

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Animal Control Implementation Plan
DEPARTMENT:	City Manager's Office Community Services Division
PRESENTED BY:	John Norris, CMO Management Analyst Rob Beem, Community Services Manager
ACTION:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution <input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

In June of 2011, the City Council directed staff to develop an "in-house implementation plan" for animal control services. The concept of the plan is to have Shoreline staff provide animal control field services, as opposed to the City contracting for this service with another entity.

The City currently provides this service under an interlocal agreement with Regional Animal Services of King County (RASKC). This agreement expires on December 31, 2012. In the agreement, the City has until May 1st to notify King County that the City does not wish to extend the agreement with RASKC. This report provides the in-house implementation plan (operating plan and cost model) as requested by Council, and provides information to Council about actions staff has taken regarding notifying the County about extending the current interlocal agreement.

RESOURCE/FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The estimated 2013 net direct cost to provide animal control services using the Shoreline in-house model is \$56,228. If overhead costs are also considered, this annual cost increases to \$149,122. Currently, the City is estimating 2011 net direct animal control service costs to be \$71,980. Thus, it is anticipated that actual costs will decrease if the City brings this service in-house. However, there will be additional staffing impacts and opportunity costs to the City.

RECOMMENDATION:

No formal action is required. The City Manager is planning to move forward with implementing the in-house animal control plan as reflected in this staff report, with in-house animal control service beginning in January 2013. If the Council has concerns with moving forward, then Council should provide further direction to staff regarding alternative service provision models, including the RASKC contract extension.

Approved By: City Manager - *JU* City Attorney ____

BACKGROUND:

Since incorporation, the City of Shoreline has received animal control services through an interlocal agreement with King County Animal Control. On June 28, 2010, the City Council authorized the City Manager to enter into a new interlocal agreement with King County Animal Control, renamed Regional Animal Services of King County (RASKC). This current interlocal agreement, which expires on December 31, 2012, restructured how animal control service was provided and how the City paid for the service.

The service delivery model in the current interlocal agreement is divided into three services:

1. animal control (officers responding to events in the field),
2. animal shelter, and
3. animal licensing.

As part of the 2010 interlocal agreement, cities had to purchase all three animal control services from RASKC; however North King County cities have their primary shelter service provided under contract by the Progressive Animal Welfare Society (PAWS). In addition to these two contracts, the City entered into a separate interlocal agreement with RASKC for enhanced (weekend) animal control services. The PAWS and RASKC enhanced animal control contracts also expire at the end of 2012.

In anticipation of these service contracts expiring at the end of 2012, in June 2011, the City Council provided direction to staff to develop an “in-house implementation plan” for animal control services. The concept of the plan is to have Shoreline staff provide animal control field services directly, as opposed to the City contracting for this service with RASKC or another entity. The 2012 City budget includes start-up funding to take animal control in house effective January 1, 2013.

This report provides the in-house implementation plan (operating plan and cost model) requested by Council, and provides information to Council about actions staff has taken regarding the current RASKC interlocal agreement. This report also provides final cost estimates for 2011 animal control services so that the in-house cost model and RASKC interlocal agreement extension cost model can be compared to current service costs.

2011 Animal Control Projected Costs

Shoreline is charged for animal control services based on costs incurred and services received. The current RASKC interlocal agreement establishes a reconciliation process to accurately assess these charges. As in past years, the reconciliation process for 2011 service costs and revenues will not occur until the second quarter of 2012. Thus, the table below provides the ‘projected actual costs’ for RASKC services, based on projected 2011 usage:

Projected Actual RASKC 2011 Costs			
RASKC Animal Control Cost	RASKC Shelter Charge	RASKC Licensing Cost	Total Projected RASKC Cost
\$57,714	\$39,895	\$40,108	\$137,716

This second table provides a comparison between the projected actual net direct costs for 2011 and the estimated cost that was used for budgeting purposes. This includes

the projected RASKC interlocal agreement costs, enhanced service cost and PAWS contract cost, less the projected animal license fee revenue collected during this same time period:

Projected Actual RASKC 2011 Net Direct Cost						
	RASKC Interlocal Agreement Cost	PAWS Shelter Cost	70% share of RASKC Enhanced Services Interlocal Agreement Cost	Total Direct Cost	Projected License Revenue	Net Direct Cost
Budget Estimate	\$152,286	\$30,000	\$54,033	\$236,319	\$168,066	\$68,253
Projected Actual	\$137,716	\$25,920	\$54,033	\$217,669	\$145,689	\$71,980
Difference	\$14,570	\$4,080	\$0	\$18,650	\$22,377	(\$3,727)

Encouragingly, the projected actual 2011 net direct costs are generally in-line with the 2011 budgeted costs. Although PAWS costs and RASKC services costs are below 2011 estimates, the projected license fee revenue collected during this time is also less than the 2011 estimated license fee revenue. In total, the net direct cost (General Fund cost) for animal control services is projected to be \$3,700 more than the final budget estimate for net animal control costs in 2011.

Leash Law Patrol and Enforcement

In addition to the animal control contract with RASKC the City currently has a separate contract with a former King County animal control officer to provide leash law patrol and enforcement in the City's parks. From February 25 through December 13, 2011, the officer worked 490 hours and issued 121 leash law citations. The officer made 553 site visits and had a total of 787 contacts with park patrons. The 2011 contract cost was \$12,250. The 2012 budget includes \$20,000 for this service. Assuming that Council still wants to implement the in-house model, staff will evaluate how the in-house ACOs can assist with leash law patrol, enforcement, and education and if additional support from a supplemental contract will still provide an additional benefit to our park patrons.

ALTERNATIVES:

In-house Implementation Plan - Operating Plan and Cost Model

The in-house animal control operating plan, which is attached to this staff report as *Attachment A*, details how animal control services will be provided beginning January 1, 2013. Structurally, animal control services will become a program within the City's Community Services Division (CSD). The CSD Manager will be the director of the animal care and control authority, as outlined in Shoreline Municipal Code Title 6: *Animal Control*. Day to day supervision of the program will be provided by the Customer Response Team (CRT) Supervisor.

Services provided include animal control field services, which will be provided by hired Shoreline Animal Control Officers (ACOs); animal control support functions, such as call intake, ACO dispatch, case tracking and ACO supervision, which will be provided by current CSD staff; animal sheltering services, which will continue to be provided under contract by the PAWS shelter and also under a new contract with the Everett Animal Shelter; and animal licensing services, which will be provided under a new contract with Pet Data, a private pet licensing firm.

Staff's recommendation is to staff the animal control service with 1.5 full-time equivalent ACOs, with service coverage scheduled at 56 hours a week (7 days a week at 8 hours per day). The projected scheduling will allow for four (4) hours of overlap coverage per week, with the remaining 52 hours having single staff coverage. Given the number of calls for service in 2011, staff is confident that one and a half ACOs will be able to provide a high level of service. As can be seen in the table below, RASKC received 317 calls for service in 2011. This is down from the 533, 464 and 511 calls received in 2008, 2009 and 2010 respectively.

2011 RASKC Shoreline Calls for Service – By Priority Level													
Priority	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
1	0	1	1	2	0	0	4	5	2	0	1	1	17
2	0	0	1	2	2	0	4	1	1	3	3	4	21
3	4	4	5	6	8	8	6	6	3	7	5	3	65
4	0	3	4	2	5	5	4	12	6	7	3	6	57
5	11	8	7	6	10	6	5	8	6	4	12	12	95
6	0	25	20	6	0	7	0	4	0	0	0	0	62
Total	15	41	38	24	25	26	23	36	18	21	24	26	317

The cost model for the in-house implementation plan is attached to this staff report as *Attachment B*. The model displays the estimated costs for animal control field, shelter and licensing services, and also identifies “overhead costs,” or opportunity costs, for existing staff. These costs will not have a direct budgetary impact, but rather are the “trade off costs” of shifting the responsibilities of existing staff to include managing and administering this service. In other words, these costs are a monetization of a reduction in service levels to current programs and projects. A good example of this is the proactive code enforcement program managed by CRT. Given that the CRT Supervisor will now be managing the City’s animal control service, less of his time can be spent on proactive code enforcement.

The table below provides the total annual estimated costs for the in-house model (from Attachment B):

2013 Estimated In-house Shoreline Animal Control Program Cost					
Field Services Cost	PAWS and Everett Shelter Cost	PetData and Other License Cost	Total Direct Cost	Overhead Cost	Total Direct Cost (with Overhead Cost)
\$140,232	\$38,605	\$23,080	\$201,917	\$92,894	\$294,811

Using 2011 license fee revenue collected as an estimate of future license fee revenue, the total annual estimated net costs for the in-house model are provided in the table below:

2013 Estimated Net Animal Control Program Cost				
Total Direct Cost	Total Direct Cost (with Overhead Cost)	2011 License Fee Revenue	Total Net Direct Cost	Total Net Direct Cost (with Overhead Cost)
\$201,917	\$294,811	\$145,689	\$56,228	\$149,122

On a per capita basis, this total annual net direct cost equates to *\$1.06 per resident*.

One identified issue with the Shoreline in-house model is the lack of “depth of service” for ACOs. Given that there will be a single ACO on duty 52 hours per week, there will be no depth of service for the ACOs beyond the four hours per week when both ACOs are on-duty. Currently, when a RASKC ACO is out on leave, another ACO is able to cover the officer’s shift.

In the in-house model, if a Shoreline ACO is not able to be on-duty because of a scheduled vacation or short-term sick leave or due to a regular holiday closure, this coverage will be administratively managed by either working with the other ACO or CSD staff to potentially provide coverage. It is also possible that there may be some gaps in service. If an ACO is not able to be on-duty for a long duration of time due to an injury or long-term illness, this situation will be managed on a case by case basis and may result in temporary ACO help being sought. To support this, funds for additional service hours will be built into the 2013 proposed budget so that an ACO can provide extra service hours when the other ACO is out for scheduled or long term leave.

RASKC Interlocal Agreement Extension

At the same time Council provided direction to staff to bring back an in-house implementation plan for animal control services, Council also stated that if the in-house plan was not satisfactory, the City could always continue to contract with RASKC for animal control services. Thus, staff has continued to attend the monthly RASKC joint City-County meetings to discuss animal control operations and issues.

In 2011, the City of Auburn explained to RASKC that they did not intend to enter into the automatic two-year extension outlined into the current RASKC interlocal agreement. As well, staff from Shoreline and other cities currently contracting with RASKC stated that they had also received direction to look at other service delivery options. Based on these actions, RASKC and the King County Executive Office staff decided to “re-open” the current RASKC contract to amend the contract terms and cost model. These amended terms would then be incorporated into the existing agreement and the agreement would be extended for an additional three years as opposed to the two year automatic extension currently in the agreement.

RASKC provided a timeline for when cities needed to communicate their “serious interest” in staying in the regional animal control system. The first deadline for providing an “initial non-binding statement of interest” was February 14. Given Council’s direction to bring back an in-house implementation plan and Council’s approval of the 2012 budget for animal services transition funding, staff communicated to the County that “it is unlikely that the City of Shoreline will participate in the animal control services contract extension at this time.” Although we have asked the County to remove us from their cost model, given that our participation in the RASKC model should decrease the costs of other participating cities, staff feels confident that Shoreline would be allowed back in the model if Council were to change direction. The only other contract city (in addition to Auburn and Shoreline) that asked to be removed from the cost model was the City of Kirkland.

To provide an alternative for Council discussion, King County staff has provided the RASKC cost model with Shoreline included. This should provide Council with the

relative costs of participating in the RASKC interlocal agreement if the in-house implementation plan is not satisfactory. The revised RASKC cost model (including Shoreline), is attached to this staff report as *Attachment C*.

RASKC Interlocal Agreement Service Changes

The revised RASKC interlocal agreement has three major changes:

1. it removes Auburn and Kirkland from the regional system and collapses the animal control service districts from four to two,
2. changes the formula for allocating costs to more heavily weight usage, and
3. implements a different staffing plan that provides services on at least one weekend day as a part of the basic services package.

In the new RASKC agreement, the service area covered by RASKC is divided into two service districts, with the northern service district being significantly larger geographically than the southern district. As well, system costs are allocated to participants using the following formula – 80% system use and 20% jurisdiction population. Although this is an improvement on the old formula of 50% use/50% population as it begins to move the cost model to more of a use-based system, staff would have liked to have seen a 100% use-based cost allocation.

The new staffing plan incorporates at least one weekend day into the weekly ACO schedule. While current RASKC ACOs work Monday through Friday, it is likely that ACOs will now be scheduled Tuesday through Saturday (pending guild approval.) Additionally, ACOs will also report directly to the district in which they work, as opposed to beginning their work day at the RASKC Animal Shelter in Kent. This will have the effect of ACOs providing more service in their district by reducing on-duty travel and start-up time.

Another notable change in this RASKC agreement is that enhanced (weekend) animal control services have not been built into the cost model. Shoreline, Lake Forest Park and Kenmore have been the only cities to purchase this higher level of service from the County, and Kenmore and Lake Forest Park have stated that they are no longer interested in paying for this enhanced level of service.

As well, the County will not be offering enhanced services in the same manner as provided currently. Going forward, the County will offer limited enhanced service hours that can be purchased on an hourly basis. These enhanced service hours will be provided by ACOs on an overtime basis and the jurisdiction purchasing the service will be required to pay the overtime hourly rate, although there will be no additional support costs charged. Given that Shoreline would not be able to achieve the economies of scale of cost-sharing an enhanced ACO and given the new overtime rate, staff would not recommend purchasing enhanced services at part of the RASKC Interlocal Agreement Extension.

RASKC Costs

In the Current RASKC Interlocal Agreement, calls for service received on the weekend by Shoreline's enhanced ACO are not calculated into the cost allocation for the base-level of animal control field services. However, given that this new model assumes service will be provided on at least one weekend day and assuming Shoreline does not purchase limited enhanced services on a hourly basis, the cost of our base-level of

animal control field services is projected to increase now that these calls are factored into the usage calculation. Even though overall RASKC system costs have been reduced, with two fewer cities to allocate cost to and an increase in “usage” due to weekend calls now being counted in the model, Shoreline’s base-level costs are projected to increase. The net direct costs to Shoreline are displayed in the following chart:

RASKC – Estimated 2013 Net Direct Cost						
RASKC Interlocal Agreement Cost	PAWS Shelter Cost	RASKC Enhanced Services Interlocal Agreement Cost	Total Direct Cost	One-Time Licensing Support Credit	2011 License Fee Revenue	Net Direct Cost
\$179,841	\$33,180	\$0	\$213,021	\$19,450	\$145,689	\$47,882

Although the annual net direct costs of this model are lower than the proposed Shoreline in-house model (*\$0.90 per resident*), the service levels of these two models are drastically different. Most importantly, the Shoreline in-house model provides for seven-day a week coverage; under the extended RASKC Interlocal Agreement, the City would only receive five-day a week service, although this would be somewhat mitigated by RASKC providing service on at least one weekend day.

As well, Shoreline has long felt that current levels of service and response times provided are inadequate, and the extended RASKC interlocal agreement will likely continue the inadequate ACO response times to service calls in Shoreline. In 2011, RASKC was only able to meet their call response goals 57% of the time. For Priority 1 calls (immediate threat to life, health, safety of humans) and Priority 2 calls (immediate threat to life, health, safety of animals), which are the most serious animal control calls, RASKC was able to meet their call response goals 63% and 67% of the time respectively, and for Priority 3 response calls (potential threat to life, health safety of humans or animals), they were never able to meet their response goals (0% of the time.)

In the Shoreline in-house model, ACOs should be able to dramatically decrease call response times for animal control field services. This, along with the ability of Shoreline ACOs to provide for “proactive” animal control enforcement in Shoreline parks and neighborhoods all week long, makes it challenging to compare service levels and costs for the Shoreline in-house model with the RASKC model.

Finally, one aspect of this model that lowers costs for 2013 is the one-time licensing support credit offered by RASKC to help mitigate Auburn and Kirkland leaving the current cost model. This credit will only be offered by RASKC in 2013 however, and will not be available for the two remaining years of the contract extension. Based on this, if usage holds constant, 2014 and 2015 costs will be closer to \$67,000. On a per capita basis, this equates to *\$1.27 per resident*.

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH:

To help inform and benchmark the in-house animal control implementation plan, Community Services Division (CSD) staff, who will ultimately be administering the animal control program, reached out to other jurisdictions in the region that provide in-house animal control services. These cities include Bothell, Burien, Lynnwood,

Mountlake Terrace, Edmonds Des Moines and Federal Way. In reviewing these jurisdictions' programs and service levels, staff is confident that the proposed levels of service and identified resources in the in-house implementation plan are adequate to provide a quality animal control program for Shoreline citizens.

It should also be noted that of these cities, Bothell, Burien and Federal Way decided not to continue to contract with RASKC for animal control services in 2010 when the new RASKC interlocal agreement was negotiated that year. Thus, staff at these cities were able to provide information about their experiences in bringing the service in-house. Even more specifically, the City of Bothell's experience has been helpful to understand, as their service delivery model follows our proposed in-house model: utilization of hired ACOs, sheltering contract with PAWS, and licensing services contract with PetData.

Regional Sub-Contracting

In addition to reaching out to cities that already provide animal control services for themselves, staff spoke with fellow staff members at the cities of Lake Forest Park and Kenmore about potentially contracting with the City of Shoreline if Shoreline were to bring animal control services in-house. Although staff did see that there could be some economies of scale in "selling" service to other communities, it was determined that staff should first focus on implementing the in-house animal control services for Shoreline. Staff believes that in the future consideration should be given to contracting Shoreline animal control services to other jurisdictions once we have adequate experience to make contracting a successful venture.

Both Kenmore and Lake Forest Park staff understood these constraints and agreed that it was prudent to not work together this year. However, staff at both cities are interested in continuing to discuss a possible future contract. Lake Forest Park (and potentially Kenmore) are currently evaluating contract alternatives with RASKC and the City of Bothell. Thus, depending on which entity they enter into a contract with, it could be at least three years before the City could enter into a future animal services contract with these jurisdictions. This would allow the time to establish Shoreline's animal control service, determine an appropriate level of service for our community, and determine what additional resources would be required to provide an appropriate level of service for these communities.

NEXT STEPS:

Assuming that Council's direction to bring animal control services in-house has not changed, staff will immediately begin work on putting in place the human resources, equipment, procedures and transition plans to implement the attached operating plan. Given the effort involved to get a new line of service up and running in less than a year, CSD staff will organize and manage a cross-departmental team of staff to focus on the following, among other items:

- ACO hiring,
- Equipment and vehicle purchasing,
- CSD staff and ACO training,
- Development of ACO operating procedures and protocols,
- Development of ACO and Shoreline Police interface procedures and protocols,
- Execution of PAWS shelter contract extension and Everett Animal Shelter contract,
- Execution of PetData contract,

- License database transfer from RASKC to PetData, and
- Citizen communication regarding the new model of service provision.

The accomplishment of all of these tasks will be coordinated so that the transition to the new animal control service will be as seamless as possible. Staff will provide an update to the Council later this year on the progress of implementation.

If the Council is interested in changing direction and not bringing animal control services in-house, staff recommends that another Council study session be scheduled to more fully review the RASKC regional animal services contract extension. Although staff has already communicated to King County to remove Shoreline from the RASKC contract extension cost model, according to the County's timeline, cities interested in receiving service from the County must provide a "second non-binding statement of interest" to participate in the model by May 1st. Thus, staff would most likely schedule another animal control discussion with Council in early to mid April to discuss the contract extension and receive council direction to provide this non-binding statement of intent.

RESOURCE/FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The estimated 2013 net direct cost to provide animal control services using the Shoreline in-house model is \$56,228. If overhead costs are also considered, this annual cost increases to \$149,122. Currently, the City is estimating 2011 net direct animal control service costs to be \$71,980. Thus, it is anticipated that actual costs will decrease if the City brings this service in-house. However, there will be additional staffing impacts and opportunity costs to the City.

SUMMARY:

Staff is confident that the animal control system described in the in-house animal control implementation plan will be able to provide high quality animal control services to the community with decreased call response times and a higher level of service than is currently being provided by RASKC. Staff is also confident that the plan can be implemented in time for a January 1, 2013 start date.

Although this model is also less costly than the current service being provided by RASKC, keeping general fund costs low will require continued vigilance on collecting license fees from animal owners. As well, although there clearly are overhead costs in the Shoreline in-house model, staff feels that the cost-benefit of these service trade-offs are manageable and do not lead staff to believe that this service should not be brought in-house. Finally, although the depth of service will clearly decrease under the Shoreline in-house model, staff is hopeful that this will not be a major programmatic issue. If an ACO is not able to provide service for some length of time, staff is confident that a work-around can be found to make sure that service levels remain adequate in the interim.

RECOMMENDATION:

No formal action is required. The City Manager is planning to move forward with implementing the in-house animal control plan as reflected in this staff report, with in-house animal control service beginning in January 2013. If the Council has concerns with moving forward, then Council should provide further direction to staff regarding alternative service provision models, including the RASKC contract extension.

ATTACHMENTS:

A: Shoreline In-house Operating Plan

B: Shoreline In-house Cost Model

C: RASKC Interlocal Agreement Extension Cost Model

In-House Animal Control Operating Plan

Animal Control Field Services

Incoming Calls and Dispatch

- **Call Intakes, Business Hours** – During City business hours (M – F, 8:00 am – 5:00 pm), animal control related calls will be handled by the Community Services Division (CSD) Administrative Assistant (AA).
 - In the event that the CSD AA is able to take incoming phone calls, these calls (and dispatching responsibilities) will be managed by the Customer Response Team (CRT) Supervisor or Representatives.
 - Incoming calls will come directly to the CSD AA phone and will most likely be relayed from a dedicated Animal Control phone number that is advertised in the community as the number to call for all Animal Control related issues (for example: (206) 801-PETS (7387)).
- **Call Intakes, Non Business Hours** – During non-business hours (M – F, 5:00 pm – 8:00 am; all day Saturday and Sunday), animal control related calls will either be forwarded to the City's afterhours phone tree, where callers can leave a message, or will be forwarded directly to an Animal Control Officer's (ACO) cell phone if they are on duty.
 - The phone tree will have a dedicated extension for animal control related issues.
 - If an ACO is on-duty, the call will be forwarded directly to their cell phone and they can respond directly to the citizen concern.
 - When no ACO is on duty, any messages left on the City's phone tree will be responded to the following business day.
 - On the message, callers will also be told that if this is an emergency situation involving the life or health of a person or animal, then they should contact 9-1-1.
- **Dispatch, Business Hours** - During City business hours, animal control related calls that require a response in the field will be dispatched by the CSD AA.
 - The CSD AA will dispatch calls for service either verbally or via email if the ACO is at their desk in City Hall.
 - If the ACO is in the field, the CSD AA will dispatch the ACO using the 800 Megahertz radio or cell phone.
- **Dispatch, Non Business Hours** – When ACOs are on duty but it is outside normal business hours (Saturday, Sunday, some potential evenings), the ACOs will self-dispatch themselves after receiving the call on their cell phone.
- **9-1-1 Dispatch** – If an animal control related call comes into the King County 9-1-1 system, King County dispatchers will contact Shoreline Police and potentially Shoreline ACOs (if on-duty) for response.
 - Shoreline Police and Shoreline ACOs will coordinate the response between the two agencies to determine which agency is the appropriate responding entity. In some circumstances, it may be appropriate for both agencies to respond.

Case Tracking and Reporting

- **Case Tracking** – Case tracking will be done using the City’s Hansen database. The module used will be the same as the module used by CRT for their case tracking of code enforcement issues and other individual issues they address in the community.
 - All cases will be assigned an individual Service Request number for tracking and monitoring purposes.
 - Service Requests will be initiated by the CSD AA if the call is received during business hours. These Service Requests will then be handed off to the responding ACO once dispatch has occurred.
 - Service Requests that are taken off the City’s phone tree during non-business hours will be generated by the ACOs themselves (or the CSD AA as back up).
 - Service Requests that are generated “in the field” by an ACO witnessing an issue will be generated by the ACO.
 - Service Requests will remain open in Hansen until completion of the issue, whether it be a simple call back with no field response required or an in-depth investigation lasting multiple months.
- **Case Reporting** – Reporting on animal control activities, outcomes, response times and other service level information will be accomplished using reports created and run in Hansen. Animal Control and CSD staff will work with Shoreline Information Technology staff to create these reports.
- **Statement Reporting Forms** – Shoreline Police will provide the ACOs police statement forms so that they can take official witness statements while investigating an animal control issue, especially if the issue may be criminal in nature.
 - Shoreline Police will also provide any other investigatory tools with the ACOs as appropriate.

Animal Control Officers

- **Hiring** – 1.5 full-time equivalent ACOs will be hired under a limited commission for field animal control services.
 - A limited commission means that the ACOs will be sworn by the Shoreline Police Chief so that they can issue criminal infractions identified in the SMC Title 6 – the Shoreline Animal Control Code. The limited commission will be specific to this section of the code. The ACOs will also be able to issue civil infractions, but will not be able to make arrests or perform other police functions.
 - ACOs will likely be hired as a 40 hour (full time) per week officer and a 20 hour (half time) per week officer.
 - The writing of job descriptions and the hiring process for ACOs will begin in the middle of 2012. This work will be accomplished by the CSD and Human Resources (HR) Department.
 - The start date of the ACOs is scheduled for November 1, 2012.
- **Schedule** – The ACOs will be scheduled seven (7) days per week, eight (8) hours per day, with four (4) hours of overlap on one day per week.

- A potential schedule could have the full time ACO working Monday-Friday, 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, and the part time ACO working Saturday and Sunday, 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, and Monday 8:00 am to noon.
 - The “four hour overlap day” will allow the two ACOs to have a joint staff meeting with their supervisor, confer of outstanding cases and investigations, and “hand-off” upcoming issues for the week.
 - Scheduling will be proposed to be flexible (pending review by HR), so that on-duty hours can vary for the time of day, depending on the season. However, there will be some regularity of scheduling as well so that ACOs can plan for vacation time.
- **Emergency Call out for Police** – If Shoreline Police are dispatched by King County 9-1-1 and an ACO is not on duty, if Police require ACO assistance, an ACO may be called into duty on an emergency basis.
 - Emergency call-out will be compensated with some form of premium pay, but would not be structured as stand-by time. Both ACOs would potentially be contacted to see who would be available and able to respond to the emergency situation.
- **Reporting Structure** – Both ACOs will report to the CRT Supervisor. The CRT Supervisor will oversee both ACOs and will provide all supervisory responsibilities. The CSD Manager, who supervises the CRT Supervisor, will oversee service delivery of the program.
 - If issues arise regarding the performance of the ACOs or citizen issues exist that necessitate an elevation of the issue beyond the ACO, the CRT Supervisor will respond to these calls.
 - Administrative rules regarding the program and the Shoreline Animal Control Code (SMC Title 6) will be drafted by the CSD Manager in concert with the CRT Supervisor.
 - The CSD Manager will be the “director of the animal care and control authority” as defined in SMC Title 6.
- **Media and Communications** – Both ACOs, the CSD Manager, CRT Supervisor and CSD AA will receive media and communications training to enhance their ability to speak to external stakeholders regarding animal control related issues. This includes the media and animal-related interest groups.
 - The CSD Manager, as the code-identified director of the animal care and control authority, will ultimately speak for the service provision of the program.
- **Depth of Service** – Given that ACOs will be individually scheduled 52 hours per week, there will be no “depth of service” for the ACOs beyond the four hours per week when both ACOs are on-duty.
 - If an ACO is not able to be on-duty because of a scheduled vacation or short-term sick leave or due to a regular holiday closure, this coverage will be administratively managed by working with the other ACO and CSD staff to potentially provide some coverage or have a gap in service.
 - If an ACO is not able to be on-duty for a long duration of time due to an injury or long-term illness, this situation will be managed on a case by cases basis and may result in temporary ACO help being sought.

- Funds for additional service hours will be built into the 2013 proposed budget so that an ACO can provide extra service hours when the other ACO is out for scheduled or long term leave.
- **Training and Licensing** – Funds for ACO and CSD staff training and any required licenses and/or certifications will be built into the 2013 proposed budget.

Animal Control Equipment

- **Uniforms and Field equipment** – Each ACO will be required to wear a Shoreline Animal Control uniform.
 - Other body equipment that may be purchased includes ballistic vests or other body armor which would be required when dealing with dangerous and/or vicious animals and/or people.
 - The Animal Control vehicle will also have equipment used to capture stray and/or vicious animals, such as catch poles, animal carriers, work gloves, safety muzzles, bite sticks, etc.
 - CSD staff will follow WCIA guidelines around appropriate safety equipment for ACOs,
- **Animal Control Vehicle** – The City will purchase one pick-up truck that is capable of being retrofitted with an animal cargo box insert.
 - The insert will be able to hold four to six animals in separate cargo boxes, along with animal control equipment.
- **Office Set-up** – The ACOs will share a desk, office phone, and computer located in the CSD section of City Hall. Each ACO will also have access to a field locker located in the City Hall shop room.
- **Field Communication Equipment** – The ACOs will each have a field laptop computer (netbook computer that is also used by CRT), an 800 megahertz radio and a cell phone.

Call Response Priority Types and Response Goals

- **Call Priorities** – Incoming animal control service calls will be prioritized using the same priority system developed under the current King County Regional Animal Services Model:
 - Priority 1 - Immediate threat to life, health, safety of humans
 - Priority 2 - Immediate threat to life, health, safety of animals
 - Priority 3 - Urgent - Potential threat to life, health safety of humans or animals
 - Priority 4 - Non-emergency - non-severe bite, stray animal confined, supervisor discretion
 - Priority 5 - Non-emergency - non-urgent service requests, nuisance, follow-up inspections, patrol requests
 - Priority 6 - Information only (no service request generated)
- **Response Time Goals** – The following potential response time goals will be set by priority:
 - Priority 1 - response goal 30 minutes
 - Priority 2 - response goal 1 hour
 - Priority 3 - response goal 1 hour
 - Priority 4 - response goal 18 hours

- Priority 5 - response goal 24 hours
- Priority 6 - logged without a response goal
- **Response Time Metrics** - The time it takes from when an incoming call comes in to the system to when that call is logged into Hansen as a Service Request and has begun to be “worked” by the ACO will be used as the metric for call response times for Priority 3-5 calls.
 - For Priority 1 and 2 calls, the time it takes from when an incoming call comes in to the system to when an ACO is in the field and on the scene of the incident will be used as the metric for the call response time.

Animal Shelter

Primary Shelter - PAWS

- **Progressive Animal Welfare Society (PAWS)** - Animal shelter for dogs and cats will continue to be provided PAWS
 - Current in-take rate of \$160 per animal (through 2012)
 - Longer term contract needs to be negotiated in 2012
 - Staff will request 3-5 year contract
 - PAWS has the capacity to serve Shoreline needs into the foreseeable future
 - PAWS may take other species of animals if they have the capacity and facilities necessary to accommodate the animal; however they are not required to by contract.
 - PAWS provides intake services for stray animals from citizens and ACOs seven days a week. However, ACOs can access PAWS more frequently. Here is the schedule for stray services for ACOs:
 - Mon: 8 a.m. to 7 p.m.
 - Tue: 8 a.m. – 7 p.m.
 - Wed: 8 a.m. – 7 p.m.
 - Thu: 8 a.m. – 7:15 p.m.
 - Fri: 8 a.m. – 7:15 p.m.
 - Sat: 7 a.m. – 6 p.m.
 - Sun: 7 a.m. – 6 p.m.
 - PAWS also provides a cooler for Dead on Arrival (DOA) animals picked up by ACOs. The deceased animals are picked up by a cremation service. For before and after hours, PAWS provides ACOs with access instructions and the combination so that they can access the cooler on their own.

Secondary Shelter – Everett Animal Shelter

- **Everett Animal Shelter** – As a back up to the PAWS shelter for animal intakes from ACOs, Shoreline will also contract with the Everett Animal Shelter for shelter services.
 - Everett Animal Shelter has a current in-take rate of \$155 per animal; contract needs to be negotiated in 2012
 - Everett Animal Shelter has the capacity to serve Shoreline needs into the foreseeable future.

- Everett Animal Shelter would serve as a secondary shelter for ACOs only; all residents would continue to be directed to PAWS to drop off stray animals that they find in Shoreline or for owner-surrender services. Shoreline ACOs would also continue to use PAWS as their primary shelter.
- Everett Animal Shelter will take all species of animals, all temperaments of animals, animals that are sick or vicious, and animals that PAWS may not take due to capacity or other issues.
- Everett Animal Shelter can also perform necropsies and can handle animal remains in a secure manner that follow evidentiary protocols in criminal cases.

Other Sheltering Components

- **Field Kennel** – Shoreline staff will also provide a kennel and equipment/food shed to hold dogs, cats and potentially other species of animals when PAWS and the Everett Animal Shelter are not open for intakes by ACOs. The kennel will primarily hold animals overnight.
 - ACOs will need to care for the animals while held in the field kennel.
 - The field kennel will be located in the back lot of the Shoreline Police Station.
 - PAWS will provide ACOs a basic cleaning protocol to make sure the kennels are properly cleaned in order to ensure disease control.
- **Animal Sheltering Contract Management** – CSD staff will manage the PAWS and Everett Animal Shelter contracts and be in close communication with these providers to troubleshoot issues that may arise with animal sheltering, animal intakes, stray animals, etc.

Pet Licensing

Pet Data

- **PetData Contract and Costs** – Pet licensing services will be provided by PetData under contract.
 - Per-license costs are as follows:
 - \$3.85 per license charged to the municipality for a one-year license or a replacement tag.
 - \$2.00 charged to the municipality for each additional year after year one if there are multi-year licenses.
 - \$2.50 Collection Service Fee for each late fee collected
 - PetData also has a \$1,000 one-time start up fee.
 - For customers who want to purchase a license online, there is a \$1.95 convenience fee. For those customers not wanting to pay this fee, they can purchase the license by mail.
- **PetData Scope of Service** – The following services will be provided by Pet Data as part of their licensing contract:
 - Manage the daily operations of animal licensing including the processing of licensing mail from pet owners, processing license sales and

vaccination reports, entering licensing and vaccination data, providing customer service and depositing money.

- Enter all new and renewal licenses into PetData's proprietary database. Process and mail license tags within ten business days after receipt of the licensing payment and complete documentation as required by local ordinance.
- Issue replacement tags to citizens whose license tags have been lost, stolen or damaged.
- Mail renewal and reminder notices to customers who have previously licensed their pets.
- Provide secure password-protected access to animal licensing data via PetAccess, a web-based application developed by PetData. Access will be granted only to authorized personnel, and the application will be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week except for periodic maintenance by PetData or internet outages outside PetData's control. The application allows searching of licensing data by various criteria, including but not limited to pet owner name, address, phone number, and license tag number.
- Provide an online license tag lookup to the public to include the owner's last name, any available phone numbers and the pet's name and description.
- Process rabies vaccination certificates on behalf of client and mail notices to those pet owners who vaccinated their pet(s) against rabies, but did not purchase license(s).
- Provide veterinarians and other authorized registrars with reasonable quantities of supplies (reporting forms, vaccination certificates, citizen mailing envelopes, etc.) necessary to sell license tags and/or report information on citizens vaccinating their animals against rabies to the client.
- Track monthly vaccination and/or sales reports from all veterinarians participating in animal licensing program and keep record of all tag inventories at authorized registrars. Provide this information to clients as requested. Furthermore, PetData will communicate directly with veterinarians as requested by client.
- Deposit all receipts collected for license fees, with the exception of those payments made via credit card, into a client bank account either at a local branch or via overnight mail to a bank in client's location.
- Provide a monthly report of animals licensed and statistical reports as requested within a timely manner. Depending on the information requested, PetData can provide most reports within five business days.
- Respond to and communicate with animal control officer inquiries or animal owners' requests in a timely fashion and communicate with citizens by phone, mail or email as needed.

Other Licensing Components

- **License Tags** – Shoreline staff will need to purchase the actual license tags and ship them to Pet Data to be issued by them. There will be a cost for the purchase of the tags.

- **License Sales Locations in Shoreline** – CSD staff will work with Pet Data to establish in-person sales locations in the community.
 - Currently, King County sells pet licenses at two QFC locations in Shoreline, as well as at the Police Storefronts and at City Hall. The City will work to replicate and hopefully expand these sales locations.
- **Pet Licensing Communication and Marketing** - CSD staff will work closely with City Communications staff to market pet licensing and inform pet owners about the importance of licensing their pet. CSD staff will also work with pet-related business in Shoreline to help with pet licensing initiatives.
- **Pet Licensing Contract Management** – CSD staff will manage the Pet Data contract and be in close communication with them to troubleshoot issues that may arise with license sales, notices, sales locations, veterinary paperwork, etc.

Attachment B

Shoreline In-house Implementation Plan Cost Model

Shoreline Field Service Cost Estimates								
						Annual	One-Time	Overhead Costs
Staffing Cost								
Field Staffing:	Salary	Benefits	Total	Units	Cost			
Animal Control Officers (ACO)	\$ 56,352	\$21,414	\$ 77,766	1.50	\$ 77,766	\$ 116,649		
<i>Total New FTE</i>				1.50				
Supervision/Administration for Personnel:								
Community Services Division Manager	Salary/Benefits		\$ 129,739	5%			\$	6,487
Customer Response Team Supervisor	Salary/Benefits		\$ 111,414	25%			\$	27,854
Community Services Division Administrative Assistant	Salary/Benefits		\$ 73,754	15%			\$	11,063
Additional Service Hours/Overtime:						\$ 5,000		
Total Staffing Cost:						\$ 121,649	\$ -	\$ 45,404
Equipment/Uniform Cost			Replacement Cycle			Annual	One-Time	Overhead Costs
Animal Control Officer Equipment: uniforms, ballistic vests, radios, cell phones, animal control equipment for two officers								
			5 years		\$ 1,000	\$ 5,000		
1/2 ton Truck			6 years		\$ 4,167	\$ 25,000		
Animal Control Vehicle: ¾ ton truck from the State bid; animal cargo boxes to hold at least 4 animals and standard pickup truck canopy								
Animal Cargo Boxes and pickup truck canopy			15 years		\$ 867	\$ 13,000		
Computer Equipment: for office and a laptop for the vehicle						\$ 750	\$ 3,000	
Equipment/Uniform Cost:							\$ 46,000	
Vehicle and Equipment Annual Replacement Fund:						\$ 6,783		
Operating Costs						Annual	One-Time	Overhead Costs
Inter-departmental Overhead: IT, HR, Payroll, Insurance, Legal, Facilities, and Accounting								\$41,920
Office Operating: supplies, cell phones and miscellaneous cost						\$ 2,000		
Field Kennel Supplies:						\$ 500		
Training: Training and travel for ACO						\$ 2,550		
Vehicle Repair:						\$ 3,000		
Fuel: 5000 miles/yr 10 mpg \$3.50 per gallon						\$ 1,750		
Marketing: printing publications, mailing and educational material						\$ 2,000		
Annual Operating Cost:						\$ 11,800		\$ 41,920
Summary Total						Annual	One-Time	Overhead Costs
Staffing Cost:						\$ 121,649		\$ 45,404
Equipment/Uniforms Cost (one-time for start-up):							\$ 46,000	
Vehicle and Equipment Annual Replacement Fund:						\$ 6,783		
Annual Operating Cost:						\$ 11,800		\$ 41,920
Total Field Services Cost:						\$ 140,232	\$ 46,000	\$ 87,323

Shoreline In-House Implementation Plan Cost Model

2013 PAWS Shelter Cost Estimates				
PAWS 2010 Annualized Total Charged Intakes	PAWS 2011 Total Charged Intakes	2-year Average Charged Intakes	2013 Rate (5% over current 2012 rate of \$160 per intake)	2013 Estimated Cost
233	162	198	\$168	\$33,180
2013 Everett Animal Shelter Cost Estimates				
Other Shelters	Estimated Animals	Estimated Per Animal Cost	2013 Estimated Cost	
Specialized, non-wildlife animal rescue organizations for sheltering and care of exotic animals, farm animals and small mammals.	35	\$155	\$ 5,425	
2013 Shelter Overhead Cost				
CRT Supervisor	Salary and Benefits	Time spent on shelter related	2013 Overhead Cost	
Management of PAWS and Everett Contracts and Troubleshooting of Contract Issues; Shelter System	\$111,414	2%	\$2,228	

2013 Pet Data Licensing Cost Estimates				
KC 2009 Licenses sold	KC 2010 Licenses sold	KC 2011 Licenses sold	3-year Average of Licenses Sold	2013 Pet Data Rate
7,062	5,402	4,975	5,813	\$3.85
2013 Other Licensing Cost				
Bulk License Tags	Estimated Tags Needed	Estimated Per Tag Cost	2013 Estimated Cost	
Must provide Shoreline license tags to Pet Data	7000	\$0.10	\$ 700	
2013 Licensing Overhead Cost				
CRT Supervisor	Salary and Benefits	Time spent on license related	2013 Overhead Cost	
Management of PetData contract, oversight of licensing program, license education and marketing, and all other licensing duties	\$111,414	3%	\$3,342	

Shoreline Cost Model – Overhead Cost			
Overhead Field Service Cost	Overhead Shelter Cost	Overhead License Cost	Total Overhead Cost
\$87,323	\$2,228	\$3,342	\$92,894

2013 Estimated Animal Control Program Cost				
Field Services Cost	PAWS and Everett Shelter Cost	PetData and Other License Cost	Total Direct Cost	Overhead Cost
\$140,232	\$38,605	\$23,080	\$201,917	\$92,894

2013 Estimated Net Animal Control Program Cost				
Total Direct Cost	Total Direct Cost (with Overhead Cost)	2011 License Fee Revenue	Total Net Direct Cost	Total Net Direct Cost (with Overhead Cost)
\$201,917	\$294,811	\$ 145,689	\$56,228	\$149,122

Regional Animal Services of King County
Precommitment 2013 Estimated Payment Calculation

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

\$1,588,778 \$2,705,128 \$653,826 \$4,947,731 \$2,272,689 -\$2,675,042

Source: Regional Animal Services of King County

Date: Feb 28, 2012 (Draft)

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