



King County

Metropolitan King County Council
Budget and Fiscal Management Committee

Agenda Item No.: 11

Date: June 8, 2010

Polly St. John
Jenny Giambattista

Proposed No.: 2010-0327

Prepared By: Marilyn Cope

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: AN ORDINANCE that would provide a total of \$3.24 million and 1.90 new FTEs in supplemental appropriation authority for regional animal services in King County.

SUMMARY:

This proposed supplemental appropriation ordinance is one of a package of three ordinances that would implement a new regional animal services model within King County. They are:

1. Proposed Ordinance 2010-0325 would amend the county code to reflect the proposed new model, including changes to fees and fines.
2. Proposed Ordinance 2010-0326 would approve interlocal agreements and Enhanced Control services contracts with 27 cities within King County.
3. Proposed Ordinance 2010-0327 would provide \$3.24 million and 1.90 new FTEs in the Records and Licensing Division.

This staff report will concentrate on the proposed supplemental Ordinance 2010-0327. Additional staff reports have been prepared for Proposed Ordinance 2010-0325 and Proposed Ordinance 2010-0326.

Proposed Ordinance 2010-0327 would provide supplemental appropriation authority of \$3.24 million. Of this amount, \$3,150,000 is for Records and Licensing and \$91,700 is for Public Health. This expenditure authority would provide for:

1. Expenditure authority for sheltering services for February through June 2010,
2. Implementation of the regional model beginning on July 1, 2010,
3. Enhanced service contracts for animal control,
4. Expenditure of animal bequest funds; and
5. One-time costs and strategic investments to reform measures.

The proposal would move 2.00 FTE positions from Public Health to Records and Licensing Services (RALS) and add 1.90 FTEs in RALS to implement the Executive's proposed regional model.

The proposal will appropriate funding for animal services through 2010. Approval of the request will "draw down" the fund balance of the General Fund by \$2,685,521. (This annual impact is similar to General Fund contributions in past years to support animal services, which has averaged \$2.65 million over the past four years.) However, the use of fund balance will not add to the 2011 projected deficit of \$60 million because animal services have been included in the deficit estimates.

COUNCIL PRIORITIES

The Executive's proposed regional animal services model may further the Council's Local and Regional Cooperation Priority to work with other governments and organizations to implement local and regional priorities and increase the efficiency of service delivery.

BACKGROUND:

On November 9, 2009, the council adopted Motion 13092, directing the Executive to end the provision of animal shelter services by King County no later than January 31, 2010. The motion also directed the executive to enter into new full cost recovery contracts with cities for animal control and pet licensing services no later than June 30, 2010.

As a result of this policy direction, the adopted 2010 budget included a number of provisos to terminate these services if full cost recovery were not achieved. The 2010 budget did not include expenditure authority for sheltering services after January.

Because there is currently not enough animal sheltering capacity in the region, the Council adopted Ordinance 16750 in January, extending staffing authority for sheltering services through July 1, 2010; however, no expenditure authority was associated with the change in staffing or other costs associated with the provision of animal services.

The Council will be asked to act quickly on the new regional model because the Executive has terminated all existing animal service contracts with cities, effective July 1, 2010.

This staff report will concentrate on the proposed fiscal implications of the proposal.

ANALYSIS:

This supplemental request will delete proviso restrictions associated with ending animal services in King County and will fund the annual costs associated with those services.

Annual Costs to Provide Regional Animal Services

2010 Budget Appropriation

Expenditure authority for Animal Care and Control resides in the county's General Fund and is budgeted mainly in the Records and Licensing Services (RALS) appropriation unit. The 2010 budget appropriated \$3,398,246 in RALS and transferred \$39,047 from the General Fund to Public Health to support shelter veterinarians. Consequently, the 2010 budget included expenditure authority of \$3,437,293 for the provision of animal services.

Proposed Annual Costs

As shown in **Attachment 4**, all analysis for expenditures and revenues related to animal services costs are broken into two categories: (1) January through June 2010 "current" costs and (2) July through December 2010 costs associated with the new regional model. This exercise allowed the Executive to build a new budget that is essentially "zero based".

The estimated 2010 annual costs to provide direct animal services will be \$6,678,993¹. This amount includes costs incurred by the county for services to the cities and unincorporated area through June and implementation of the new model beginning in July.

Total Supplemental Request

The difference between the estimated costs of \$6,678,993 and already appropriated expenditure authority of \$3,437,293 is the amount of the requested supplemental appropriation – \$3,241,700 – as shown in the table below:

Table 1. 2010 Annual Costs for Animal Services

Existing/Proposed Expenditure Authority	Amount
2010 Budget Appropriation:	
RALS	\$ 3,398,246
Public Health	39,047
subtotal	\$ 3,437,293
Supplemental Request:	
RALS	\$3,150,000
Public Health	91,700
subtotal	\$ 3,241,700
Total 2010 Cost for Animal Services	\$ 6,678,993

General Fund Impact

The \$6.7 million in expenditure authority is proposed to be backed by \$3,993,473 in revenues. The revenues are not sufficient to support all expenditures; consequently, the General Fund must be used to support animal services. Approval of the request will "draw down" fund balance in the General Fund by \$2,685,521. This annual impact is similar to General Fund contributions in past years to support animal services, which

¹ Previously assumed and budgeted overhead costs totaling \$579,000 are included in the allocation model.

has averaged \$2.65 million over the past four years. However, the use of fund balance will not add to the 2011 deficit because animal services costs have been included in the estimated \$60 million deficit.

General Fund Support will Decrease in Out-Years

The new service model assumes increasing revenues from city contracts that will **decrease** General Fund contributions in the out years as shown in the table below:

Table 2. Anticipated General Fund contributions for Animal Services

Year	General Fund support
2010	\$2,685,521
2011	\$2,070,357
2012	\$1,591,321
2013	\$1,456,189
2014	\$1,320,825

The revenues from city contracts are estimated to increase in each year of the model. This new revenue is a stable source of funding because if licensing revenues for a city decrease, then city net payments increase a commensurate amount. As a result, the county's estimated general fund contribution under the new regional model is less in the second half of 2010 and in 2011 than it has been in recent years and is significantly less in out years.

Service Allocation Costs

Proposed Ordinance 2010-0326 would approve a new Interlocal Agreement that allocates the costs for the new regional animal services model among participating cities and the county. Please see the staff report for the interlocal agreement, Proposed Ordinance 2010-0326 for a more detailed discussion of the cost allocation model.

The new regional animal services model breaks contracting cities into four geographical areas:

1. Area 200 includes Bothell², Carnation, Duvall, Kenmore, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Redmond, Sammamish, Shoreline, and Woodinville.
2. Area 220 includes Beaux Arts, Bellevue, Clyde Hill, Issaquah, Mercer Island, Newcastle, North Bend, Snoqualmie, and Yarrow Point.
3. Area 240 includes Kent, SeaTac, and Tukwila.
4. Area 260 includes Auburn, Black Diamond, Covington, Enumclaw, and Maple Valley.

King County will continue to be responsible for service provision within the unincorporated areas of the county.

The proposed model allocates 2010 costs (less non-licensing revenue) for animal services in three specific areas: control services – \$1,698,500, shelter services – \$3,004,900, and licensing services – \$898,400. These total allocated costs equal

² Bothell has agreed to a six month contract rather than a 2.5 year contract

\$5,601,800. The cost allocation assumptions are based on both population and use of the system. Unincorporated King County allocations for service provision are included in the model and are assumed in all cost estimates. *These annualized cost estimates will be discussed in more detail in a subsequent staff report.*

2010 Development and Implementation Costs incurred by King County

The proposal includes an initial investment in the first year of the model by the county to develop and implement the proposal. These transitional costs are excluded in the cost allocation calculation shown above. As shown in **Attachment 5**, these costs include \$542,500 for one-time implementation costs and \$533,200 for general operations and reform efforts.

One Time Implementation Costs - \$542,500

These costs are associated with model implementation and include contract negotiation, IT system upgrades, the move from the mainframe computer, and transitional license marketing support. It is anticipated that the IT systems will be upgraded and moved off the mainframe computer by December 2011; however, the first six months associated with IT support is included.

The County is also providing one-time marketing services in 2010 to the five cities with the lowest per capita licensing revenue (Bellevue, Enumclaw, Kent, SeaTac, and Tukwila). The program involves canvassing residents to increase the number of pet licenses issued. Any revenue generated will offset the cities cost of animal services.

General Operations and Reforms - \$533,200

The costs assumed for general operations and reforms include salary upgrades and reclassifications, some consultant costs, and one new administrative position. The executive notes these costs are necessary to implement the new model.

Incentives to Participate in the New Regional Model

The new regional model proposal includes financial incentives from the county to encourage city participation. The new regional model includes transition funding for cities with high per capita costs and residential credits for cities whose use is low relative to population. *Attachment C-1 to the Interlocal Agreement is a spreadsheet that details the assumed cost allocations to cities, including transitional funding and residential credits for each city.*

Transitional Funding Credits - \$325,000 in 2010 (1/2 year)

The Transition Funding Credit has been calculated to offset costs to certain cities on a declining basis over four years. In the first full year of the model, county credits for this purpose equal \$650,000 and declines each year thereafter, lessening the burden to the General Fund. According to the Executive transmittal letter, this support was necessary to reach consensus across jurisdictions that vary significantly regarding use and revenue generation as well as the value they place on animal welfare. This support also establishes a smooth transition for cities in difficult financial times – a principle articulated in the council's adopted motion.

Cities qualifying for this credit are those that under the cost allocation formula (allocating costs generally based half on population and half on usage), would pay the highest per capita costs in 2010.

The Transition Funding Credit begins at an annual amount of \$650,000 and declines over time: 50% of the annual amount (since the service year is six months, rather than a full year) is allocable to each qualifying city in calculating the Estimated 2010 Payment; 100% of the amount is allocable again in calculating the 2011 Estimated Payment; 66% of the amount is allocable in 2012. If the Agreement is extended for an additional two years, 33% of the amount is available in 2013; no transition funding credit is allocable in 2014.

Resident Usage Credits to Cities - \$139,761 in 2010 (1/2 year) and \$279,521 thereafter
The county will provide credits to cities especially impacted by the cost allocation methodology. These include resident usage credits and impact mitigation credits.

The Resident Usage Credit has been calculated to offset the costs of certain cities that have a low use of King County animal services relative to their population. The amount of the credit is different depending on whether the City of Bothell is receiving service during a given Service Year. The credit has been determined by comparing the estimated cost cities would pay on an annualized basis in 2010 if the regional payment model was based solely on usage.

- (1) The resident usage credit limits the cost allocation in the regional model to no more than 20% greater than the charge would be under a usage-only model for all cities whose net cost is greater than \$5,000.
- (2) The impact mitigation credit limits overall net cost increases to contracting cities resulting from cities opting out of the model earlier in the negotiation process to not more 10 or 15% greater than in the previous model (including the residential use credit), depending on whether Bothell is contracting.

Model Revenue Assumptions

As shown in Table 3, the new model assumes 2010 revenues from a number of sources. Revenues anticipated to be generated by the new model in 2010 include pet licensing revenues from King County unincorporated area and contract cities, new city contract revenues for July through December of 2010.

Table 3. Assumed Revenue Sources

Revenue Source	2010 Regional Model
Non-License Revenue	127,000
Pet License Revenue	1,534,938
New City Contract/ Licensing Revenue	537,535
Increased Fines and Fees (5)	31,000
Enhanced Services Contracts	150,000
Donations to Bequest Fund	100,000
Total Revenues	2,480,473

C:\Documents and Settings\aguilol\Local Settings\Temporary Internet Files\Content.Outlook\BOSKJCCG\2010-0327 supplemental for regional model Final 06-08-10 (3).doc

Pet Licensing Revenues

Licensing revenues are based on 2009 actuals and does not include assumptions in 2010 for the economic downturn. *Staff analysis will compare how license revenues from City of Seattle may have been impacted and how they compare with the county assumptions).*

The new model assumes that pet licensing revenue is allocated back to jurisdictions. Further, contracting cities must pay the county the difference between their cost allocation and their pet licensing revenue. If a city generates more licensing revenue than the service costs, the county will remit the difference back to the city. As a result, executive staff have noted that under this model, cities will be motivated to actively participate in the marketing of licenses.

Non-Licensing Revenues

Non-licensing revenues are anticipated to contribute nearly \$1 million on top of pet licensing revenue to support services in the first year of the model. The revenues from city contracts are estimated to increase in each year of the model, as transitional support provided to cities declines. As noted earlier in this report, the county's estimated General Fund contribution under the new regional model will decrease in the out years.

Payment Period

The cities will pay for animal services every six months based on the estimated cost of those services (derived from historical use and revenue data, and the most recent budget data).

FTE Changes and New Positions

Proposed Ordinance 2010-0327 deletes the 2010 RAL budget proviso that the number of FTES be reduced from 41.60 to 27.60 by July 1, 2010. This proviso inadvertently included a term limited temporary (TLT) position. The actual number of FTEs dedicated to animal services in the 2010 budget was actually 40.60.

The proposed ordinance would move 2.00 vet tech positions from Public Health, allowing the consolidation of all FTEs dedicated to animal services in one appropriation unit. The regional model would also reconfigure FTE positions to reflect the move from a seven to five day a week provision of service, add a new administrative position, and fund a new vet tech from the bequest fund. The table below shows the FTE changes assumed for the regional service model:

Table 4. FTE Changes in the Regional Model

Crosswalk Item	FTEs	Changes
2010 appropriation for Animal Services	40.60	
move vets from PH		2.00
new administrator		1.00
new vet techs		2.00

Crosswalk Item	FTEs	Changes
volunteer coordinator		1.00
move regulatory services manager to RAL		(1.00)
sales and marketing coordinator		0.40
pet licensing supervisor		(0.50)
cut field positions		(9.00)
add sheltering positions		6.00
cut customer service specialist		(1.00)
add enhanced officers		2.00
Total Animal Services Changes	40.60	2.90
add FTE to RAL administration		1.00
Total RAL Appropriation FTE Changes		3.90

Although there appears to be a reduction in field positions and an increase in sheltering positions, this change reflects that some field staff have been working in the shelter for the last few years. Consequently, these changes reflect a budget “clean up” by changing the positions to reflect current operations. Also, the cut in field staff is partially achieved by reducing regular control service from seven days per week to five days per week, which, because of scheduling and oversight needs, makes a significant difference in the number of positions required. *Staff analysis continues.*

Proviso Changes

Proposed Ordinance 2010-0327 will delete proviso restrictions associated with ending animal services and amend a proviso regarding canvassing activities.

- 1 Proviso P2 regarding canvassing activities would be amended to allow canvassing on Sundays. These functions had previously not been allowed on Sunday or unless the activities are specified in a full cost recovery contract. This change would allow the new model assumptions for increased licensing revenues to be implemented by providing the ability to reach pet owners during non-work hours when they might be more readily available.
- 2 Proviso P3 specified how animal care and control funding should be expended with specific amounts for control, shelter, and licensing functions. It is deleted to allow the new model to be implemented.
- 3 Proviso P4 would reduce FTEs for animal services. It is deleted to allow the new model to be implemented.
- 4 Proviso P5 specified that funding should be available in quarterly increments based upon revenue reports. It is deleted to allow the new model to be implemented.

Issues

Council staff is analyzing possible impacts to the county that may result from implementation of the new service model. *This analysis is ongoing.*

- Limits on City Contributions

The costs to cities are capped by the limits set in the interlocal agreements discussed above. Therefore, if the costs of the regional model exceed the cost inflator cap, the county would be liable for those costs.

In addition, council staff has asked for additional information on the potential cost impacts to the county if the cities assumed to participate in this model, decide not to participate.

- Maintenance Costs Associated with County Shelter Facilities

It does not appear that the new regional contract assumes any revenues for maintenance of the county's sheltering facilities. Consequently, it would be the sole responsibility of the county to maintain the facilities. Maintenance or major repairs are usually funded from the Building Repair and Replacement Fund or the Major Maintenance Reserve Fund which are heavily supported from General Fund transfers.

Executive staff has noted that the collaborative initiatives in the contract – that will be pursued by the joint city county committee – include long term planning for repair or replacement of the Kent shelter.

It is hoped that implementation of the model will result in reductions in the homeless animal population and will increase private sector partnerships for shelter capacity. Until the model is implemented, the long term facility needs to meet capacity requirements are unknown. Some unanticipated costs could be incurred by the county over the next 2.5 years without the inclusion of maintenance in the contract assumptions. *Staff analysis continues.*

- Burien Non-Participation in the Regional Model

The City of Burien does not plan to participate in the new regional model. According to Executive staff, the city does not currently have a system or plan in place for the provision of animal services. There are concerns as to how Burien's animal care needs could affect the county. *Staff analysis will continue.*

NEXT STEPS:

As noted throughout this staff report, analysis of the Executive's proposal is on-going. The committee will discuss the regional animal services model again at its next meeting on June 15.

INVITED:

- Carrie Cihak, Strategic Initiatives Director, Office of the Executive
- Caroline Whalen, County Administrative Officer
- Bob Roegner, Special Projects Manager, Department of Executive Services
- Ken Nakatsu, Manager, Regional Animal Services
- Dwight Dively, Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

- Shelley De Wys, OMB

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Proposed Ordinance 2010-0327
2. Transmittal Letter, dated June 1, 2010
3. Fiscal Note
4. Outline of Costs for 2010 Animal Services and General Fund Contributions
5. Excluded Elements



KING COUNTY
Signature Report

Attachment I
1200 King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

June 8, 2010

Ordinance

Proposed No. 2010-0327.1

Sponsors Patterson

1 AN ORDINANCE making a supplemental appropriation of
2 \$3,150,000 to records and licensing services, \$91,700 to
3 public health and emergency medical services general fund
4 transfers, and \$91,700 to public health for regional animal
5 services; and amending the 2010 Budget Ordinance,
6 Ordinance 16717, Sections 30, 46 and 93, as amended, and
7 Attachment K, as amended and adding a new section to
8 Ordinance 16717.

9 **STATEMENT OF FACTS:**

- 10 1. King County animal care and control has provided services to the
11 unincorporated areas of King County and by contract to the majority of
12 cities in the county in exchange for retention of their pet licensing revenue
13 since the mid-1980s.
- 14 2. The county general fund contribution to the provision of animal
15 services has increased over the years culminating in a general fund
16 contribution of nearly \$3 million in recent years.
- 17 3. Motion 13092, adopted by the metropolitan King County council on
18 November 9, 2009, directed the county executive to end the provision of
19 animal shelter services by King County for contract cities and for

20 unincorporated King County as soon as possible but no later than January
21 31, 2010, and to enter into new full cost recovery contracts with cities for
22 animal control and licensing services by June 30, 2010.

23 4. The 2010 Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 16717, Section 30, provided
24 funding for animal care and control for sheltering services only through
25 January 31, 2010.

26 5. With the adoption of Ordinance 16750, extending FTE authority for
27 animal sheltering services through June 30, 2010, the county recognized
28 that there is currently not sufficient sheltering capacity in the region to
29 close the King County animal shelter. The extension of FTE authority
30 provided for a common deadline for the county to work with cities on a
31 new regional model for animal services, inclusive of animal sheltering,
32 animal control, and pet licensing functions. Without further amendment to
33 the 2010 Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 16717, FTE authority for animal
34 services will be reduced from 41.6 to 27.6 by July 1, 2010.

35 6. A regional model for animal services enables the county and the cities
36 to provide for better public health, safety, animal welfare and customer
37 service outcomes at a lower cost than jurisdictions are able to provide for
38 on their own. This is accomplished through: properly aligned financial
39 incentives, partnerships to increase revenue, economies of scale, a
40 consistent regulatory approach across participating jurisdictions and
41 collaborative initiatives to reduce the homeless animal population and

42 leverage private sector resources while providing for a level of animal care
43 respected by the community.

44 7. Beginning in January 2010, a joint cities-county work group began
45 meeting on a weekly basis to develop a new regional animal services
46 model for King County and individual cities to consider. The work group
47 included representation from King County and the cities of SeaTac,
48 Tukwila, Kent, Bellevue, Redmond, Sammamish, Shoreline and Lake
49 Forest Park.

50 8. On February 26, 2010, the executive transmitted to the council an
51 implementation plan for entering into new animal services contracts with
52 cities. The implementation plan included documents developed by the
53 joint cities-county work group for regional animal services including
54 working principles, a common interests statement and an adopted scope
55 and purpose statement outlining specific timelines and deliverables for
56 entering into new interlocal agreements between the county and the cities
57 for animal services by the end of June.

58 9. Consistent with the implementation plan, the county executive sent to
59 cities notice of termination of all existing animal services agreements
60 between the county and cities, effective July 1, 2010.

61 10. Consistent with the implementation plan, the joint cities-county work
62 group for regional animal services developed an agreement in principle for
63 a new regional animal services model that defines services, expenditures,
64 and cost and revenue allocation methodologies for animal shelter, animal

65 control and pet licensing services. The agreement in principle and
66 supporting materials were shared with all cities, the county council, and
67 the public in early April through presentations to city managers and
68 administrators, the suburban cities' association public issues committee,
69 the regional policy committee, numerous city council meetings and
70 through individual meetings with county and city officials and staff.

71 11. Consistent with the implementation plan, the work group developed
72 an interlocal agreement for animal services based on the agreement in
73 principle.

74 12. The proposed interlocal agreement includes a cost allocation
75 methodology that is based on system use and population and shares
76 defined regional animal system costs between the county and all
77 participating cities.

78 13. The twenty-seven cities who have twice indicated interest in
79 participating in the new regional model would together contribute nearly
80 \$1 million in new revenue to the county for animal services in the first
81 year of the interlocal agreement. As a result, the county's general fund
82 contribution under the new regional model for animal services is estimated
83 to be less in 2010 and 2011 than in recent years and significantly less in
84 years thereafter.

85 14. The executive has transmitted proposed legislation to the council that
86 would authorize the county to enter into the interlocal agreements for

87 animal services with cities. Supplemental appropriation and FTE
88 authority is needed to implement the proposed interlocal agreements.

89 15. Some cities have indicated interest in entering into contracts with the
90 county for full-cost recovery enhanced animal control services. The
91 executive has transmitted proposed legislation to the council that would
92 authorize the executive to enter into such contracts with cities.

93 Supplemental appropriation and FTE authority is needed to implement
94 these enhanced animal control service contracts.

95 16. King County and cities participating in the interlocal agreement have
96 a mutual interest in increasing program revenue to support animal
97 services, including through: (a) changes to pet license fees; (b) programs,
98 penalties and other incentives to increase pet license sales; (c) enforcement
99 of city and county codes requiring the licensing of pets; (d) gifts, bequests
100 and donations that promote animal welfare; and (e) entrepreneurial
101 programs for raising revenue, such as sponsorships, advertising, naming
102 rights, concessions and fundraising events. The executive has transmitted
103 proposed legislation to the council that would enable revenue generation
104 through these mechanisms in partnership with cities and would incent
105 change to reduce system use and cost. Supplemental appropriation and
106 FTE authority is needed to implement these mechanisms and generate
107 revenue.

108 17. King County residents and volunteers regularly donate funds to King County
109 to enhance the welfare of animals generally or through specific means such as

110 providing for animals' special medical needs or supporting spay/neuter services.
111 Expedient access to these funds for use in the manner in which they were donated
112 is critical to the welfare of animals in King County's care. The executive has
113 transmitted to the council proposed legislation that would establish a tier one
114 animal bequest fund for these donations and has taken steps to include the
115 regional animal services program in this year's employee charitable campaign.
116 Supplemental appropriation and FTE authority is necessary to access and utilize
117 these funds for their intended purpose.

118 18. Over the past few years, the council has led an effort to reform animal
119 services and has conducted a number of studies. Certain strategic investments are
120 recommended by these studies to improve accountability, improve service
121 delivery and further reduce costs. These recommendations include upgrading
122 data systems, external reviews, a non-represented position to support innovative
123 organizational partnerships, an increase in veterinary support to reduce disease
124 outbreak and support the transfer of animals to other organizations, and a
125 dedicated volunteer coordinator to facilitate the better care for animals and the
126 movement of animals into foster care. Supplemental appropriation and FTE
127 authority is needed to implement these reforms.

128 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

129 SECTION 1. Ordinance 16717, Section 30, as amended, is hereby amended by
130 adding thereto and inserting the following:

131 RECORDS AND LICENSING SERVICES - From the general fund there is
132 hereby appropriated to:

133 Records and licensing services \$3,150,000

134 The maximum number of additional FTEs for records and licensing services shall
135 be: 3.90

136 P1 PROVIDED THAT:

137 Of this appropriation, it is the intent of the council that no employees should be
138 laid off to achieve savings related to the operational shutdown savings contra until the
139 executive submits a reorganization plan for the records and licensing division. The plan
140 will identify an organizational structure with appropriate management and supervision
141 levels and achieve cost savings while maintaining customer service for the public.

142 The plan required to be submitted by this proviso must be filed in the form of a
143 paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the
144 original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers and to the committee
145 coordinator for the government accountability and oversight or its successor.

146 P2 PROVIDED FURTHER THAT:

147 Of this appropriation, no funds may be expended on canvassing activities before
148 10:00 a.m. on Saturday or ((any time on)) Sunday in unincorporated King County((,
149 unless those canvassing activities are specified in a full cost recovery contract with a city.

150 P3 PROVIDED FURTHER THAT:

151 It is the intent of the council that the 2010 budget for animal care and control
152 should be expended as follows:

153 1. \$2,085,253 for animal control activities with public safety as the first priority
154 for service.

155 2. \$496,057 for sheltering activities

