



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 2009-0594 **Version:** 2
Type: Motion **Status:** Passed
File created: 10/26/2009 **In control:** Committee of the Whole
On agenda: **Final action:** 11/9/2009
Enactment date: **Enactment #:** 13092

Title: A MOTION relating to the King County policy for the provision of animal services; establishing the policy and requesting the county executive to take actions necessary to implement the policy.

Sponsors: Julia Patterson, Bob Ferguson, Dow Constantine, Kathy Lambert, Jane Hague, Larry Phillips

Indexes: Animals

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. 13092.pdf, 2. 2009-0594 Staff Report for 11-02-09 COW.pdf, 3. Amendment Package 11-09-09

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
11/9/2009	1	Metropolitan King County Council	Passed as Amended	Pass
11/2/2009	1	Metropolitan King County Council	Deferred	
11/2/2009	1	Committee of the Whole		
10/26/2009	1	Metropolitan King County Council	Introduced and Referred	

A MOTION relating to the King County policy for the provision of animal services; establishing the policy and requesting the county executive to take actions necessary to implement the policy.

WHEREAS, for the last two and one-half years, King County has worked diligently to find the best way to provide high-quality, humane care and control services for animals, including high adoption rates and low euthanasia rates, and

WHEREAS, an advisory committee was reconstituted and presented a report, two consultant studies were completed and approximately one million dollars in supplemental funding for animal shelter staffing, equipment and supplies was provided in 2008, and

WHEREAS, the King County general fund has historically supported animal shelter and control services for certain cities through discretionary contracts for services at a cost of approximately two million dollars per year, and

WHEREAS, King County is facing an ongoing financial crisis and does not have a sufficient, stable source of revenue to continue to manage and maintain the animal services at a level which would result in King County providing a model program, and

WHEREAS, King County has performed a diligent evaluation and analysis of alternative ways to provide humane animal shelter services for the county and cities that contract with the county for shelter services, and King County has determined that successful alternative models are available and warrant further exploration, evaluation and potential implementation, and

WHEREAS, in 2003, the budget advisory task force made a number of recommendations regarding county finances including a policy that King County should be "Ensuring that discretionary service contracts provide full cost recovery to the county including overhead, operation and capital costs," and

WHEREAS, on October 13, 2003, the King County council approved Motion 11820 establishing the policy that all county discretionary contracts shall be full-cost recovery, and

WHEREAS, the 2009 King County Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 16312, included a finding setting the policy direction that "King County shall continue to explore the community-based services model as defined by the Operational Master Plan," and

WHEREAS, the King County auditor's office recently conducted an audit of animal shelter and control services provided by King County's records and licensing services division. The audit findings regarding management include, "...inconsistent leadership, shifts in management direction, and sustained organizational uncertainty have limited ACC's [Animal Care and Control's] ability to make needed improvements in population monitoring and management and to use technology effectively to improve shelter operations ...," and

WHEREAS, King County values the employees who perform animal shelter and control services and encourages contract cities and other organizations to consider them in providing animal services in the future;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

The executive is requested to take all actions necessary to effect the following outcomes:

- A. End the provision of animal shelter services by King County for contract cities and for unincorporated King County as soon as possible but no later than January 31, 2010;
- B. Establish a goal of April 1, 2010, to end the provision of animal control services for contract cities under the terms of current contracts by and encourage individual cities to enter into full-cost-recovery contracts with King County for animal control services;
- C. Establish a firm deadline of June 30, 2010, to end the provision of animal control services for contract cities unless individual cities enter into full-cost-recovery contracts with King County for animal control services;
- D. Establish a goal of April 1, 2010, to end the provision of pet licensing services for contract cities under the terms of current contracts and encourage individual cities to enter into full-cost-recovery contracts with King County for pet licensing services;
- E. Establish a firm deadline of June 30, 2010, to end the provision of pet licensing services for contract cities unless individual cities enter into full-cost-recovery contracts with King County for pet licensing services;
- F. Cities that choose to enter into full-cost-recovery contracts with King County for pet licensing services shall be responsible for setting their own pet license fees;
- G. King County will continue to provide animal control services and pet licensing services for unincorporated King County;
- H. King County will work cooperatively and actively with its city partners to ensure a smooth transition in the care of animals;
- I. Starting immediately, King County will actively work with contract cities to establish a countywide animal response team to prepare for the event of a disaster, based on the best standards, practices and concepts of operations established by the Pierce county animal response team; and
- J. Conduct a study and make recommendations to the King County council by March 31, 2010, on

alternatives for animal control services in unincorporated King County. The study should examine, but not be limited to, the following elements:

1. An analysis of revenues, expenditures and business activities necessary to meet the county's mandatory animal control responsibilities as required by state law. This analysis should include an evaluation of the potential effects and outcomes of implementing models used in other metropolitan areas including Multnomah county, Oregon;
2. An analysis and presentation of historical records on pet license revenues from unincorporated areas as well as historical cost estimates to provide animal control services for unincorporated areas; and
3. Presentation of potential options to provide animal control services in unincorporated areas that are fully supported by animal license fee revenues or other revenue generating options that do not involve general fund support. This element should include a staffing analysis.