of these discussions was a cost allocation based 50% on system usage and 50% on jurisdiction population. The exception to this is the sheltering cost for North King County cities, where we are being charged for the “regional sheltering charge” as noted earlier. To see how system costs are allocated across all jurisdictions, please see Attachment C.

Not included in the King County cost allocation however are the PAWS costs for North King County cities, which are identified in the PAWS section of this staff report, and the cost for the enhanced ACO for the five north end cities. The following table outlines all of these costs:

King County Regional Cost Model - City of Shoreline						
King County Animal Control Cost Allocation	King County Sheltering Charge	King County Pet Licensing Cost Allocation	Total King County Cost Allocation	PAWS Shelter Cost	Enhanced Animal Control Officer Cost Allocation	Total System Cost
\$71,289	\$37,036	\$46,034	\$154,359	\$28,369	\$59,651	\$242,379

Furthermore, if 2009 King County license revenue is added, the net cost, or the amount the City would have to pay out of our General Fund to pay for this regional system, is detailed in the table below. The table also outlines what the revenue and the net cost would look like if the amount of revenue collected increases by 15%. This is being included in this staff report as King County has stated that this is an increase they believe that they can reasonably achieve through increased marketing, sales partnerships, canvassing and other efforts.

King County Regional Cost Model - Shoreline Animal Control Revenue and General Fund Differential			
2009 Licensing Revenue	Licensing Revenue Assuming 15% Increase over 2009 License Revenue	Difference Between 2009 Revenue and Total System Cost	Difference Between Inflated 2009 Revenue (15% increase) and Total System Cost
\$189,347	\$217,749	-\$53,032	-\$24,630

It should also be noted that although this Regional model is a viable option at this point, if a city or grouping of cities, especially high use cities, decide to not participate in this model, the model may not be feasible and may cease to exist as an option for Shoreline. Once it is determined which jurisdictions are interested in participating in the Regional model, the model size must be reconfigured and the costs must be reallocated (if any cities opt out). All cities have been given until April 30, 2010 to let King County know if they are opting in or opting out of this model. If enough cities decide not to participate, and a percentage of the remaining system costs shift to those cities that do, these new costs may be so great that the system would now be unaffordable for any city. This is a distinct possibility with the Regional model, especially given the fact that for cities in South King County (and to a lesser extent cities in East King County), the current model has significantly high net costs. If the reconfigured Regional model is acceptable and affordable to the remaining cities in the model (those that have opted in), cities must tell King County to move forward with the new Regional model by May 15, 2010, and the Regional interlocal agreement would need to be brought back to Council for approval sometime thereafter.

Provide Service through North King County Sub-regional Model:

Although starting a little later than the regional animal control effort, staff began participating with staff from the four other cities in North King County (Lake Forest Park, Kenmore, Bothell and Woodinville) to look at a sub-regional animal control system to see if there would be benefit in working across jurisdictional boundaries to provide this service. The outcome of this work effort is a proposed North Sub-regional model that would be administered and operated by a lead jurisdictional agency to provide animal control field services and licensing services to the residents of the five cities. Similar to the other options in this report, animal shelter would be provided by PAWS. This proposed model is anticipated to field between 1,000 and 1,100 service calls per year, shelter between 350 to 500 animals per year, and license almost 18,000 animals per year at a total system cost of roughly \$475,000.

Sub-regional Field and Licensing Services:

The following section describes how field services and licensing services will be provided in the North King County Sub-regional model:

Staffing - The North Sub-regional model would be staffed by two ACOs who would provide services seven days a week, 10 hours a day. This service level would be provided by staffing each ACO four days a week, 10 hours per day, where there would be one "overlap" day for one ACO to work in the office on paperwork and other non-field related duties. In the event that an ACO is absent due to vacation, sick time, or some other absence, the service level would be reduced accordingly.

The ACOs would be primarily responsible for responding to animal related calls for service and animal related investigations, and would also provide proactive animal management services. The ACOs would be limited commission law enforcement personnel so that they would have the ability to issue necessary citations and file any applicable criminal charges if a case warranted that level of enforcement. The manager for the program would be assigned within the lead agency's police department to a division commander or operations manager, and daily supervision of the officers would be assigned to the administrative police sergeant or other similar position. After hours and weekend response would be provided by the local Police Department where the service call originated from on an emergency basis.

Service Call Response and System Coordination – For this model to function effectively, an administrator must serve as a point of contact with residents looking to obtain animal control services as well as liaison between the various pieces of the system. This role would be filled by the Animal Control Liaison Records Clerk who would be the lead coordinator for and connection point between the cities and the ACOs. The Clerk would take in all initial calls for service and would send them to dispatch as necessary. The Clerk would also be the contract coordinator with PetData for licensing services and PAWS for shelter services. Finally, the Clerk would coordinate marketing and licensing efforts to ensure license fees remain stable and increase over time, as well as troubleshoot issues and take on other duties as assigned.

Field Service Dispatch – Although many service calls are expected to be handled over the phone by the Liaison Records Clerk, for those calls which require a field response by the ACOs, the Clerk would use a currently existing dispatch service to send the call to the ACOs. Two dispatch services are currently used in North King County, and which one is used would depend on who the lead agency is (Bothell Dispatch, used by Lake Forest Park and Bothell, or King County Dispatch, used by Shoreline, Kenmore and Woodinville).

Licensing - The Sub-regional licensing system will be provided by PetData, a private licensing vendor serving local jurisdictions across the country. PetData is the largest animal licensing organization in the U.S. and is the only private company currently providing animal licensing services to municipalities. PetData currently administers animal licensing programs for thirty-one municipalities in the U.S. and licensed approximately 440,000 animals in 2008 and roughly 500,000 in 2009. In Washington State, the City of Lakewood uses PetData to manage their animal licensing program.

To provide this service to the North King County cities, PetData will charge \$3.95 per license issued with a very minimal start-up fee. More information on PetData, including a draft contract scope of work, can be provided upon request

Sub-regional Interlocal Agreement and Contracts:

To establish the Sub-regional model, all five North King County cities would have to enter into a new interlocal agreement with each other to formally establish how the system would function, who would be responsible for operating the system, what system oversight would look like, how system costs would be allocated, etc. Due to time constraints, uncertainty of what the policy direction from Council will be and uncertainty surrounding the overall viability of the Regional King County model, much of this detailed interlocal agreement work has not been completed. For decision making purposes however, a cost model and cost allocation have been provided which would serve as the basis for much of the work that would need to be accomplished in a Sub-regional interlocal agreement. This interlocal agreement would need to be brought back to Council for approval. Additionally, a service contract would need to be entered into with PetData so that they could provide pet licensing services on behalf of the City of Shoreline.

Sub-regional Cost Model and Cost Allocation:

The \$475,000 Sub-regional system cost is built off of three primary cost centers: the cost to provide field services for the five cities partnering in the sub-regional model cost, the cost for PAWS to shelter animals, and the cost for PetData to license animals and manage the license renewal process. The tables below highlight these costs for the City of Shoreline for both the 2010 transition year and for a full year of service in 2011. The 2010 transition year includes six months of operational costs (July 1 – December 31, 2010) as well as the start-up capital costs it will require to implement the system.

It should also be noted that up-front staff time needed to implement this model has not been calculated in this analysis. Although this staff time will not be “paid for” by the City, as this staff time will be provided by currently employed staff, the opportunity costs of this staff time will be considerable. However, ongoing staff time and other overhead charges such as office space and utilities, insurance, supervisory staff time, internal services such as Human Resources, Information Technology, etc., and ACO training expenses have been included, as these overhead costs will have to be assumed by all five cities in the model. To see the full Sub-regional model and cost allocation for field services, please see Attachment D.

North Sub-Regional Cost Model - 2010 (6 months of costs + start-up)			
Field Services Cost Allocation	PAWS Shelter Cost	License Costs	City of Shoreline North Sub-regional Cost Allocation
\$127,941	\$14,185	\$13,305	\$155,430

North Sub-Regional Cost Model – 2011 (12 months of costs)			
Field Services Cost Allocation	PAWS Shelter Cost	License Costs	City of Shoreline North Sub-regional Cost Allocation
\$164,257	\$28,369	\$26,610	\$219,237

Similar to the Regional model analysis, the tables below highlight the net cost of this system if 2009 King County license revenue is added in. These net costs are shown for both the transition year (2010), which only shows six months worth of revenues, and for

the out years (2011). However, not shown on these tables are the net costs if revenues are increased by 15%, as achieving an increase of this size may be very challenging, given the fewer system resources, less staff time to implement license marketing strategies, and potential confusion around the new animal control system and licensing program.

2010 North Sub-Regional Cost Model - Revenue and General Fund Differential		
½ 2009 Shoreline Licensing Revenue	2010 System Cost	Difference Between ½ 2009 Revenue and System Cost
\$94,673	\$155,430	-\$60,757

2010 North Sub-Regional Cost Model - Revenue and General Fund Differential		
2009 Shoreline Licensing Revenue	2011 System Cost	Difference Between 2009 Revenue and System Cost
\$189,347	\$219,237	-\$29,890

In-house Service Model:

The third model in this analysis is for the City of Shoreline to provide this service ourselves. This model provides the most control for our City, as we would not be dependent on other cities to partner with us, but we would lose any economies of scale that may exist with the other larger models, as well as a depth of service that comes with more personnel servicing our residents. The proposed In-house model would be administered and operated by the Shoreline Police Department with support from the City Clerk's Office and City Manager's Office. Animal shelter would be provided by PAWS, and animal licensing and renewal would be provided by PetData. In this model, it is anticipated that we would take in between 500 and 600 service calls per year, shelter between 150 to 200 animals per year, and license around 7,000 animals per year at a total system cost of roughly \$240,000, which includes an estimation of the indirect overhead costs that would be assumed by existing Shoreline staff.

Other Local Government In-house Animal Control Service Costs:

One question asked by Council during the February 22 Council meeting related to the costs of animal control systems provided by other jurisdictions that provide this service in-house. As part of the North King County work group, staff from the City of Shoreline and from other cities collected the following system cost data from other cities:

Jurisdiction	Annual Animal Control System Cost
Des Moines	\$123,737
Seattle	\$3.3 million
Edmonds	\$276,715
Renton	\$220,756
Lynnwood	\$410,273
Everett	\$1,648,328
Federal Way	\$337,500 (Proposed)

What is important to note about these system costs is that many of the cities shown here did not include staff overhead and system management in their total cost figures. For instance, the \$123,737 cost for the City of Des Moines comes directly from their budget, and they were not able to calculate all of their overhead and other costs outside of this budgeted line item. Similarly, the City of Edmonds \$220,756 costs reflects only direct costs of personnel, equipment, vehicle replacement, etc., and also does not include supervisory and administrative support costs. Thus, these system cost numbers should be viewed as a helpful benchmark to use against our In-house model costs, but should not be viewed as a direct comparable, given that staff has tried to include as many real costs in the Shoreline In-house model as possible.

In-house Field and Licensing Services:

The following section describes how field services and licensing services will be provided by the City of Shoreline:

Staffing - The In-house Shoreline model would be staffed by one ACO who would provide services 40 hours per week, most likely providing service five days per week for eight hours per day. In the event that the ACO is absent due to vacation, sick time, or some other absence, service would only be provided on an emergency basis by Shoreline Police.

Similar to the Sub-regional model, the ACO would be a limited commission law enforcement officer and would primarily be responsible for responding to animal related calls for service and animal related investigations, as well as provide proactive animal management services when available. The Shoreline Police Chief or Captain would manage the animal control program with daily supervision of the ACO assigned to the Administrative Police Sergeant within Shoreline Police. After hours and weekend response would be provide by Shoreline Police officers on an emergency basis.

Service Call Response and System Coordination – There would be no centralized administrator for the animal control program, but a few points of contact that would serve as liaisons between the various pieces of the system. The Shoreline Police front desk staff would provide call in-take for all initial calls for service and would send calls requiring a field response by the ACO to King County dispatch. The Police front desk staff would also liaison between the ACO, Administrative Sergeant and Police Chief or Captain if there were problems or issues to troubleshoot and address. Front desk staff may also be supplemented with police volunteers if the call volume and work load necessitated additional human resources.

The City Clerk's office would serve as the contract coordinator with PetData and would provide oversight of the licensing program, and provide license education and marketing when available. These responsibilities will be managed by various staff members within the Clerk's Office. The City Manager's Office would oversee the PAWS contract and would help with overall system coordination between the Police Department, the shelter provider (PAWS), the Clerk's office and the license provider (PetData).

In-house Cost Model:

Similar to the Sub-regional model, the In-house model is built off the same three primary cost centers: field services, PAWS, and PetData. However, a fourth cost center, indirect overhead costs, has also been included as noted earlier. This is a cost

estimation of the ongoing staff time it will take to manage this system internally. Although these costs will not be paid for, as the staff time that makes up the source of these costs will be provided by existing City staff, to have a fair comparison between the service delivery models, it is helpful to quantify these costs and include them in the analysis. It should also be noted that similar to the Sub-regional model, staff time implementation costs (one time costs) have *not* been calculated in this analysis.

The tables below highlight the costs for the City of Shoreline for both the 2010 transition year and for a full year of service in 2011. To see the full In-house cost model, please see Attachment E.

Shoreline Cost Model - 2010 (6 months of costs + start-up)					
Field Services Cost Allocation	PAWS Shelter Cost	License Costs	Indirect Overhead Costs	City of Shoreline System Cost	City of Shoreline System Cost (With Overhead)
\$108,819	\$14,185	\$13,305	\$31,535	\$136,608	\$167,843

Shoreline Cost Model – 2011 (12 months of costs)					
Field Services Cost Allocation	PAWS Shelter Cost	License Costs	Indirect Overhead Costs	City of Shoreline System Cost	City of Shoreline System Cost (With Overhead)
\$123,637	\$28,369	\$26,610	\$63,069	\$178,617	\$241,686

If 2009 King County license revenue is added, the net cost of the In-house system is detailed in the tables below. These net costs are shown for both the transition year (2010) and for a full year of service (2011).

2010 In-House Cost Model - Revenue and General Fund Differential				
½ 2009 Shoreline Licensing Revenue	2010 System Cost	2010 System Cost (With Overhead)	Difference Between ½ 2009 Revenue and System Cost	Difference Between ½ 2009 Revenue and System Cost (With Overhead)
\$94,673	\$136,608	\$167,842	-\$41,635	-\$73,169

2011 In-House Cost Model - Revenue and General Fund Differential				
2009 Shoreline Licensing Revenue	2011 System Cost	2011 System Cost (With Overhead)	Difference Between 2009 Revenue and System Cost	Difference Between 2009 Revenue and System Cost (With Overhead)
\$189,347	\$178,617	\$241,685	+\$10,730	-\$52,339

COST MODEL ANALYSIS:

In reviewing the three cost models, the ongoing operational costs (2011 costs) and net costs (using 2009 license fee revenue) of the models are as follows:

Cost Model Analysis – City of Shoreline			
Model	Operational Costs	Net Costs	Start-up Costs
King County Regional	\$242,379	-\$53,032	\$0
North Sub-Regional	\$219,237	-\$29,890	-\$45,812
In-house	\$178,617	+\$10,730	-\$47,000
In-house with Indirect Overhead Costs	\$241,685	-\$52,339	-\$47,000

As is clear in this side by side comparison of future ongoing costs, there is a price variation in the three models, with the Regional King County model being the most expensive. However, when the indirect overhead costs are taken into consideration in the In-house model, the system costs between this model and the Regional model are almost the same. When looking at net costs, it is hard to determine which model provides the best opportunity for the City to hold license fee revenues at least constant with 2009 revenues, if not increase them. King County has stated that they feel they can achieve a 15% increase in license fee revenue in the Regional model. Staff is not as confident that this increase can be achieved in the In-house or Sub-regional model, and thus, net costs are being based off of 2009 revenue only.

The other cost consideration in this analysis is start-up costs. As can be seen in this table, the "hard" start-up costs are very similar for Shoreline for both the In-house and Sub-regional models, with no start-up costs in the Regional model. This is due to a smaller and less expensive animal control vehicle and animal cargo box system being purchased in the In-house model. Staff felt that this would be an area where we could cut start-up costs in this model to bring it more in-line with the Sub-Regional model.

As noted earlier, staff time to implement all three models has not been included in the analysis, although it is assumed that there will be a considerable amount more staff time devoted to implementing the In-house or Sub-region model than the Regional King County model, as much of the contracting, interlocal agreement and operating procedure work will be done by County staff, and no hiring, equipment purchase, or other operational transition work will need to occur.

Evaluation Criteria:

Although cost is probably the predominant consideration in choosing which model to implement, it should be viewed as just one evaluation criteria. The other significant criteria that staff has tried to evaluate these models by is ease of implementation, service level provided, and depth of service. The following matrix highlights the four evaluation criteria, and staff's evaluation of each model:

Evaluation Criteria Matrix				
Model	Operational Cost	Difficulty of Implementation	Service Level Provided	Service Depth Provided
KC Regional	Medium-High	Low	Medium	High
North Sub-regional	Medium	Medium	Medium-High	Medium-Low
In-house	Medium-Low	High	Medium-Low	Low
In-house with Indirect Overhead	Medium-High	High	Medium-Low	Low

The outcome of this matrix evaluation is that the Regional King County model, although more expensive than the other models, scores high amongst the other criteria. It is by far the easiest model to implement, and the benefits of a regional system and the economies of scale achieved by the system provide the high depth of service. This relates to ACO back-up, specialty areas such as animal cruelty investigations, and dedicated licensing marketing and sales, among others. Although the level of service, especially for field services, may be reduced with the large animal control district in the

model staffed by just one ACO, staff feels that this has been compensated for by the enhanced field services contract included in the model.

As for the In-house model, in addition to the low cost, the benefit of this model is that having our own ACO who would know our community, our parks, and our residents would provide for a higher level of service. However, there is very little depth of service in this model, and when the ACO would not be on duty, the service gaps would be considerable, and would put additional work load and strain on the Shoreline Police Department. As well, because there would be no dedicated administrator to oversee the system, service levels and system linkages may be affected, and the indirect overhead costs on existing staff would be significant. Finally, there would be a lot of difficulty in implementing the system given current staffing constraints and the short timeline.

The North Sub-regional model provides higher levels of service and service depth than the In-house model, and is also potentially easier to implement, especially if Shoreline would not be the lead agency operating the system. However, there is slightly more cost in this model than Shoreline going it alone, although it is less expensive than the Regional model. In looking at the evaluation criteria in totality, they seem to suggest that this is a superior model than providing this service in-house, although it does not provide the same level of benefit than the Region Model, especially given the implementation issues.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Although the financial impact of any of the models analyzed in this report will vary with both the future use of the system and the future number of pet licenses sold, the net cost figures provided in the Cost Model Analysis section of this staff report provide the best estimation of the financial impact of the analyzed service delivery models on the City's General Fund.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council direct the City Manager to pursue the King County Regional model for animal control. However, if enough cities in the current Regional model decide not to participate in the model, therefore making the model much less affordable for the City of Shoreline or removing this as a feasible option altogether, staff recommends that City Council direct the City Manager to pursue the North Sub-regional model as a secondary option. Council will have another opportunity however to revisit this secondary decision if necessary.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A: King County Regional Model Field Services Map
- Attachment B: King County Regional Model Outlines
- Attachment C: King County Regional Model Cost Allocation
- Attachment D: North King County Sub-regional Model and Cost Allocation
- Attachment E: In-house Shoreline Cost Model

168



Attachment B: King County Regional Model Outlines - Based-Level Field Service Model

Field Staffing	Services Provided	Service Levels	Notes/ Assumptions	Costs (2010 estimated annualized costs)
6 Total Animal Control Officers (ACOs) = 4 on-duty 5 days per week 1 Animal Control Sergeant = 1 on-duty 5 days per week 1 Animal Cruelty Sergeant = 1 on-duty 5 days per week IT Tech = shared with licensing & sheltering 1 AC Center Lead/Admin Assistant = 1 on-duty 5 days per week 2 AC Call Takers = 2 on-duty 5 days per week 12 Positions Total	<p><i>Non-Peak Season:</i> During non-peak season, officers will attempt to respond to all calls in order of priority.</p> <p><i>Peak Season:</i> Due to high call volumes during peak season (late Spring, Summer, early Fall) some lower priority calls will not be responded to at all (call takers will attempt to resolve over the phone).</p> <p>Call types include: <u>High Priority Calls (Emergent Circumstances):</u> *Animal Bite *Vicious Dog *Injured Animal *Police Assist *Loose Livestock *Animal Cruelty</p> <p><u>Lower Priority Calls:</u> *Non-emergent High Priority *Patrol Request *Trespass *Stray Dog/Cat Confined *Barking Dog *Leash Law Violation *DOA Animal</p>	<p><u>Service Districts:</u> 4 geographic animal control service districts. Each of the districts staffed with a minimum of 1 ACO for eight hours a day, 5 days a week (days TBD; referred to below as "business days").</p> <p>After-hours and weekend calls will be responded to the next business day or, when necessary, will be handled to by local police officers.</p>	<p>Some days there will be more than 4 ACOs on duty. When this occurs, the first priority for the additional ACO(s) would be responding in districts with the highest call volumes that day or backlogs of calls.</p> <p>Rural areas will receive a lower level of service than urban areas.</p> <p>Assumes annual shelter intake numbers reduced to 7,000 so service levels in shelter can be maintained with current program staffing level.</p>	<p>Direct Service Staff Costs (and FTEs): 0.4 ACC Manager/0.4 Ops Manager/0.17 IT Tech \$109,000 1.0 Sergeant/1.0 Cruelty Sergeant/6.0 AC Officers \$683,000 1.0 Admin Asst-Lead /2.0 Call Takers \$210,000 Overtime/Duty/Shift Differential \$22,000 Temp Staff \$50,000 Total: \$1,074,000</p> <p>Other Direct Service Costs: Facilities \$10,000 Medicine/Ambulance/Hospital \$25,000 Other Services (Consult, Laundry, Legal) \$80,000 Office & Other Supplies/Equipment \$11,000 Copy, Printing, Pubs & Postage \$45,000 Motorpool, Misc Trans, Cab Refurb. \$155,000 Phones, Cell, Pagers & Radio \$36,000 IT Equipment & IT Services \$58,000 Misc Direct Costs \$37,000 Total: \$457,000</p> <p>Overhead Costs: GF Overhead \$17,000 Division Overhead \$111,000 IT & Telecom Overhead \$31,000 Finance & Other \$15,000 Total: \$174,000</p>
* Except costs for overnight call dispatch by Sheriff are not included. Also excludes IT costs associated with mainframe systems (\$50,000/year), which King County will absorb.				Total Fully-Loaded Cost* \$1,705,000
				Estimated Control Revenues \$6,400
				Net Cost \$1,698,600

Attachment B: King County Regional Model Outlines - Based-Level Pet Licensing Model

Field Staffing	Services Provided	Service Levels	Notes/ Assumptions	Costs (2010 estimated annualized costs)	
6 Total Animal Control Officers (ACOs) = 4 on-duty 5 days per week 1 Animal Control Sergeant = 1 on-duty 5 days per week 1 Animal Cruelty Sergeant = 1 on-duty 5 days per week 1 IT Tech = shared with licensing & sheltering 1 AC Center Lead/Admin Assistant = 1 on-duty 5 days per week 2 AC Call Takers = 2 on-duty 5 days per week 12 Positions Total	<p><i>Non-Peak Season:</i> During non-peak season, officers will attempt to respond to all calls in order of priority.</p> <p><i>Peak Season:</i> Due to high call volumes during peak season (late Spring, Summer, early Fall) some lower priority calls will not be responded to at all (call takers will attempt to resolve over the phone).</p> <p>Call types include: <u>High Priority Calls (Emergent Circumstances):</u> *Animal Bite *Vicious Dog *Injured Animal *Police Assist *Loose Livestock *Animal Cruelty</p> <p><u>Lower Priority Calls:</u> *Non-emergent High Priority *Patrol Request *Trespass *Stray Dog/Cat Confined *Barking Dog *Leash Law Violation *DOA Animal</p>	<p><u>Service Districts:</u> 4 geographic animal control service districts. Each of the districts staffed with a minimum of 1 ACO for eight hours a day, 5 days a week (days TBD; referred to below as "business days").</p> <p>After-hours and weekend calls will be responded to the next business day or, when necessary, will be handled to by local police officers.</p>	<p>Some days there will be more than 4 ACOs on duty. When this occurs, the first priority for the additional ACO(s) would be responding in districts with the highest call volumes that day or blacklogs of calls.</p> <p>Rural areas will receive a lower level of service than urban areas.</p> <p>Assumes annual shelter intake numbers reduced to 7,000 so service levels in shelter can be maintained with current program staffing level.</p>	<p>Direct Service Staff Costs (and FTEs): 0.4 ACC Manager/0.4 Ops Manager/0.17 IT Tech \$109,000 1.0 Sergeant/1.0 Cruelty Sergeant/6.0 AC Officers \$683,000 1.0 Admin Asst-Lead /2.0 Call Takers \$210,000 Overtime/Duty/Shift Differential \$22,000 Temp Staff \$50,000 Total: \$1,074,000</p> <p>Other Direct Service Costs: Facilities \$10,000 Medicine/Ambulance/Hospital \$25,000 Other Services (Consult, Laundry, Legal) \$80,000 Office & Other Supplies/Equipment \$11,000 Copy, Printing, Pubs & Postage \$45,000 Motorpool, Misc Trans, Cab Refurb. \$155,000 Phones, Cell, Pagers & Radio \$36,000 IT Equipment & IT Services \$58,000 Misc Direct Costs \$37,000 Total: \$457,000</p> <p>Overhead Costs: GF Overhead \$17,000 Division Overhead \$111,000 IT & Telecom Overhead \$31,000 Finance & Other \$15,000 Total: \$174,000</p>	
<p>* Except costs for overnight call dispatch by Sheriff are not included.</p> <p>Also excludes IT costs associated with mainframe systems (\$50,000/year), which King County will absorb.</p>				Total Fully-Loaded Cost*	\$1,705,000
				Estimated Control Revenues	\$6,400
				Net Cost	\$1,698,600

Attachment B: King County Regional Model Outlines - Based-Level King County Animal Shelter Services Model

Shelter Staffing	Services Provided	Service Levels	Assumptions	Costs (2010 estimated annualized costs)	
12 Total Animal Control Officers (ACOs) = 8 ACOs scheduled to work each day = average of 6 ACOs on-duty each day 2 Animal Control Working Sergeants = 1 on-duty each day 1 Placement Specialist = 1 on-duty 5 days per week 2 Vets = 1 on-duty 6 days per week 2 Vet Techs = 1 on-duty 6 days per week 1 Volunteer/Foster Coordinator = 1 on-duty 5 days per week 20 Positions Total	<u>Services</u> *Shelter and care of owner-released and lost or stray dogs, cats, and other types of animals including: -Enrichment/exercise -Good care and feeding -Reasonable medical attention *Pet adoptions *Animal care/behavior education *Redemption of impounded pets *Quarantine of bite animals *Pet license sales *Convenient hours for the public *Robust volunteer programs *Animal sheltering operations for animals during disasters and emergencies <u>Service Standards</u> *No adoptable, reasonably treatable animal euthanized *Shelter cleaned according to best practices	Shelter operations reduced from two locations to one location (Crossroads Shelter in Bellevue is closed). Kent Animal Shelter is open 7 days per week, and late hours (6 pm) on weekdays to facilitate customer service. Annual intake will be limited to 7,000 animals to ensure quality care for animals. Policies will be put in place to limit owner-surrenders and field pick-ups and incentivize community-based solutions.	Animal Control Officers work 5/8 shifts (5 on, 2 off) and 4/4 shifts (4 on, 4 off) to increase number of ACOs on duty each day. Crossroads staff transferred to Kent. Animal Control Sergeants are working supervisors, helping with animal care as well as supervision. Volunteers perform more duties at shelter to assist ACOs. Kent Animal Shelter is not impacted by Green River flooding. Seasonal ACO temps boost staffing levels during peak season.	Direct Service Staff Costs: 0.6 FTE ACC Manager/0.6 FTE Ops Manager/0.17 FTE IT Tech \$155,000 2.0 Sergeants/12.0 AC Os/1.0 Placement Specialist/1.0 Volunteer Coord. \$1,280,000 2.0 Vets/2.0 Vet Techs \$399,000 Seasonal Shelter ACOs \$100,000 Overtime, Duty, and Shift pay \$106,000 Total: \$2,040,000 Other Direct Service Costs: Facilities \$150,000 Medicine/ Ambulance/ Hospital \$145,000 Other Services (Consult/ Laundry/Legal) \$200,000 Office & Other Supplies & Equipment \$114,000 Copy, Printing, Pubs, Postage \$5,000 Motorpool & Misc Transportation \$10,000 Phones, Cell, Pagers & Radio \$13,000 IT Equipment & IT Services \$35,000 Misc Direct Costs \$49,300 Total: \$721,300 Overhead Costs: GF Overhead \$203,000 Division Overhead \$195,000 IT & Telecom Overhead \$17,000 Finance & Other \$31,000 Total: \$446,000	
			Total Fully-Loaded Cost	\$3,207,300	
			Estimated Sheltering Revenues	\$202,500	
			Net Cost	\$3,004,800	

Attachment B: King County Regional Model Outlines – Agreement in Principle, Page 1

	CONTROL	SHELTER	LICENSING
Parties <i>Assumes the following cities do not participate: Federal Way, Seattle, Renton, Des Moines, Normandy Park, Medina, Newcastle, Skykomish, Milton</i>	TBD	TBD Bothell, Woodinville, Lake Forest Park, Shoreline, Kenmore (“Northern Cities”) will contract for primary shelter services with PAWS (a nonprofit shelter located in Lynnwood). The County will also seek to contract with PAWS for sheltering of animals from part of the north County unincorporated area.	TBD
Services 172	4 districts, each staffed with 1 Animal Control Officer, 5-day/week, 8-hour/day (TBD: M-F or T-S). 6 total officers to cover sick leave, vacation leave, other. Cities may coordinate sub-regionally to purchase higher level of service (specific service options TBD). Regionally shared resources: 1 field sergeant; 1 animal cruelty sergeant; 3 FTE call center open 5-day/8-hour, after hours dispatch through Sheriff’s Office.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Humane standards of care ▪ Kent Shelter remains open ▪ Crossroads Shelter closes ▪ PAWS serves Northern Cities under separate contract ▪ Seek future partnerships for adoption, technical assistance with other nonprofit animal welfare organizations 	Administration of licensing system; marketing, education and outreach to maintain and increase licensing sales. County will absorb costs of using mainframe IT system.
Cost Allocation	Allocate one quarter of total costs to each district. Within each district, allocate costs to jurisdictions by combination of usage (calls for service) and population (50% usage/ 50% population).	Allocate costs by combination of usage (shelter intake) and population (50% usage/50% population). Northern Cities pay half of the population-based factor for regional system benefits associated with shelter.	Allocate by usage and population (50% usage/50% population).
Revenue Allocation	Control revenues (e.g., fines for control violations) netted from total control costs before allocating costs.	Shelter revenues (e.g., adoption fees, microchip fees, impound fees) netted from total shelter costs before allocating costs.	Licensing penalty revenue netted from total licensing costs before allocating costs. Regular licensing fees allocated to jurisdiction of resident buying license.

Attachment B: King County Regional Model Outlines – Agreement in Principle, Page 2

Payment Method/ Timing	<p>Payment for July-December 2010 services due January 2011. Estimated fees for July-December 2010 service based on 50% of estimated annualized 2010 regional program cost allocation.</p> <p>For services in 2011 and 2012, semi-annual payments due April 1 and October 1, estimated based on prior year usage and revenue, applied to current year budget.</p> <p>Reconciliation calculated each June based on prior year's actual usage, allocable actual costs and actual revenues. Reconciliation amounts will be applied as credit or charge to October payment. Reconciliation for 2010 fees (calculated in June 2011) based on half of estimated annualized 2010 regional program cost allocation, and actual July-December revenues and usage.</p>
Cost Inflation Cap	<p>The total cost for control, shelter and licensing collectively allocable to the cities (excluding any costs associated with purchases by cities of additional services) will not increase by more than 5.5% per year.</p>
Contract term and termination provisions	<p>Contract Term: 2½ years: July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 6 month termination for convenience notice (can be used on day one or at back end of contract). ▪ Transitional support provided by County for cities with highest cost or lowest revenue per capita; only available to cities contracting for full 2.5 year term. ▪ County reserves right to terminate services for areas/services if too many cities withdraw making continuation of service delivery to remaining areas impracticable (e.g., lack of contiguous service area, impracticability in linkages between field and sheltering, records management challenges). ▪ Option to extend service contract for 2 additional years upon mutual agreement.
Services Purchased	<p>Cities must purchase all three services from the County under the contract. Limited exception will be made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Northern Cities contracting with PAWS will pay no shelter usage component charge but will pay a regional sheltering charge equal to one-half the population-based sheltering charge (incorporated into current cost estimates).

Attachment B: King County Regional Model Outlines – Agreement in Principle, Page 3

<p>County Transition Funding</p> <p>174</p>	<p>The County shall establish an initial annualized level of transition funding for cities as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ \$250,000 shall be allocated by population to those cities with estimated net per capita 2010 regional model costs above the median (net cost > \$3 per capita). ▪ An additional \$400,000 shall be allocated by population to the five cities with the highest estimated net per capita 2010 regional model costs (net cost > \$5.50 per capita). <p>Cities who contract for the full 2.5 year term and qualify for transition funding shall receive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One-half of the initial annualized level for the second half of 2010; the initial annualized level in 2011; 66% of the initial annualized level in 2012; 33% of the initial annualized level in 2013, if the city and County enter into a 2-year extension agreement; and 0% in 2014. <p>In addition, the County shall provide in 2010 enhanced licensing marketing support to the five cities with the lowest 2009 licensing revenue per capita. For each unit of enhanced licensing marketing support, the County will provide \$20,000 in services estimated to generate 1,000 licenses or \$30,000 in licensing revenue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two cities over 100,000 in population shall each receive 2 units of enhanced licensing marketing support (estimated \$60,000 in licensing revenue in each city). ▪ Three cities under 30,000 in population shall share one unit of enhanced licensing marketing support (estimated \$10,000 in licensing revenue in each city).
<p>Joint City-County Committee</p>	<p>A committee composed of 3 county representatives (appointed by County) and 6 city representatives (appointed by cities) shall meet not less than twice each year to review service issues and make recommendations regarding efficiencies and improvements to services. Members may not be elected officials. The committee shall review and make recommendations regarding the conduct and findings of the collaborative initiatives. Subcommittees to focus on individual initiatives may be formed, each of which shall include membership from both county and city members of the Joint City-County Committee. Recommendations of the Joint City-County Committee are non-binding.</p>

Attachment C: King County Regional Model Cost Allocation

Total Regional Program Costs To Be Allocated:		Control	Sheltering	Licensing	Total Allocated Costs	2009 Licensing Revenue
		\$1,698,600	\$3,004,900	\$898,400	\$5,601,900	\$3,209,469
Proposed Animal Control District Number	Jurisdiction	Estimated Animal Control Cost Allocation	Estimated Sheltering Cost Allocation (Excludes Costs to North Side Cities for PAWS Sheltering)	Estimated Pet Licensing Cost Allocation	Estimated Total Cost Allocation	2009 Licensing Revenue
200	Bothell	\$34,336	\$22,973	\$30,095	\$87,404	\$102,067
	Carnation	\$2,563	\$8,091	\$1,564	\$12,218	\$5,723
	Duvall	\$6,615	\$12,571	\$5,385	\$24,571	\$22,113
	Unincorporated King County	\$116,932	(see below)	(see below)	\$116,932	(see below)
	Kenmore	\$25,488	\$13,943	\$19,140	\$58,571	\$73,160
	Kirkland	\$50,147	\$97,540	\$38,979	\$186,666	\$159,211
	Lake Forest Park	\$13,759	\$8,741	\$12,726	\$35,226	\$71,987
	Redmond	\$50,336	\$97,197	\$41,042	\$188,575	\$134,311
	Sammamish	\$38,565	\$68,595	\$34,532	\$141,692	\$135,125
	Shoreline	\$71,289	\$37,036	\$46,034	\$154,359	\$189,347
	Woodinville	\$14,619	\$7,275	\$9,462	\$31,357	\$37,918
SUBTOTAL FOR CITIES IN 200 (excludes unincorporated area)		\$307,718	\$373,961	\$238,959	\$920,638	\$930,963
220	Beaux Arts	\$466	\$459	\$301	\$1,226	\$900
	Bellevue	\$151,300	\$233,274	\$90,629	\$475,204	\$274,346
	Clyde Hill	\$3,676	\$4,389	\$2,465	\$10,530	\$8,044
	Unincorporated King County	\$174,816	(see below)	(see below)	\$174,816	(see below)
	Hunts Point	\$382	\$677	\$229	\$1,288	\$230
	Issaquah	\$42,683	\$58,181	\$20,013	\$120,876	\$64,509
	Mercer Island	\$26,827	\$37,530	\$17,142	\$81,498	\$55,113
	North Bend	\$10,448	\$14,463	\$4,024	\$28,935	\$14,341
	Snoqualmie	\$12,950	\$20,832	\$6,901	\$40,683	\$23,667
	Yarrow Pt	\$1,102	\$1,405	\$819	\$3,327	\$2,864
SUBTOTAL FOR CITIES IN 220 (excludes unincorporated area)		\$249,834	\$371,210	\$142,523	\$763,567	\$444,014
240	Burien (Includes N. Highline)	\$85,675	\$161,131	\$35,845	\$282,652	\$119,251
	Unincorporated King County	\$81,257	(see below)	(see below)	\$81,257	(see below)
	Kent (Includes Panther Lk)	\$169,516	\$643,902	\$84,166	\$897,584	\$255,365
	SeaTac	\$50,171	\$105,148	\$18,847	\$174,166	\$53,065
	Tukwila	\$38,031	\$78,208	\$12,000	\$128,239	\$30,348
SUBTOTAL FOR CITIES IN 240 (excludes unincorporated area)		\$343,393	\$988,390	\$150,858	\$1,482,641	\$458,028
	Algona	\$10,146	\$16,087	\$2,418	\$28,651	\$11,415
	Auburn	\$135,980	\$318,537	\$45,052	\$499,569	\$158,415

Attachment D: North King County Sub-regional Cost Model and Cost Allocation

Field Service Cost Estimates

Direct Services Costs							
						Annual	One-Time
Field Staffing:	Salary	Benefits	Total	Units	Cost		
Animal Control Officer (ACO)	\$56,352	\$21,414	\$77,766	2.00	\$77,766	\$155,532	
Animal Control Liaison Records Clerk	\$47,400	\$18,012	\$65,412	1.00	\$65,412	\$65,412	
Total FTE:				3.00			
Supervision/Administration for Personnel:							
Police Manager	Salary/Benefits		\$95,200	10%		\$9,520	
Sergeant	Salary/Benefits		\$108,000	10%		\$10,800	
Overtime:						\$5,000	
Field Staffing Direct Cost						\$246,264	

Equipment/Uniform Cost							Annual	One-Time
ACO equipment includes uniforms, ballistic vests, radios, cell phones, animal control equipment for two ACOs			5 years	Replacement Cycle		\$2,000	\$10,000	
Animal Control vehicle is a ¾ ton truck from the State bid; custom animal cargo box canopy to hold at least 6 animals			3/4 ton Truck	6 years	Replacement Cycle	\$8,000	\$48,000	
			Animal Cargo Box	15 years	Replacement Cycle	\$2,133	\$32,000	
Computer equipment for office and a laptop for the vehicle			Per employee	\$2,000	4 years	Replacement Cycle	\$1,500	\$6,000
Equipment/Uniform Cost								\$96,000
Vehicle and equipment annual replacement fund							\$13,633	

Overhead Cost						
					Annual	One-Time
City Overhead: (IT, HR, Payroll, Insurance, Legal, Facilities, and Accounting)					\$39,807	
Office Operating: supplies, cell phones and miscellaneous cost					\$4,000	
Training: Training/travel for ACO					\$2,000	
Vehicle Repair:					\$3,000	
Fuel:	25,000 miles/yr	10 mpg	\$3 per gallon	\$7,500		
Marketing: Printing publications, mailing and educational material					\$8,000	
Dispatch:					\$20,000	
Overhead Annual Cost					\$84,307	

Field Service Cost Estimates – Summary Total		
Direct Services Cost	\$ 246,264	\$96,000
Equipment/Uniforms Costs (one-time for start-up)		
Equipment/Uniform Costs (annual replacement fund)	\$ 13,633	
Overhead Costs	\$ 84,307	
Total Field Services Costs	\$ 344,204	\$96,000

Field Service Cost Allocation - 2010					
Jurisdiction	3-yr Average Annual Service Calls (2007-2009)	Service Calls Percentage	6 Month Field Service Costs	Startup Costs	Total Costs
Allocation			\$172,102	\$96,000	\$268,102
Bothell	195	18.17%	\$31,272	\$17,444	\$48,716
Kenmore	176	16.34%	\$28,123	\$15,687	\$43,811
Lake Forest Park	83	7.69%	\$13,235	\$7,382	\$20,617
Shoreline	513	47.72%	\$82,129	\$45,812	\$127,941
Woodinville	108	10.08%	\$17,344	\$9,674	\$27,018
Total	1,075	100%	\$172,102	\$96,000	\$268,102

Field Services Costs - 2011			
Jurisdiction	3-yr Average Annual Service Calls (2007-2009)	Service Calls Percentage	Annual Costs
Allocation			\$344,204
Bothell	195	18.17%	\$62,544
Kenmore	176	16.34%	\$56,247
Lake Forest Park	83	7.69%	\$26,469
Shoreline	513	47.72%	\$164,257
Woodinville	108	10.08%	\$34,687
Total	1,075	100.00%	\$344,204

Shelter Cost Estimates

Progressive Animal Welfare Society (PAWS) Cost			
2-Year Average (08-09) of Number of Animal Intakes into KC Shelter	30% Increase in Shelter Population Due to PAWS Proximity and Familiarity in the Community	PAWS Shelter Rate	PAWS Shelter Cost
151	196	\$145	\$28,369

Licensing Cost Estimates

PetData Costs		
3-Year Average (07-09) of Number of License Sold	PetData - Per License Cost	PetData Cost
6,737	\$3.95	\$26,610

Attachment E: In-House Shoreline Cost Model

Field Service Cost Estimates

Direct Services Costs						Annual	One-Time	Un-Funded
Field Staffing:	Salary	Benefits	Total	Units	Cost			
Animal Control Officer (ACO)	\$56,352	\$21,414	\$77,766	1.00	\$77,766	\$77,766		
Police Administrative Assistant	Salary/Benefits		\$53,525	0.20	\$10,705	\$10,705		
Total New FTE:				1.20				
Supervision/ Administration for Personnel:								
Police Manager	Salary/Benefits		\$168,258	5%	\$8,413			\$8,413
Police Sergeant	Salary/Benefits		\$135,602	6%	\$8,136			\$8,136
Police Administrative Assistant	Salary/Benefits		\$134,972	5%	\$6,749			\$6,749
Overtime:						\$5,000		
Field Staffing Direct Cost						\$93,471		\$23,298

Equipment/Uniform Cost						Annual	One-Time	Un-Funded
ACO equipment includes uniforms, ballistic vests, radios, cell phones, animal control equipment for two ACOs								
			5 years	Replacement Cycle		\$1,000	\$5,000	
Animal Control vehicle is a ½ ton truck; animal cargo boxes to hold at least 4 animals and standard pickup truck canopy	1/2 ton Truck		6 years	Replacement Cycle		\$5,000	\$30,000	
	Animal Cargo Boxes and pickup truck canopy		15 years	Replacement Cycle		\$667	\$10,000	
Computer equipment for office and a laptop for the vehicle	Per employee	\$2,000	4 years	Replacement Cycle		\$5,00	\$2,000	
Equipment/Uniform Cost								
Vehicle and equipment annual replacement fund						\$7,167	\$47,000	

Overhead Cost			
	Annual	One-Time	Un-Funded
City Overhead: (IT, HR, Payroll, Insurance, Legal, Facilities, Accounting, etc.) Office Operating: supplies, cell phones and miscellaneous cost Training: Training/travel for ACO Vehicle Repair: Fuel: 10,000 miles/yr 10 mpg \$3 per gallon Marketing: Printing publications, mailing and educational material Dispatch:	 \$2,000 \$1,000 \$3,000 \$3,000 \$4,000 \$10,000		\$30,880
Overhead Annual Cost	\$23,000		\$30,880

Field Service Cost Estimates – Summary Total			
	Annual	One-Time	Un-Funded
Direct Services Cost	\$93,471		\$23,298
Equipment/Uniforms Costs (one-time for start-up)		\$47,000	
Equipment/Uniform Costs (annual replacement fund)	\$7,176		
Overhead Costs	\$23,000		\$30,880
Total Field Services Costs	\$123,637	\$47,000	\$54,178

Shelter Cost Estimates

Shelter Cost Estimates						
				Annual	One-Time	Un-Funded
PAWS Costs	2-Year Average of Animal Intakes	30% Increase in Shelter Population	PAWS Shelter Rate			
	151	196	\$145	\$28,369		
CMO Management Analyst: Management of PAWS Contract and Troubleshooting of Contract Issues; System Coordination	Salary/Benefits - \$95,710	4% of time spent on Shelter and Animal Control Issues				\$3,828
Total Shelter Costs				\$28,369		\$3,828

Licensing Cost Estimates

Licensing Cost Estimates					
			Annual	One-Time	Un-Funded
PetData Costs City Clerk: Management of PetData contract, oversight of licensing program, license education and marketing, and all other licensing duties	3-Year Average of License Sold	Per License Cost			
	6,737	\$3.95	\$26,610		
	Average of all Four Clerks' Office Employees Salaries and Benefits - \$84,391	6% of time spent on Licensing Issues			\$5,063
Total License Costs			\$26,610		\$5,063

Indirect Overhead Cost Estimates

Shoreline Cost Model – Indirect Overhead Costs			
Indirect Field Service Costs	Indirect Shelter Costs	Indirect License Costs	Total Indirect Costs
\$54,178	\$3,828	\$5,063	\$63,069