

## **SUMMARY and FISCAL NOTE**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Dept. Contact:</b>	<b>CBO Contact:</b>
Finance and Administrative Services	Selina Chambliss	Lorine Cheung

### **1. BILL SUMMARY**

**Legislation Title:** AN ORDINANCE relating to animal fees; adjusting and simplifying pet license fees, adoption fees, and spay and neuter clinic fees; removing guard or attack dog licenses; authorizing the Director of Finance and Administrative Services to adjust animal fees by Director’s Rule; amending Sections 9.25.030, 9.25.050, 9.25.083, 9.25.100, 9.25.110, 9.25.200, 9.26.020, 9.26.050, and 9.26.060 of the Seattle Municipal Code; and repealing Sections 9.25.054, 9.26.025, and 9.26.040 of the Seattle Municipal Code.

**Summary and Background of the Legislation:** This ordinance proposes raising licensing and veterinary fees in the Department of Finance and Administrative Services (FAS). The increase will right-size Seattle Animal Shelter fees for the services it provides.

The Seattle Animal Shelter (SAS) is mindful of equity and how SAS fees compare with other organizations in the region like the Regional Animal Services of King County, Seattle Humane Society and the Northwest Spay and Neuter Center. SAS increased license fees in 2019 and veterinary fees in 2018. SAS seeks to increase both fees so they are comparable to other local, affordable options. Additionally, there are a few fees that will decrease in order to be competitive with the region, including discontinuing the guard/attack dog license fee, which has been inactive since 1998. The overall change in fees will increase revenue by approximately \$150,000 in 2025 and 2026.

The Director of FAS has authority to charge fees “as established by Chapter 9.26.” ([SMC 9.25.030.A.11](#)). Changing fees for SAS currently requires approval by Council as the fees are set by the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC Chapter 9.26). FAS is additionally proposing to amend the SMC so that future fees can be set by director’s rule in lieu of amending the SMC with the FAS budget submission. Using director’s rules to establish fees provides SAS with the greatest flexibility to adjust as needed to support costs and is consistent with other fees of these types.

Seattle Animal Shelter Fees would change as follows:

<b>Description</b>	<b>Current Fees</b>	<b>2025 Proposed Fees</b>
Lic&Perm-Cats Alt	\$26.00	\$ 30.00
Lic&Perm-Dog Alt	\$37.00	\$ 45.00
Lic&Perm-Cats Un-alt	\$79.00	\$ 90.00
Lic&Perm-Dog Un-alt	\$105.00	\$ 125.00

Lic&Perm-Goat	\$21.00	\$25.00
Lic&Perm-Potbelly Pig	\$32.00	\$40.00
Late Renewal Fee	\$30.00	\$ 35.00
Lic&Perm-Lost License	\$5.00	\$6.50
Cat Spay	\$108.00	\$120.00
Cat Neuter	\$102.00	\$115.00
Rabbit Spay/Neuter	\$90.00	\$100.00
Dog Spay (under 50 pounds)	\$156.00	\$160.00
Dog Neuter (under 50 pounds)	\$144.00	\$160.00
Dog Spay (50-80 pounds)	\$174.00	\$180.00
Dog Neuter (50-80 pounds)	\$162.00	\$180.00
Dog Spay/Neuter (over 80 pounds)	\$186.00	\$200.00
Cost of treatment-veterinary care	\$100.00	\$125.00
Vaccination	\$10.00	\$15.00
Adoption – cat	\$75.00	\$30.00
Adoption – kitten	\$125.00	\$100.00
Adoption – two kittens	\$200.00	\$150.00
Adoption – senior/special needs cat	\$35.00	\$15.00
Adoption – dog	\$275.00	\$100.00
Adoption – puppy	\$375.00	\$200.00
Adoption – senior/special needs dog	\$100.00	\$50.00
Adoption – rabbit/ferret	\$40.00	\$20.00
Adoption – chinchillas/sugar gliders	\$65.00	\$30.00

## 2. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Does this legislation create, fund, or amend a CIP Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No

## 3. SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Does this legislation have financial impacts to the City? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Expenditure Change (\$);	2025	2026 est.	2027 est.	2028 est.	2029 est.
General Fund	0	0	0	0	0
Expenditure Change (\$);	2025	2026 est.	2027 est.	2028 est.	2029 est.
Other Funds	0	0	0	0	0

Revenue Change (\$); General Fund	2025	2026 est.	2027 est.	2028 est.	2029 est.
	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
Revenue Change (\$); Other Funds	2025	2026 est.	2027 est.	2028 est.	2029 est.
	0	0	0	0	0

Number of Positions	2025	2026 est.	2027 est.	2028 est.	2029 est.
	0	0	0	0	0
Total FTE Change	2025	2026 est.	2027 est.	2028 est.	2029 est.
	0	0	0	0	0

### 3.a. Appropriations

☐ This legislation adds, changes, or deletes appropriations.

### 3.b. Revenues/Reimbursements

☒ This legislation adds, changes, or deletes revenues or reimbursements.

#### Anticipated Revenue/Reimbursement Resulting from This Legislation:

Fund Name and Number	Dept	Revenue Source	2025 Revenue	2025 Estimated Revenue
General Fund 00100	FAS	Animal Shelter Fees	\$150,000	\$150,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>

#### Revenue/Reimbursement Notes:

### 3.c. Positions

- ☐ This legislation adds, changes, or deletes positions.

### 3.d. Other Impacts

**Does the legislation have other financial impacts to The City of Seattle, including direct or indirect, one-time or ongoing costs, that are not included in Sections 3.a through 3.c? If so, please describe these financial impacts.**

No.

**If the legislation has costs, but they can be absorbed within existing operations, please describe how those costs can be absorbed. The description should clearly describe if the absorbed costs are achievable because the department had excess resources within their existing budget or if by absorbing these costs the department is deprioritizing other work that would have used these resources.**

N/A

**Please describe any financial costs or other impacts of *not* implementing the legislation.**

The fees for animal sheltering vary across the country. The Seattle Animal Shelter (SAS) has compiled information regarding the regional animal sheltering organizations and has adjusted proposed fees accordingly based on that information. Without the adjustments in fees, SAS will be out of step with other regional providers and revenues will lag behind recent increases in inflation.

## 4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

- a. Please describe how this legislation may affect any departments besides the originating department.**

N/A

- b. Does this legislation affect a piece of property? If yes, please attach a map and explain any impacts on the property. Please attach any Environmental Impact Statements, Determinations of Non-Significance, or other reports generated for this property.**

No.

- c. Please describe any perceived implication for the principles of the Race and Social Justice Initiative.**

- i. How does this legislation impact vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities? How did you arrive at this conclusion? In your response please consider impacts within City government (employees, internal programs) as well as in the broader community.**

The shelter was thoughtful in the discussion about how and why it would make adjustments to shelter fees. Inflation data for the City of Seattle was used to make proposed increases to certain fees. The shelter closely evaluated impacts to racial equity, vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities and employees of different races if

fees were raised. The proposed fee increases align with other organizations in the Puget Sound, while also prioritizing equity. SAS has a fee waiver process that was generated using the Racial Equity Toolkit. It also has the pet population fund that provides access to vet services for people that meet the state financial requirement of 80% Area Median Income. Lastly, SAS provides a food bank twice a week for pet needs and monthly free pet vaccination clinics that are targeted in disadvantaged neighborhoods. While the shelter took the approach to increase fees related to licensing and veterinary care, it is also decreasing its adoption fees. Decreasing adoptions fees allows the shelter to address barriers of pet ownership for vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities, be more competitive with other animal welfare organizations, and drive more adoptions of animals from the shelter to lower operating costs.

**ii. Please attach any Racial Equity Toolkits or other racial equity analyses in the development and/or assessment of the legislation.**

N/A. A RET was conducted in 2023 evaluating the use of waiving certain fees. While this proposal will increase certain fees, SAS still maintains the ability to waive fees for certain individuals with needs. The 2023 fee waiver RET is attached.

**iii. What is the Language Access Plan for any communications to the public?**

SAS completed a 40-document plain language review, and we are actively using language line, bringing interpreters to vaccine clinics, and beginning the process of translating our documents to incorporate Tier one languages.

**d. Climate Change Implications**

**i. Emissions: How is this legislation likely to increase or decrease carbon emissions in a material way? Please attach any studies or other materials that were used to inform this response.**

N/A

**ii. Resiliency: Will the action(s) proposed by this legislation increase or decrease Seattle's resiliency (or ability to adapt) to climate change in a material way? If so, explain. If it is likely to decrease resiliency in a material way, describe what will or could be done to mitigate the effects.**

N/A

**e. If this legislation includes a new initiative or a major programmatic expansion: What are the specific long-term and measurable goal(s) of the program? How will this legislation help achieve the program's desired goal(s)? What mechanisms will be used to measure progress towards meeting those goals?**

N/A

## 5. CHECKLIST

- ☐ Is a public hearing required?
- ☐ Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required?
- ☒ If this legislation changes spending and/or revenues for a fund, have you reviewed the relevant fund policies and determined that this legislation complies?
- ☐ Does this legislation create a non-utility CIP project that involves a shared financial commitment with a non-City partner agency or organization?

## 6. ATTACHMENTS

**Summary Attachments:** Summary Attachment A – RET Analysis of SAS Fee Waiver Policy



## Racial Equity Toolkit Summary Sheet

Department:	Finance and Administrative Services (FAS)
Division (if applicable):	Seattle Animal Shelter (SAS)
RET Contact Name(s):	Jocelyn Bouchard
RET Contact Titles(s):	Deputy Director
RET Contact Email(s):	Jocelyn.Bouchard@seattle.gov

RET Title:	Fee Waiver Policy
RET Team:	Jocelyn Bouchard, Caryn Cantu and Ken Haymon
Start Date for RET Process:	Fall 2019
End Date for RET Process: If applicable	February 2024

This Summary Sheet should be completed by those who worked on this RET, with input from Change Team members and department leadership. Representatives from these different groups should review the final version so that there is consensus on content before it is submitted. For questions about the Summary Sheet, please contact [RSJI@seattle.gov](mailto:RSJI@seattle.gov).

Please respond to the following questions below. Brevity is appreciated. **When finished, this whole document should be 5 or less pages.**

1. What issue area (project, program, policy, or budgetary decision) did you apply the RET on? Why did you choose this issue area and RET topic?
2. What was your north star? What racial equity outcomes guided your thinking (RET Step 1)? How did you design and facilitate a process that was rooted in [relational culture](#)?
3. What data, stories, and communities did you engage with? What relationships did you develop, sustain, or deepen during this process? (RET Step 2)
4. How did these relationships help you to identify the burdens and benefits of your proposed work? What are the burdens? What are the benefits? (RET Step 3)

5. Please identify how the [four types of racism](#) (internalized, interpersonal, institutional, and structural) influenced your RET process and what you learned. (RET Step 3)
  6. As a result of the above analysis, how will you increase opportunity and/or minimize harm for the impacted community? (RET Step 4)
  7. What steps will the RET team take to ensure that department leadership will implement the recommendations from the RET?
  8. How will you become/remains accountable to the relationships developed during the RET process? How will you report back to your stakeholders?
  9. What additional racial equity issues did this RET reveal outside the scope of the RET project? How do these unresolved issues present opportunities for further structural transformation, including building a [relational culture](#)?
- 

### **Enter Your Responses Below**

1. What issue area (project, program, policy, or budgetary decision) did you apply the RET on? Why did you choose this issue area and RET topic?

The project we took on was looking at our fee waiver policy. This document allows for the waiving or reduction of fees associated with adoptions and redemptions and we wanted to ensure that it was equitable and removed barriers for pet owners trying to redeem lost or impounded pets.

2. What was your north star? What racial equity outcomes guided your thinking (RET Step 1)? How did you design and facilitate a process that was rooted in [relational culture](#)?

When we considered who we wanted to engage in this project we faced two challenges, determining how to reach and collect input from users or potential users, and wanting to reach additional potential stakeholders-- people that really may need the services who may not even be aware of them to begin with. We came up with a plan that relied on direct mail from existing contacts and direct contacts through outreach activities.

Budget, the onset of COVID 19 and the hiring freeze resulted in several strategy shifts. Ultimately, we determined that much of this could be accomplished through leveraging existing activities (Field contacts, petfood banks and other existing outreach) and creating new partnerships. We reached out to partners to help us distribute a survey that asked some initial questions and enabled a contact list that we could use to create a stakeholder panel. Between their connections and ours we distributed a survey that resulted in 173 responses.

The survey closed at the end of December 2021, and we planned to identify people from the survey who can serve on a stakeholder panel. We lacked success with that endeavor and spent most of the next two years trying to get together a stakeholder panel. As it became clear that this was going to continue to be a challenge, we looked at other avenues to determine ways to create more equitable policies for the fee waiver process.



These avenues included reaching out to other organizations and individuals that were already doing work in this space.

**3. What data, stories, and communities did you engage with? What relationships did you develop, sustain, or deepen during this process? (RET Step 2)**

Animal Welfare groups and organizations doing work in this area, Seattle's Department of Neighborhoods (DON), Ken Haymon's relationships within the FAS change team. SAS's own work in outreach and expanded efforts in BIPOC communities.

**4. How did these relationships help you to identify the burdens and benefits of your proposed work? What are the burdens? What are the benefits? (Step 3)**

Many of our discussions with groups like DON provided real life examples and differing perspectives. We were also able to identify areas of success other animal welfare groups had in this space. The burdens of our work include ensuring that we are able to lead and support the community in keeping pets and their families together, healthy and safe. The benefits are the opportunities to be able to promote the humane and compassionate treatment of people and animals through equity, innovation and collaboration.

**5. Please identify how the [four types of racism](#) (internalized, interpersonal, institutional, and structural) influenced your RET process and what you learned. (RET Step 3)**

Our RET had many conversations about how SAS in general has contributed to these four areas of racism and our goal was to create a document that eliminated or at least greatly decreased the ability for any one of these influences to impact the fee waiver process.

We created some parameters so staff responsible for applying and/or approving waivers would be less able to use personal judgements in their decisions.

We allowed for multiple opportunities for people to obtain fee waivers, recognizing that financial challenges are often ongoing and not stagnant or one-time situations for many of our citizens.

One of the biggest changes we made was no longer requiring spay/neuter to obtain a fee waiver. This was a long-standing practice in animal welfare that disrespected people's personal beliefs and practices and typically fractured relationships and trust within segments of our community.

**6. As a result of the above analysis, how will you increase opportunity and/or minimize harm for the impacted community? (RET Step 4)**

We did this by updating the policy to eliminate and/or change rigid requirements and open eligibility however, discussion held in staff meetings and beyond have helped to open up these conversations and create awareness of our own judgements and personal responsibilities in the four types of racism. |

**7. What steps will the RET team take to ensure that department leadership will implement the recommendations from the RET?**

The new SOP was implemented April 1, 2024. |

**8. How will you become/remain accountable to the relationships developed during the RET process? How will you report back to your stakeholders?**

This work continues through the SAS ASSET team (similar to the FAS change team) who, among other activities, now regularly join leadership meetings and also have a standing agenda item at all staff meetings. |

**9. What additional racial equity issues did this RET reveal outside the scope of the RET project? How do these unresolved issues present opportunities for further structural transformation, including building a [relational culture](#)?**

Our ASSET team at SAS really carries on this work for our division however as we continue our work towards being more community-centric these issues are constantly being identified and create ongoing opportunities for transformation at all levels of the work we do. |