

- Action
- Discussion
- Information

**SUBJECT: ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICES UPDATE**

**STAFF CONTACT:** Sheida Sahandy, City Manager's Office, 452-6168

**POLICY ISSUE:** King County's animal services contract with the City of Bellevue expires December 31, 2012. Notice must be provided to the County by May 1, 2012 regarding the City's intention to enter into a new contract. This briefing will provide an update on the negotiations with King County, and the potential costs and timing for moving forward in the regional model. Staff will also describe the sub-regional alternative being explored.

**DIRECTION  
NEEDED**

**FROM COUNCIL:** This is an informational briefing. No action is being requested at this time. Staff will provide a second update to Council on March 26, and return on April 23 for a final update and to seek direction.

**BACKGROUND**

***King County Interlocal Agreement***

King County provides animal care and control services for 26 cities, including the City of Bellevue, and the unincorporated areas of King County. The current interlocal agreement (ILA) covers the period of July 2010 through December 2012. The ILA automatically extends for a period of two years unless a party opts out of the regional system, which then triggers a re-negotiation among the remaining parties. The Cities of Auburn, Kirkland and Shoreline have provided verbal notification of their intent to leave the regional system at the end of 2012. A city-county staff workgroup has been meeting over the last few months to explore terms for a new agreement. County animal services will end at the end of the year unless an agreement is adopted by the parties by June 30, 2011.

***King County Services***

Animal control services provided by the County fall into three categories: shelter/adoption, animal control and pet licensing. Each category is described further below. In 2011, the County responded to 4,800 calls for service, sheltered 5,300 animals, and issued 99,000 pet licenses. The County also provides ancillary services such as animal cruelty investigations, adjudication of civil infractions, and responses to public disclosure requests.

### **Field Services**

Field services include responding to resident complaints as well as enforcement functions in parks and other public places. Examples include responding to complaints about barking dogs, investigating allegations of vicious animals or animal abuse, picking up stray, injured or deceased animals, assisting police, and patrol services in parks for enforcement of licensing, leash and clean-up laws.

Calls are divided into six levels of priority, as described below. The data from 2011 show that the vast majority of Bellevue calls (78%) fell into the non-urgent categories (Priorities 4, 5 and 6).

<b>Category</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Number of Bellevue calls</b>	<b>Percent of Total Bellevue Calls (out of 439 total Bellevue calls)</b>
<b>Priority 1</b>	Immediate threat to life, health and safety of humans	17	4%
<b>Priority 2</b>	Immediate threat to life, health and safety of animals	25	6%
<b>Priority 3</b>	Urgent – Potential threat to life, health and safety of humans or animals	51	12%
<b>Priority 4</b>	Non-emergency- non-severe bite, stray animal confined	153	35%
<b>Priority 5</b>	Non-emergency- non-urgent service request, nuisance, follow-up inspection	91	21%
<b>Priority 6</b>	Information only – patrol requests, unwilling to sign complaint, limited information prevents response	102	22%

### **Shelter and Adoption**

Shelter services are provided at the County's Kent facility, which provided care, shelter and adoption services to 5,300 animals in 2011. This shelter has benefitted from significant facility and service level improvements during the term of the ILA. The euthanasia rate has dropped steadily from 35% in 2007 to 14% in 2011. The facility is an "open shelter," accepting many types of animals, including livestock, birds, rodents, reptiles and fish. The significant majority of intakes, however, are cats and dogs (approximately 270 animals per year are not cats or dogs). The facility accepts aggressive animals, which require special handling and safety procedures. Approximately 421 intakes in 2011 were of aggressive animals. The County also performs cruelty investigations and impounds animals being held as evidence for those investigations, which are therefore at high risk for theft. These animals require special safety precautions. Typically, animals are brought to the facility by field officers, Good Samaritans, or owners.

### **Licensing**

County pet license services include: marketing, education and outreach; license sales online, in person at King County facilities and through partner businesses; sending renewal reminders and late notices; compliance enforcement in conjunction with field officers; mailing of license tags; and maintenance of a database of pets, owners, addresses and violations. The County has recently hired a new marketing manager for its program and rolled out a new branding scheme. Increasing the rate of license issuances and renewals is now a focus for the County.

**Bellevue Service Usage Summary**

Bellevue’s usage data for the three services provided by the County is shown below. Bellevue’s payment obligations under the existing ILA are determined by application of a formula which takes into account the amount of systems usage, the amount of revenue generated through licensing, and certain credits from King County that were negotiated at the outset of the contract. Attachment 1 illustrates how Bellevue’s use of the County services in 2010 and 2011 translated into the actual payments owed.

Year	Bellevue Calls for Service	Shelter Intakes from Bellevue	Number of Licenses Sold to Bellevue Residents	Revenue Generated from License Sales
2011	439	185	9,380	\$274,000
2010	434	234	13,700	\$338,000
2009	400	251	10,340	\$274,000
2008	506	346	11,310	-

**Option #1: Remain Part of the King County Regional System**

A regional animal services model has the benefit of providing consistency of service and economies of scale. The County’s stated goal for the next contracting cycle is to increase revenues and achieve a self-sustaining system by the end of the three year period. With respect to developing the new model, the County’s goal is to maintain or reduce costs to each participating city from the estimated 2012 levels without impacting service delivery.

However, formulation of a system that adequately addresses the differing needs of participating jurisdictions while maintaining reasonable and equitable costs continues to be a challenge for the County. In response to cost concerns voiced by the cities, the County has proposed efficiencies and cuts that would lower costs by 11% in 2013, as compared to 2011. Accordingly, the County’s total animal control services costs, which have gone from \$5.9 million in 2010 and 2011, to an estimated \$5.8 million in 2012, would become \$5.3 million in 2013.

Some of the key changes proposed by the County are described below as well as in greater detail in Attachment 2. It should be noted, however, that negotiations are ongoing and it is not yet known which cities will ultimately decide to participate in the regional model. Since the model is extremely sensitive to the number and demographics of city participants, the terms being discussed at this time are subject to change. In addition to the key terms set forth below, the County has agreed to allow cities substantive involvement in developing service protocols, to exclude any shelter capital costs from those allocated to the cities, and to focus on the aggressive pursuit of revenue enhancement options.

Term	Current ILA	Proposed ILA**
<b>Cost Allocation</b>	50% Usage - 50% Population	80% Usage- 20% Population
<b>Net Costs to Bellevue</b>	See Attachment 1	See Attachments 1 and 2
<b>County Financial Support to System</b>	\$1.37 million in 2012	\$1.76 million in 2013

<b>ILA Duration</b>	2.5 years	3 years
<b>Animal Control Officer Service Hours</b>	Weekdays	Possible addition of a weekend day being explored
<b>Control Districts</b>	4 Districts, officers work out of Kent facility	3 Districts with officers hosted within districts

*\*\* This proposal contemplated that only the City of Auburn would leave the regional system. The County is currently working on a model without the Cities of Shoreline and Kirkland.*

**Option #2: Form a Sub-Regional System**

Staff from Bellevue, Kirkland, Redmond and Mercer Island has been exploring a sub-regional service delivery model in which the City of Bellevue would provide contracted field services for all four cities. Each city would be responsible for its own licensing and animal shelter services. This model would likely have the advantage of lower long term costs and greater control over service delivery. However, it would also require unbudgeted startup investments in 2012 at the same time that the City would still be paying King County for animal control services under the existing contract.

Staff is developing the details of this alternative model, including exploration of operational, risk, labor, records, court system, hearing examiner, prosecution, and other direct and indirect service and cost impacts. Greater detail on this option will be presented to Council at the next Council update on March 26.

***Next Steps***

Continue to explore all options available to the City to provide good animal control services at a reasonable cost, using the principles included Attachment 3 as guidance.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

NA

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

N/A

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1) Table Showing Bellevue's Historical and Proposed Cost in the Regional Model
- 2) Current Draft of the Regional Proposal
- 3) Staff Guiding Principles for Animal Care and Control, developed by staff in 2010

**Bellevue's Actual Historical and  
Estimated Future Costs  
In the King County Regional System**

The following table shows Bellevue's actual and estimated costs during the term of the existing interlocal agreement (June 2010 through December 2012), as well as the 2013 costs proposed by the County for the new model. Payments due to King County are calculated by adding Control Costs, Shelter Costs and Licensing Costs, then subtracting Licensing Revenues, Credits Provided by King County, and Transitional License Revenues generated by extra canvassing efforts.

YEAR	Control Costs (A)	Shelter Cost (B)	Licensing Cost (C)	Total Allocated Costs (A+B+C)	Licensing Revenue (D)	Net Cost (A+B+C-D)	Credits Provided by King County (E)	Transitional License Revenue through King County (F)	Payment Made/Due (A+B+C-D-E-F)
1 2010 - six months actual	\$ 74,270	\$ 118,364	\$ 53,977	\$ 246,611 <sup>1</sup>	\$ 161,343	\$ 85,268	\$ 34,196	\$ 49,697	\$ 1,375
2 2011 -- full year actual	\$ 142,920	\$ 248,731	\$ 98,139	\$ 489,790	\$ 274,346	\$ 215,444	\$ 96,500	\$ 60,000	\$ 58,944
3 2012 High Revenue Estimate <sup>2</sup>	\$ 157,077	\$ 258,846	\$ 86,089	\$ 502,012	\$ 334,835	\$ 167,177	\$ 96,500	0	\$ 70,677
4 2012 Low Revenue Estimate	\$ 157,077	\$ 258,846	\$ 86,089	\$ 502,012	\$ 274,346	\$ 227,666	\$ 96,500	0	\$ 131,166
5 2013 - Proposed Regional Model	\$ 142,322	\$ 161,486	\$ 75,249	\$ 379,057	\$ 273,931	\$ 105,126	\$ -	\$ 34,449	\$ 70,677

<sup>1</sup> If doubled in order to represent a full year, the Total Allocated Costs would have been \$493,222.

<sup>2</sup> The formula used in the ILA for payment estimation is tied to 2010 revenue numbers. Since 2011 revenue numbers were significantly lower (due to lower license sales), both the high and low revenue versions are provided to show the range of possible actual payments which may be due for 2012.

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

Auburn Out, Allocation Method: Population = 20%, Usage = 80% Control Districts 240 and 260 combined into one (500), with 240 and 260 consolidated to District 500, costs to districts 25%, 25%, 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 #1**

Control	Shelter	Licensing	Total Allocated Costs (1)	2011 Licensing Revenue (est)	Estimated Net Cost
Budgeted Total Allocable Costs	\$2,819,960	\$673,640	\$5,264,087		
Budgeted Non-Licensing Revenue	\$112,507	\$13,265	\$205,812		
Budgeted Net Allocable Costs	\$2,707,453	\$660,375	\$5,058,275	\$2,491,824	-\$2,566,451

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 Credits (Annual) (6)	2013-2015 Transition Funding (Annual) (5)	Estimated Net Costs with Transition Funding and Credits	Estimated Revenue from Proposed Transitional Licensing Support (7)	Estimated Net Final Cost (8)	
200	Carnation	\$4,118	\$9,497	\$1,239	\$8,854	\$4,792	-\$4,102	\$0	\$552	-\$3,550	\$968	-\$2,584	
	Duvall	\$11,261	\$15,264	\$5,351	\$31,876	\$21,343	-\$10,533	\$0	N/A	-\$10,533	\$7,658	-\$2,875	
	Estimated Unincorporated King County	\$83,837	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Kenmore	\$37,911	\$11,592	\$15,423	\$64,926	\$58,902	-\$6,324	\$0	\$0	-\$6,324	\$0	-\$6,324	
	Kirkland	\$94,595	\$99,626	\$24,162	\$244,162	\$219,135	-\$25,027	\$0	\$0	-\$25,027	\$12,718	-\$12,309	
	Leke Forest Park	\$7,034	\$12,089	\$42,027	\$48,504	\$6,477	-\$8,027	\$0	\$0	-\$8,027	\$0	-\$8,027	
	Redmond	\$37,867	\$54,303	\$32,308	\$124,478	\$116,407	-\$8,071	\$0	\$0	-\$8,071	\$0	-\$8,071	
	Stammish	\$35,341	\$44,214	\$31,129	\$110,684	\$117,649	\$6,965	\$0	\$0	\$6,965	\$0	\$6,965	
	Shoreline	\$92,519	\$29,677	\$38,194	\$160,391	\$145,688	-\$14,702	\$0	\$0	-\$14,702	\$0	-\$14,702	
	Woodinville	\$12,268	\$5,103	\$7,708	\$26,079	\$29,220	\$3,141	\$0	\$0	\$3,141	\$0	\$3,141	
<b>SUBTOTAL FOR CITIES IN 200 (excludes unincorporated area)</b>		<b>\$338,776</b>	<b>\$271,310</b>	<b>\$203,392</b>	<b>\$813,477</b>	<b>\$781,301</b>	<b>-\$51,624</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$552</b>	<b>-\$51,624</b>	<b>\$21,342</b>	<b>-\$30,282</b>	
220	Baux Arts	\$86	\$167	\$246	\$500	\$930	-\$430	\$0	\$0	\$430	\$0	\$430	
	Bellevue	\$142,322	\$161,486	\$75,249	\$379,056	\$273,931	-\$105,125	\$0	\$0	-\$105,125	\$34,449	-\$70,676	
	Clyde Hill	\$1,866	\$3,168	\$1,952	\$6,985	\$7,170	\$165	\$0	\$0	\$165	\$0	\$165	
	Estimated Unincorporated King County	\$166,199	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Issaquah	\$59,351	\$46,167	\$18,279	\$115,797	\$65,947	-\$49,850	\$0	\$0	-\$49,850	\$0	-\$49,850	
	Mercer Island	\$13,581	\$16,177	\$13,653	\$45,611	\$49,962	\$4,351	\$0	\$0	\$4,351	\$0	\$4,351	
	Newcastle	\$16,484	\$12,318	\$4,657	\$33,459	\$18,188	-\$15,271	\$0	\$0	-\$15,271	\$2,599	-\$12,672	
	North Bend	\$15,851	\$16,273	\$4,128	\$36,252	\$15,694	-\$20,558	\$386	\$1,376	-\$18,596	\$6,463	-\$12,133	
	Snoqualmie	\$12,248	\$11,116	\$6,737	\$30,101	\$25,065	-\$5,036	\$0	\$0	-\$5,036	\$0	-\$5,036	
	Yarrow Point	\$625	\$561	\$760	\$1,945	\$2,700	\$755	\$0	\$0	\$755	\$0	\$755	
<b>SUBTOTAL FOR CITIES IN 220 (excludes unincorporated area)</b>		<b>\$265,432</b>	<b>\$269,432</b>	<b>\$123,862</b>	<b>\$649,707</b>	<b>\$445,670</b>	<b>-\$203,037</b>	<b>\$566</b>	<b>\$1,376</b>	<b>-\$201,075</b>	<b>\$43,511</b>	<b>-\$157,564</b>	
500	Ken	\$263,232	\$794,101	\$69,400	\$1,126,733	\$253,944	-\$872,789	\$495,870	\$110,495	-\$266,424	\$0	-\$266,424	
	SeaTac	\$184,894	\$179,732	\$27,938	\$472,322	\$47,232	-\$230,708	\$116,611	\$7,442	-\$106,653	\$0	-\$106,653	
	Tukwila	\$49,635	\$110,797	\$9,229	\$169,652	\$32,705	-\$136,947	\$51,987	\$5,255	-\$89,705	\$0	-\$89,705	
	Black Diamond	\$8,084	\$14,340	\$2,685	\$25,108	\$10,165	-\$14,923	\$1,209	\$1,209	-\$10,451	\$2,001	-\$8,450	
	Covington	\$82,450	\$82,456	\$12,634	\$147,580	\$48,992	-\$98,588	\$6,070	\$36,409	-\$57,119	\$0	-\$57,119	
	Enumclaw	\$41,747	\$56,672	\$6,920	\$105,340	\$25,307	-\$80,033	\$28,407	\$11,188	-\$40,438	\$5,973	-\$34,465	
	Estimated Unincorporated King County	\$305,059	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	(see total below)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	Maple Valley	\$41,275	\$68,380	\$15,080	\$124,979	\$56,628	-\$68,047	\$6,867	\$6,027	-\$55,153	\$6,956	-\$48,197	
	<b>TOTAL FOR CITIES IN 500 (excludes unincorporated area)</b>		<b>\$1,131,322</b>	<b>\$1,852,373</b>	<b>\$456,514</b>	<b>\$3,440,209</b>	<b>\$1,682,954</b>	<b>-\$1,757,255</b>	<b>\$750,000</b>	<b>\$148,614</b>	<b>-\$858,641</b>	<b>\$79,783</b>	<b>-\$776,858</b>
	<b>Total King County Unincorporated Area Allocation</b>		<b>\$559,125</b>	<b>\$655,080</b>	<b>\$203,861</b>	<b>\$1,618,065</b>	<b>\$808,870</b>	<b>-\$809,195</b>					<b>-\$809,195</b>

Source: Regional Animal Services of King County  
Date: Jan 30, 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.

- Based on various efficiencies and changes to the RASCK operating budget, adjustments for reduced intakes overall, reduced usage with Auburn out, and shifting two positions out of the model (county sponsored), the 2013 Estimated Budgeted Total Allocable Cost has been reduced to \$5,264,087.
- One quarter of control services costs are allocated to control districts 200 and 220, and one half of control costs are allocated to district 500, then costs are further allocated 80% by total call volume (2011 Calls - Preliminary year end) and 20% by 2011 population.
- This excludes the cost to northern cities of sheltering their animals at PAVS under separate contracts. Shelter costs are allocated 80% by total call volume (2011 Calls - Preliminary year end) and 20% by 2011 population.
- Licensing costs are allocated 20% by population (2011) and 80% by total number of Pet Licenses issued (2011) less \$0.00 Sr. Lifetime Licenses.
- Transition funding is allocated per capita in a two tier formula to cities with certain per capita net cost allocations. For additional detail, see 2010 Interlocal Agreement Exhibit C-4 (2013 column) for more information. Transition Funding does not change for years 2013 - 2015 (except for minimum payments as specified in the ILA).
- Credits are allocated to those jurisdictions whose shelter intakes per capita exceeded the system average (20043) and are intended to help minimize the impact of changing the cost allocation methodology from 50% population/50 usage model. See Interlocal Agreement Exhibit C-4 for more detail.
- New Transition License Funding has been included for certain jurisdictions to help limit the Estimated Net Final Cost to the 2012 estimated level. Receipt of support is contingent on city providing in-kind services and county ability to provide resources and/or recover costs
- Net Final Costs greater than \$0 will be reallocated to remaining jurisdictions with a negative net final cost, except northern cities where the anticipated rebate is used to offset the cost of sheltering with PAVS.

**Staff Guiding Principles for Animal Care and Control**

1. Ensure the City has Good Animal Care and Control Services: While not state-mandated, the provision of an animal care and control program is an important service for community safety, enjoyment of public open spaces and provides a benefit for pet owners. The program should provide proper care and control for animals entering the system.
2. Provide a Good Value: An animal care and control program should provide the level of service desired at the lowest cost to the City and citizens licensing their pets.
3. Control Over Revenue: The City should have control over the use of licensing revenue generated from licensing activities in the City.
4. Be a Self-Sustaining Program: The animal care and control program should be structured to be financially self-sustaining, achieving to the greatest extent possible, full-cost recovery through license fees and any other program revenue.
5. Ensure Future Sustainability: The program should be structured to be sustainable and stable into the future.
6. Governance: A program should provide the ability for the City to determine desired service levels and control costs.
7. Good Decision-making: The City's decisions regarding an animal care and control program should be based on sound principles and data.