CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION AGENDA
April 27, 2015

6:00 p.m. - Special Meeting for the purpose of holding an Executive Session to consider real estate disposition per RCW 42.30.110(1)(c)
7:00 p.m. – Study Session

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

4. CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE RECORD
   
a. E-Mail Dated April 16, 2015, from Susan Goding.  
b. E-Mail Dated April 16, 2015, from Kristen Sluiter.  
c. Email Dated April 17, 2015, from Jack Mayne.  
d. E-Mail Dated April 18, 2015, from Susan Goding.  
e. E-Mail Dated April 20, 2015, from Dan Poiree.  
f. E-Mail Dated April 20, 2015, from Anna Friel.  
g. E-Mail Dated April 20, 2015, from L. Plein.  
h. E-Mail Dated April 21, 2015, from Earl Gipson.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS
   
b. Review Tree Retention Draft Work Program.  
d. Summary of 2014 Animal Services; a Proposal for Additional Cat Services by Burien CARES; and, an Update on New Pet Licensing Software Acquisition by City Staff.  
e. Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.

6. COUNCIL REPORTS

7. ADJOURNMENT

COUNCILMEMBERS

Lucy Krakowiak, Mayor  
Nancy Tosta, Deputy Mayor  
Stephen Armstrong  
Lauren Berkowitz  
Bob Edgar  
Gerald F. Robison  
Debi Wagner

City Hall, 400 SW 152nd Street, 1st Floor
Dear Ms. Goding,

Thank you for writing to the City Council to express your concerns. Your email will be included in a future Council agenda packet as Correspondence for the Record.

Sincerely,
Carol Allread
Executive Assistant

Dear Esteemed Council Member,

I was eating at Coffee and Wine and it occurred to me that more people living within walking distance of the commercial areas of Burien would help our local businesses. I know that developments are considered less desirable than single use housing, however, condos are becoming more popular. Seattle workers need affordable house and Burien is so close.

Please consider hiring a consultant to develop a plan for rezoning to denser housing.

More condo and even apodments could be appealing for young and retired people, as long as there are restaurants and activities within walking distance. Higher density housing would result in more residents and better support for business. Seems like a win/win.

A public process around the a plan could help persuade a lot of the You Know You're From Burien If You Remember Facebook crowd. Burien used to have a lot more business and services. More people in the right areas could bring back some of the variety of businesses and support the businesses here in our fair city.

I would also support more density in my neighborhood, around the Thriftway on Des Moines Memorial Drive. The commercial space does not seem to have enough nearby customers to succeed. This area could be a little gem in Burien if these businesses could be made sustainable with zoning for denser housing.

Sincerely,
Susan Goding
2441 S 121 Place
Burien, WA 98168
206-369-9907

CC: Dan Trimble, Economic Development Manager
Chip Davis, Community Development Director
Dear Ms. Sluiter,

Thank you for writing to the City Council to express your concerns. Your email will be included in a future Council agenda packet as Correspondence for the Record.

Sincerely,

Carol Allread
Executive Assistant

From: Kristen Sluiter [mailto:KSluiter@swyfs.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2015 3:15 PM
To: Public Council Inbox
Cc: Kristen Sluiter
Subject: Safety on Military Road

4/16/15

Dear Burien City Council,

I am writing today to request that the City provide funds for higher visibility flashing lights for the Hilltop Elementary School zone at 12312 Military Road South. I am a staff member of New Futures at Woodridge Park Apartments which serves many of the families and students who attend Hilltop and use this school crossing to walk to and from school.

In late 2013, a group of parents at the Woodridge Park Apartments petitioned the city to improve safety at this location of a busy school crossing, a high traffic area with poor visibility, no sidewalks and where cars consistently travel well above the speed limit.

In a letter dated December 31, 2013 the city responded to the request stating that:

“The traffic data collected demonstrates that the 85th percentile speed on Military Road South was 36.75 during school hours when the speed limit is 20 mph (7:00 am to 8:55 pm and 3:00 pm to 3:55 pm).”

The letter goes on to state that a crossing guard will be provided at this location by the Highline School District and that “The City will restripe the existing crosswalk, install two reflective markers in front of each ladder stripe on the approach side of the crosswalk, and install advanced warning signs per the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Is it possible that this location could be considered for Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFB) when there is available grant funding in the future. Police enforcement is recommended during schools hours (7:00 am to 8:55 am and 3:00 pm to 3:55 pm).” [Original emphasis as per written in letter]

Various times throughout the year I have met students to walk them to our after-school program. I have observed cars going above the 20 mph expected speed limit during school hours and no police presence. For the month of March 2015 I consistently met students each day between 3:00 and 3:15 pm to walk them to program. Additionally while there is a crossing guard the guard is not always consistently available as students cross.
Over 100 children and youth cross here to get to and from their school or bus stop. Almost all the students who attend programming at Woodridge Park New Futures' site attend Hilltop Elementary School or attend Chinook Middle School and Tyee High School which drop-off their students at this point, too. I invite you to please follow through on the promised improvements and invest in Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons in this area.

Additionally, I invite you to spend a week observing this area with me as I greet students after school and walk with them to our facility. I think you will see very quickly the need to prioritize the safety and well-being of children and families in your city along this route. Thank you for time and prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kristen Sluiter
New Futures Program Coordinator
Grades 7-12
New Futures/SWFYS at Woodridge Park
206-246-1980
Hi Jack,

Thanks for your email. On a daily basis, staff and the city attorney take care to examine legal issues around every ordinance, and we did so for 606 and 621. Most of the time, the issues or areas of interpretation are straightforward and sources of legal analysis agree; other times, there is a diversity of opinions and people disagree. Having personally discussed these ordinances with the city's legal counsel numerous times, and participated in the meetings with the ACLU where their legal opinions were described, I feel very comfortable with the city's actions.

-Kamuron

-----Original Message-----

From: Jack Mayne [mailto:jgmayne@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2015 9:22 AM
To: Kamuron Gurol; Public Council Inbox; Bob Noe
Subject: Trespass Ordinances: Unconstitutional? fact or opinion?

I have heard people continually to refer to Ordinances 606 and 621 as being unconstitutional but the only backup for that is that the ACLU thinks the ordinances are unconstitutional. While the ACLU is an august and well respected organization, my limited legal training says its opinion about the constitutional status of the ordinances is just that, an opinion.

Can anyone give me a definitive response to this question. I am acting under the view that the ordinances are constitutional until a properly constituted court rules to the contrary.

Can anyone tell me the answer?

Jack Mayne
Senior Writer

B-Town Blog,
SeaTac Blog,
Waterland Blog,
Normandy Park Blog,
White Center Blog

jgmayne@gmail.com
Home/Office 206.274.6069
Mobile: 206.369.6328
Dear Esteemed Council Members,

Thank you for your service to the community. A couple of years ago, the Council proposed running a levy for Cops and Kids. It was motivated by a desire to contribute to the well being of our children. It had good intentions but the focus was misguided. A better idea would be to create a liveable, healthy city. I would like to suggest that the City buy up property adjacent to our public schools, as they become available, to expand the playgrounds. The City would be able to increase the space for the schools and citizens would have access to large outdoor areas after school and on weekends. Gravel tracks with exercise stations would attract and benefit many demographics.

We need more density to support local businesses, however, we do not need condos or apartment buildings surrounded by asphalt parking. There are urban designs for denser communities that contribute to livability. This is the kind of permitting policies that a consultant can help develop.

Times and the needs for housing are changing rapidly. I hope that Burien can be a bold leader in providing housing, cool local businesses and walk and play spaces for citizens. There is a lot of opportunity to rethink our urban design goals right now. Please go big in your plans for our fair city.

Sincerely,
Susan Goding
2441 S 121 Place
Burien, WA 98168
206-369-9907

On Thu, Apr 16, 2015 at 4:37 PM, Susan Goding <suenoir@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Esteemed Council Member,

I was eating at Coffee and Wine and it occurred to me that more people living within walking distance of the commercial areas of Burien would help our local businesses. I know that developments are considered less desirable than single use housing, however, condos are becoming more popular. Seattle workers need affordable house and Burien is so close.

Please consider hiring a consultant to develop a plan for rezoning to denser housing.

More condo and even apodments could be appealing for young and retired people, as long as there are restaurants and activities within walking distance. Higher density housing would result in more residents and better support for business. Seems like a win/win.

A public process around the a plan could help persuade a lot of the You Know You're From Burien If You Remember Facebook crowd. Burien used to have a lot more business and services. More people in the right areas could bring back some of the variety of businesses and support the businesses here in our fair city.
I would also support more density in my neighborhood, around the Thriftway on Des Moines Memorial Drive. The commercial space does not seem to have enough nearby customers to succeed. This area could be a little gem in Burien if these businesses could be made sustainable with zoning for denser housing.

Sincerely,
Susan Goding
2441 S 121 Place
Burien, WA 98168
206-369-9907
Dear Mr. Poiree,

Thank you for writing to the City Council to express your concerns. Your email will be included in a future Council agenda packet as Correspondence for the Record.

Sincerely,

Carol Allread
Executive Assistant

---

From: Daniel Poiree [dpoiree@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 5:25 AM
To: Bob Edgar
Subject: Please support Ordinance 621

Dear Council Member Edgar,

I am writing in support of Ordinance 621.

The City of Burien and its residents have invested too much, and have too much to lose by giving into protesters and their frenzy.

For the most part the arguments for repeal of Ordinance 621 seem to be distortions and exaggerations of the facts for the purpose of drawing media attention by professional demonstrators. Most are not homeless, not those with chemical dependencies, or even from Burien. (The homeless and the addicted have separate needs that need to be addressed separately.)

While the demonstrators may claim to represent the homeless, the claim seems doubtful. Those with a closer eye on the street activities have informed me that Burien’s homeless most often turn and walk away when approached by the demonstrators.

The City of Burien, to its credit, built a beautiful downtown area a few years ago. Now, the City is faced with a choice: To preserve the current assets and continue with the city improvements and live up to its potential, or stand back and watch it decay because the required maintenance supported by responsible governance is too daunting. I say the line on tolerated behavior is drawn appropriately: hold the line on Ordinance 621. Please continue to govern responsibly.

Of all the speakers who have addressed the council in support of Ordinance 621, a seventh grader said it best: If she and her little brother don’t feel safe at city hall and the library, then Burien has a problem. Burien has the need for Ordinance 621 and its enforcement.

There are some who feel that Ordinance 621 is excessively restrictive. I cannot agree with this. To paraphrase another speaker at a Council public speaking session, “These are basic rules we all were taught in kindergarten. If you can’t follow common rules of order and decency you need to take a time out and temporarily leave.” Essentially, that is Ordinance 621.
I urge you to go to City Hall at 6:00 AM or so and witness the litter and broken bottles, as I have numerous times. Go to the library and parks a few times and bring your young relatives. Take them to the bathrooms. Then ask yourself if this is what you want of the city where you raise your family.

I acknowledge the difficult situation the City Council members are facing. I don’t envy this position. I am firm in my belief that the Council has governed reasonably by adopting Ordinance 621. The Council has drawn the line appropriately.

Please, for so many reasons, support Ordinance 621 for the benefit of our City.

Sincerely,

Dan Poiree
City Council,

I am writing this email to answer and clear up some questions that were brought up at the last City Council meeting (4/6) regarding my rezone request (Friel).

During the meeting, City Manager Gurol, stated that we bought the property when the zoning process was occurring and we expressed concern to the City because we didn’t really understand what was going on at that time. I just want to clear up this information as it is misleading. We bought while the property was still zoned multi-family. The public hearings were conducted after our purchase and the City never notified us so we could attend/amend. We found out about the downzone a year later in August 2014 and called the City that day.

It was brought up that I needed to have a Planning Commissioner or Council to sponsor my rezone request first in order for it to be added on the docket. I just want to clear up that I was never told this by the City, I was only told that I need to fill out the application and to add a sponsor request statement in that document.

Council wanted to know why I would think someone should sponsor my request instead of paying the $5000 fee... the bottom line is when we purchased our property it was zoned multi-family. Then the City of Burien down-zone us in 2013 and did NOT notify us before nor after this was voted on so we could amend it. We just want our property reinstated to it’s original zone. I feel that there is way more concern and focus with the $5000 price tag and not the issue at hand, which is, WHY did this downzone even happen given our location and when Burien is looking to future growth near commercial nodes/centers?!

I asked my friend Tom O’Keefe (O’Keefe Development, Normandy Park Towne Center, Tully’s Coffee...), his professional opinion on the City’s current zoning on our property. He stated that our property is zoned incorrectly and it’s really a multi-family site, not single-family location due to being sandwiched between the freeway and a huge apartment complex that runs parallel to the whole area.

Just curious...why would it cost staff $5000 just to reinstate us back to multi-family?! How much did it cost staff to look into our property specifically to downzone us? Was there research made or a survey on our property in 2013 which deemed it fit to downzone?

Not only have we lost our property rights, we have lost a great deal of property value... We shouldn’t even be dealing with any of this to begin with...

Anna Friel
From: Public Council Inbox
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2015 8:34 AM
To: 'lindaplein@comcast.net'
Subject: RE: Concerns regarding Burien's grant application

Dear Ms. Plein,

Thank you for writing to the City Council to express your concerns. Your email will be included in a future Council agenda packet as Correspondence for the Record.

Sincerely,

Carol Allread
Executive Assistant

To David Tiemann/King County Conservation Futures Committee/- 4/20/15
David.Tiemann@kingcounty.gov<mailto:David.Tiemann@kingcounty.gov>

Dear Mr. Tiemann;

I am a resident of King County and the City of Burien. I am writing to you about a grant that has been submitted for the Bel R greenhouses in Burien under two possible funding sources, the Conservation Futures (CFT) 2016 application for funds and the Park Levy funds. The project name is South King County Urban Ag Center. The total cost for this project is shown as $3.2 million dollars. I am concerned and perplexed about the process that was followed to get these grants written and submitted to you. I am also concerned about the cost of this project and the fact that the City of Burien does not have the matching dollars to support this grant for the purchase of the land and the greenhouses and that the City of Burien doesn’t have the funds to run and manage these greenhouses in the future. If a private commercial investor wants to buy them, keep them running and keep them on the tax roll, that is fine with me. Public monies should not be used for this project because it is unsustainable for Burien.

First off, I am unsure of the rationale for submitting these two grants. The minutes from the King County Conservation District (KCD) meeting of March 9, 2015 show (page 3, line 76 to 86) that the Board of Supervisors knew that these grants would not qualify for the CFT grant dollars, the land was not farmland and that the greenhouse area/10 lots were covered in large part with impervious surfaces. The impervious surface coverage disqualifies this grant from Park Levy funding also. So why someone okayed $3,000 of county money to write grants that don’t meet the criteria doesn’t make sense to me. Please share the 3/9/15 KCD minutes that cover this KCD discussion with your committee members.

Second, Burien is a poor city that has lost considerable amounts of lands to its tax roll. The expansion of the Sea Tac Third Runway further contributed to that loss. Should Burien lose more residential tax generating lands to this greenhouse project, it will even have less money to contribute to this grant but more importantly to try to maintain these greenhouses which the Council and citizens were never given the actual costs on. Your committee should consider whether this is really a financial feasible project for Burien; a city with no funding to even match the grant application.

Third, while the County Executive wants to retain farmlands in the county this is not farmland in Burien. The efforts to retain farmlands and demonstration sites to train future
farmers in South King County would be better aimed at Kent, Maple Valley, Auburn, etc. These areas of the county are losing their existing farmlands because they are being pressured by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) to add more housing units to their cities and force out farmlands.

My hope is that your committee will consider my comments and use these grant monies for the criteria of the grants and not change the criteria because of political pressure or because a Burien Council members sits on the grants committee oversight board. Please use the Park Levy money for parkland and habitat preservation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

L. Plein
Dear Mr. Gipson,

Thank you for writing to the City Council to express your concerns. Your email will be included in a future Council agenda packet as Correspondence for the Record.

Sincerely,

Carol Allread
Executive Assistant

-----Original Message-----
From: Earl Gipson [mailto:egipson-gts@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2015 6:02 AM
To: Public Council Inbox
Subject: Locked doors during meetings-SeaTac history

Dear Burien City Council,

The locked door issue in your last meeting was addressed years ago in SeaTac. The doors remain unlocked during Public meetings, period.

I hope the attached helps in making your decision.

Thank you for your service to your City.

Earl Gipson
17050 51st Ave South
SeaTac, WA 98188
(206) 246-7626

*******************************************************************************
Mr. Gipson:

City Council committee meetings are subject to the Open Public Meetings Act and we will seek to remedy any barriers to public attendance post haste. As you are aware, most Council committee meetings end by 5:00 PM or earlier, with the exception of the Land Use and Parks Committee and other committees on occasion, and I have not been aware of instances in which public access to Council committee meetings has been precluded. I understand we have signage providing directions to contact staff when the doors lock because meetings run past the time the electronic locks were programmed to stay open, and I know of instances when that approach was successful so I believed it was working well. Now that you have made me aware of this issue, I will meet with our Facilities Director to ensure that the committee meetings are accessible to members of the public, as they should be, even if that occasionally impairs our building security. If additional signage directing the public to the committee meetings is necessary, we will revise our signage immediately.

Thanks,

Craig

-----Original Message-----
From: Earl Gipson
To: Craig Ward
CC: timf@atg.wa.gov; Barry Ladenburg; chriswythe@hotmail.com; Mia Gregerson; Terry Anderson; tonyanderson1@comcast.net; Gene Fisher; Ralph Shape; Mary Mirante Bartolo; Mark Johnsen; Julia Yoon; Todd Cutts
Subject: Open Public Meetings Act Violation

Dear City Manager Craig Ward,

Until the last LUP (Land Use and Parks) conducted 06/11/09 at 4:30 PM in Room 345 on Thursday June 11th, the City Hall doors have locked at 5:00 PM and the elevators inaccessible and building accessible by card key only except for meetings held in Council Chambers or on the first floor. Myself and other members of the public can bear witness to this fact as we have been in attendance on numerous occasions.

Committee Meetings A&F (Administration and Finance), T&PW (Transportation and Public Works), LUP (Land Use and Parks), PS&J (Public Safety and Justice), and Hotel/Motel Tax Advisory Committee have all been held in RM 345 except for the TP&W meeting June 17th to my knowledge. The listed committees are all Council Committees per the SeaTac website.

It is my understanding the City Hall doors being locked, the elevators inaccessible is a violation of the Open Public Meetings Act as the public has no access to the meeting after 5:00 PM even though the meetings may run till 8:00 PM at times. No posting on the City Hall entrance has directed the Public to the Committee meeting (until the last LUP on 06/11/09). It is also been my experience there has been a quorum of Council members present at times.

I wish this practice to stop in total, the City Hall doors remain open, the third floor remain accessible (if that is where the meeting is held) to the
CITY OF BURIEN
AGENDA BILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Subject:</th>
<th>Review Tree Retention Draft Work Program</th>
<th>Meeting Date:</th>
<th>April 27, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>1. Draft Tree Retention Work Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Stephanie Jewett, Planner</td>
<td>Fund Source:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>(206) 439-3152</td>
<td>Activity Cost:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Budgeted:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unencumbered Budget Authority:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Adopted Initiative: | Yes | No | X |
| Initiative Description: | |

PURPOSE/REQUIRED ACTION:
Review proposed work program for Staff and Planning Commission intended to address Council’s directives related to tree retention.

BACKGROUND (Include prior Council action & discussion):
At the June 16 and August 4, 2014 City Council meetings, staff reviewed Burien’s current significant tree preservation regulations, presented a survey of the current tree retention regulations in nine peer cities (SeaTac, Federal Way, Des Moines, Beaux Arts Village, Lake Forest Park, Tukwila, Seattle, Lynnwood and Olympia) and reviewed the following findings -

- Burien and the majority of surveyed jurisdictions exempt developed single-family lots not located within critical areas from tree retention requirements.
- Significant tree retention requirements in the surveyed jurisdictions included a variety of approaches including zoning designation and intensity of development, citywide canopy coverage targets, and trees per acre/square foot of lot area standards.
- For developments that are not able to meet their tree retention requirements, the tree replacement requirements for Burien and the majority of the surveyed jurisdictions are based on the diameter of the tree removed.
- Seattle, Olympia and Lynnwood have specific regulations intended to encourage Heritage/Exceptional tree preservation.

Based on Council’s previous discussion of these findings, the attached detailed list of work items to be completed by Staff and Planning Commission this Fall is proposed for Council’s consideration.

Administrative Recommendation: N/A

Advisory Board Recommendation: N/A

Suggested Motion: N/A

Submitted by: Stephanie Jewett

Today’s Date: April 22, 2015

File Code: \File\records\CC\Agenda Bill 2015\042715cd-1 Review Tree Retention.docx
ATTACHMENT 1

Below is a draft work program to address Council's directives from the June 16th and August 4th meetings related to significant tree retention in the City.

Item 1: Heritage/Exceptional Tree Preservation (September/October 2015)

To move forward on the Council's directive to consider a heritage/exceptional tree preservation program that balances both environmental and economic interests, the following work program is proposed –

- Review existing Heritage/Exceptional Tree Preservation programs in other city's in the region, such as Seattle, Lynnwood and Olympia. Consider how the definition, designation and retention regulations of Heritage Trees in these jurisdictions might apply to the City of Burien and review with Planning Commission.

- For the definition of Heritage/exceptional trees consider size, species, age, historical significance, location, and aesthetics as potential defining factors for heritage trees.

- For the designation of Heritage/Exceptional trees consider nomination by property owners, council, staff, and residents.

- Identify any known trees of local importance to the community.

- For the retention of Heritage Trees consider voluntary and incentivized measures.

- Review existing Comprehensive Plan policies that provide direction for the preservation of trees of local and historical significance within the City (noted below) with the Planning Commission and consider if expansion is required to include the implementation of a Heritage/Exceptional Tree Program.

Environmental Quality Policy 1.1

To enhance the community's appearance, identity and natural beauty, the City shall promote the conservation and retention of trees of local and historical significance. The use and incorporation of non-invasive native vegetation into landscaping and buffer areas is also encouraged for new development.

Natural Environment Policy 2.12

The City should consider developing and implementing a measure which would preserve trees of historical significance.

Item 2: Tree Canopy Inventory (September/October 2015)

To move forward with Council's question of what would it take to do a tree canopy inventory for the City, the following is proposed –

- Identify if there are existing GIS data sources that would show Burien's tree canopy
as it exists now in comparison to 10-20 years ago to determine the extent of change in the City’s tree canopy.

**Item 3: Existing Significant Tree Retention Regulations (October/November 2015)**

To move forward with Council’s interest in looking at improving the definition of significant trees in the City’s existing tree retention regulations, research why other jurisdictions have removed black locust, cottonwood, native alder, native willow, Lombardy poplar, and European ash from their definitions of Significant Trees and consider exempting these species from Burien’s significant tree regulations.

**Possible Future Steps for working towards an Urban Forestry Plan:**

Washington Department of Natural Resources and Oregon Department of Forestry sponsor the **Community Tree Management Institute (CTMI)** every other year (next session is 2016-2017). CTMI is a training course for public employees that addresses elements of successful urban forestry programs, including tree inventories and management plans. Each CTMI participant is required to complete one out-of-class urban forestry project specifically tailored to their community’s needs. This type of training would provide the City with valuable training for an employee on staff to begin to move the City towards a comprehensive urban forestry program as time and budget allows. More detailed information about the program is attached.
2014-2015 Community Tree Management Institute

CTMI At-A-Glance:
What is CTMI? A training course for employees from Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington cities or agencies who have tree related responsibilities.

When and Where is it Held? There are six CTMI sessions, three of which are online. Participants must be able to attend all sessions in order to be accepted into CTMI.

Session 1 - September, 2014 - Online
Session 2 - October 7-9, 2014
Silverton, OR
Session 3 - October - November, 2014 - Online
Session 4 - December 2 or 3, 2014
Oregon or Washington
Session 5 - January - February, 2015 - Online
Session 6 - March 10-11-12, 2015 (tentative)
Location TBA, western Washington

How Much Does it Cost? The fee for CTMI is $295, which includes all course materials, and food costs for Sessions 2, 4, and 6.

Who Should Attend? Any local government employee interested in improving the quality of life in their city, keeping their public safe, and reaping the economic, environmental and social benefits that city trees can provide.

How Do I Sign Up? - CLICK HERE to Register by June 1, 2014

WHO IS MINDING YOUR COMMUNITY'S TREES?

Who manages tree issues in your city? Who determines if a street or park tree is hazardous and needs to be removed, or hires someone to evaluate it? Who talks with downtown business owners about the fact that shoppers pay more for goods purchased in business districts with trees than those without? Some cities have a city forester or city arborist position, but in many cities or park agencies, particularly smaller ones, there is someone in the Parks, Planning, or Public Works Department who is the designated "tree person" or "tree manager". It is for this agency employee that the Community Tree Management Institute (or CTMI for short) has been developed.

What if your city isn't dealing with its tree issues? Take a look around your city for a moment. What is it that makes your city a livable place? What is it that makes residents want to live there, or businesses want to relocate there? Chances are, one of the contributing reasons is that your city is a nice place to live and work due to the presence of trees in your city. Though we often take them for granted, the trees in our cities provide a wide variety of benefits. It is well known that trees provide many environmental services like clean air and storm water control. Research has shown that the presence of trees increase property values as well. The trees in your city are assets that need to be managed properly. Without proper management, trees can become a liability for a city. Teaching people how to manage trees to realize these benefits within a safe, healthy, and sustainable community forest is why CTMI was created.

The CTMI is an advanced continuing educational curriculum offered every few years, specifically tailored to the needs of municipal parks, planning, or public works employees who have tree related responsibilities in their city. This year-long course is an intensive training experience covering the technical, managerial, and administrative aspects of managing trees in cities. This training is appropriate for anyone who coordinates community forestry issues, reviews tree plans, issues permits, or inspects trees in your city. Since 1994, over 150 people have completed this course.

The CTMI is one of most innovative and cost-effective training sessions in the Pacific Northwest, and it is now being copied in other states. Inside this brochure you will find more information about how your agency can send a representative to be part of the CTMI class of 2014-15.
QUALIFYING TO BE A PART OF CTMI

Participants in previous CTMI courses have come from the ranks of city planners, park management staff, public works employees, tree board staff, horticulturalists, and other similar job classifications. Campus arborists and others with urban forestry program responsibilities are also welcome. Some CTMI participants spend 10% of their jobs working with trees, and some spend 100%. The purpose of the CTMI is to provide participants with the necessary or additional education, leadership focus, and skills to carry out tree related responsibilities in a more efficient and effective manner.

The CTMI is an intensive training opportunity, so your personal commitment, your supervisor's approval, and your city's or agency's support are critical. The CTMI is an innovative and interactive course that will contribute to your professional development as well as your agency's urban forestry efforts.

CTMI 2012 INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

The instructors for CTMI will include experienced urban forestry professionals from the Washington Department of Natural Resources and the Oregon Department of Forestry. They will be joined by past CTMI graduates, and urban forestry professionals from the public and private sectors.

CTMI 2014-15 REGISTRATION FEES

The cost per participant for the Community Tree Management Institute is $295.00. Since this fee is already significantly subsidized through the support of the USDA Forest Service, no scholarships are available. This fee covers the following:

- Tuition for the course, including all course materials, and curriculum expenses
- Food and refreshment costs and meeting room rentals for sessions 2, 4, and 6, and local transportation costs for Session 4.

Participants are responsible for their own travel costs to and from the session locations, and lodging related to Session 2, 4, and 6 (sessions 2 and 6 will have room blocks set aside for participants to reserve single rooms, or to share with other participants). Participants are responsible for their own Internet access for the online sessions.

THE 2014-15 CTMI COURSE SCHEDULE

The Community Tree Management Institute consists of pre-institute readings and electronic discussions, and three place-based sessions spread throughout the year. Participants must attend all six sessions and complete a community project in order to fulfill the requirements of the course. Sessions 1, 3, and 5 are online sessions, and Sessions 2, 4, and 6 are face-to-face sessions. The online sessions may be completed from any computer at your own pace, and consist of individual modules with lectures, videos, website visits, readings, a discussion board, and a weekly live chat with instructors and participants.

Session 1 will be held online during the weeks of September 15 and 22, 2014. This session will introduce the CTMI.

Session 2 will be held October 7-8-9, 2014 at the Oregon Garden Resort in Silverton, OR. This session will cover creating and managing a successful urban forestry program.

Session 3 will be an online session with four weekly sessions from the weeks of October 27 through November 17, 2014. This session will examine elements of effective urban forestry programs.

Session 4 on December 2 or 3, 2014 will be a one-day field tour of a municipal urban forestry program, and attendees will have a choice of attending one in Washington or in Oregon.

Session 5 will be a self-paced online session with four biweekly sessions from the weeks of January 5, January 19, February 2, and February 16, 2015. This session will examine the remaining elements of effective urban forestry programs.

Session 6 will be a final in-person meeting, held at date and location to be announced later. Tentative plans are to hold it on March 10-11-12, somewhere in western Washington state. The theme of this concluding session is advancing and sustaining urban forestry programs.

Upon completing all sessions of the Community Tree Management Institute, each participant will receive a Certificate of Completion, a notebook of resource materials, and an extensive network of professional contacts. ISA Certified Arborists may also obtain up to 15 recertification credits from attending the CTMI.

CTMI 2014-15 is Organized By:

With Support From:

Financial Sponsor:
THE CTMI CURRICULUM

The Community Tree Management Institute is offered only every few years, and the course content is revised and updated each time to reflect current trends and needs in urban forestry. Local and national urban forestry professionals are called upon to help define the Institute’s core curriculum. Upon acceptance into the Institute, each participant will define specific urban forestry-related needs so that the course structure can be further honed to meet those needs. The following themes and subjects are illustrative of the curriculum that will be a part of CTMI 2014-15:

◊ Principles of Urban Forestry Program Leadership
  • Improving community livability through trees
  • Sustainability and green infrastructure

◊ Elements of Successful Urban Forestry Programs
  • Writing and administering tree ordinances
  • Community forestry strategic planning
  • Tree inventories and management plans
  • Community Involvement

◊ Technical Foundations of Healthy Urban Forests
  • Arboricultural principles
  • Tree risk management policy and legal issues
  • Hazard tree evaluation

◊ Addressing Contemporary Urban Forestry Issues
  • Protecting trees during construction
  • Trees and infrastructure conflicts

◊ Partnerships that Advance Urban Forestry Programs
  • Working cooperatively with volunteers
  • Organizational dynamics and effectiveness

◊ Sustaining a Successful Urban Forestry Program
  • Communicating the costs & benefits of trees
  • Solving community problems with trees

Each CTMI participant will also complete one out-of-class urban forestry project specifically tailored to their community’s needs.

Come to the CTMI prepared to be challenged. This training was the first of its kind in the U.S. The CTMI strives to offer a variety of learning opportunities such as lectures, “hands-on” learning, small group exercises, large group discussions, and informal networking. You won’t just be sitting in a classroom (or in front of a computer) listening to lectures.

Talk to someone who has completed one of the previous CTMI sessions in 1994, 1996, 2000, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009 or 2012. Chances are, they still use their resource notebooks, they stay in contact with fellow CTMI graduates, and they still apply what they learned during their CTMI experience. Their city’s urban forest is healthier, too.

WHAT PAST PARTICIPANTS SAY ABOUT THE COMMUNITY TREE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE:

"The CTMI provided me with an arsenal of tools, resources and contacts that has greatly improved my ability to manage the City’s urban forest"
— Chris Neamtu, Planning Director, City of Wilsonville, OR

"Since communities are relying on their trees for more than aesthetic beauty, things like improving air quality, assisting in stormwater management, reducing the heat island effects, it is important to have knowledgeable staff to deal with these issues. CTMI can provide the knowledge. I still use the CTMI notebook as a resource"
— Rob Crouch, Community Forestry Consultant, Portland, OR

"CTMI was one of the best training experiences I have ever had. It addressed urban forestry in a very comprehensive manner, in a logical sequence. I only wish that I could have received this type of training much earlier in my career."
— Alan Haywood, Horticulturist, City of Issaquah, WA

"The networking was wonderful. There was more reference material than I could cover in a year. The organization of the material and the range of professional and experienced presentations set me up for program development for years to come."
— Robbin Pearce, Conservation Analyst, City of Ashland, OR

"I was fairly “green” to Urban Forestry and this training equipped me with the necessary skills and resources to pursue a comprehensive program. The classroom lectures, field trips, and real world workshops really made this a rewarding and memorable experience. I’ve made some great connections and friends through CTMI. I would highly recommend this training."
— Jennifer Shiu, Engineering Associate, City of Tacoma, WA

QUESTIONS?

Questions about the Community Tree Management Institute may be directed to Paul Ries, Urban and Community Program Manager, Oregon Department of Forestry - (503) 945-7391 email (pries@odf.state.or.us), or to Linden Lampman, Urban and Community Forestry Program Manager, Washington DNR, (800) 523-8733, email (linden.lampman@dnr.wa.gov).

REGISTER ONLINE FOR CTMI 2014-15

CLICK HERE NOW to register for the 2014-15 CTMI

Successful applicants will be notified with payment instructions and additional registration information after the June 1, 2014 deadline. Space may be limited; apply today.
**Purpose/Required Action:**
Initiate discussion with City Council regarding proposed changes to the Burien Zoning Code (BMC 19.17.100) related to the keeping of animals in Burien.

**Background (Include prior Council action & discussion):**
In December of 2014, as part of the 2014 Comprehensive Plan update and annual amendments, the City Council began consideration of amendments to the Zoning Code related to keeping animals on residential properties in Burien. The proposed changes were based on public comments received during the past three years expressing interest in urban resilience, sustainability and a push for healthy eating.

A summary and explanation of the areas that were proposed for amendment are as follows:

- Consider permitting three (3) chickens per single detached dwelling unit on all residential lots equal to or less than 6,000 square feet. Establish an additional square footage requirement to allow an additional chicken for each 2,000 square feet over 6,000 square feet.

- Consider establishing a maximum number of chickens allowed to keep the number at a level sufficient to feed an average family and perhaps a few of their friends. On average a chicken will lay 1 egg per day, for a total of 7 eggs per week. Three chickens could lay 3 eggs per day for a total of 21 eggs per week.

- Consider permitting two (2) miniature or pygmy goats per single detached dwelling unit on residential lots with at least 200 square feet of outdoor space devoted only to the goats. Male miniature goats shall be dehorned and neutered. Establish minimum height for fencing of at least 5 feet.

- Consider adjusting the setbacks from property lines and neighboring dwelling units for fowl and small animals.

- Consider establishing minimum standards for the maintenance and care of animals.

- The addition of Peafowl to the prohibited small animals list.

During Council’s consideration of the proposed amendments, questions were raised concerning the impacts on adjacent properties resulting from the proposed changes and how violations of animal related provisions would be enforced. As a result the proposed amendments were tabled for later consideration. A summary of Council comments and staff responses is attached as Attachment 1.

Based on Council’s previous discussion of the proposed amendments and comments received, Staff requests direction on how to proceed with consideration of Zoning Code amendments by the Planning Commission for City Council adoption this Fall.
## CITY COUNCIL COMMENT MATRIX

**REVISED**
December 11, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Goal/Policy Language or Topic</th>
<th>Council Comment or Amendment Request</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
<th>Council Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Keeping of Animals Amendments</td>
<td>In the &quot;Keeping of Animals&quot; section, why reduce the distance from 20 feet to 10 feet with regard to the distance a structure for animals is to the property line?</td>
<td>All of the surveyed jurisdictions (except for Des Moines which requires 35 foot setbacks) have 10 foot setbacks from the property lines. All of the surveyed jurisdictions except Seattle and Tukwila, which have 10 foot setbacks from structures, have 20 foot setbacks from neighboring structures. The setback from the structures helps to reduce the impacts of odor and noise on adjacent residences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2        | Keeping of Animals Amendments | Check with other jurisdictions on number of chickens allowed on a 7,200 square foot lot, the impact to animals that are kept on small lots and the size requirement for full sized goats. | Burien is proposing 4 chickens be allowed on a 7,200 square foot lot.  
- Auburn currently allows 4  
- Federal Way allows 4  
- Kent allows 5  
- Renton allows 5  
- Seattle allows 8  
- Des Moines allows 0  
- Tukwila allows 7  
The National Pygmy Goat Assoc recommended the 200 square foot outdoor space for care for pygmy goats. As to impacts to animals kept in a smaller space, the animals are small and are bred for small areas. Larger livestock are regulated under the proposed code for the larger acreage that they require. The square foot requirements in Burien’s code are in keeping with what other jurisdictions reported on the survey. Full sized goats were categorized with larger livestock in all of the surveyed jurisdictions. | |
<p>| 3        | Keeping of Animals Amendments | Consider adding miniature cows and horses; revisit setback for animal shelters. | Other jurisdictions do not mention these smaller animals in their codes and to date staff has not received any requests regarding miniature cows and horses. After some research, staff has determined that these animals are limited to hobby farms, are not considered inside animals due to weights of 500 pounds or more and as such are treated as livestock. See #1 above for response to setbacks issue. | |
| 4        | Keeping of Animals Amendments | Provide restrictions for animal waste in shoreline/critical areas. | BMC 19.17.100.6.C. requires wetland and stream protection under BMC 19.40 “Critical Areas”. BMC 19.40.350.2.1 requires approval of a plan for all proposals in the vicinity of streams and buffers that include the introduction of livestock. BMC 19.17.100.6.v also addresses critical area protection by requiring a farm management plan including stream corridor and wetland management practices and a minimum 25 foot vegetated buffer setback for all streams and wetlands. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Goal/Policy Language or Topic</th>
<th>Council Comment or Amendment Request</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
<th>Council Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Keeping of Animals Amendments</td>
<td>How do other jurisdictions consider suitable pen information for rabbits and potbellied pigs?</td>
<td>A 50 square foot pen with a dog house is recommended for potbellied pigs. However most pigs are kept as household pets and as such are kept within the residence. Other jurisdictions surveyed do not have housing requirements for rabbit or potbellied pig other than keeping areas clean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Keeping of Animals Amendments, section 4.E</td>
<td>Keep “miniature goats” in the livestock section [BMC 19.17.100(6)].</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Keeping of Animals Amendments, section 4.F</td>
<td>Do not allow rabbits in addition to fowl for the total number of animals. Three (3) total allowed.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Keeping of Animals Amendments, section 4.G</td>
<td>It is ok to increase the number of domestic fowl, however it should be the same for rabbits as long as it is fowl and/or rabbit combination.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Keeping of Animals Amendments, section 4.I</td>
<td>Do not change setbacks at this time.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Keeping of Animals Amendments, general</td>
<td>Please clarify if our existing regulations address this issue first but before changes are made, the council should have a noise ordinance in place with regard to animals, which could address the issue of potentially noisy peafowl.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agenda Subject:
Summary of 2014 Animal Services; a Proposal for Additional Cat Services by Burien CARES; and, an Update on New Pet Licensing Software Acquisition by City staff.

### Meeting Date:
April 27, 2015

### Department:
City Manager

### Contact:
Nhan Nguyen

### Telephone:
206-439-3165

### Attachments:
1. CARES’ 2014 Report
2. Animal Services’ Statistics
3. CARES’ Proposal for Cat Services
4. Managing Community Cats

### Fund Source:
N/A

### Activity Cost:
N/A

### Amount Budgeted:
N/A

### Unencumbered Budget Authority:
N/A

### Adopted Initiative:
Yes  No  X

### Initiative Description:
N/A

### PURPOSE/REQUIRED ACTION:
The purpose of this agenda bill is for Burien CARES staff to provide Council a summary of 2014 animal services, to discuss a CARES proposal for additional cat services, and for City staff to provide an update on new pet licensing software acquisition process.

### BACKGROUND:
**2014 Animal Service Report:** In June 2011, the City of Burien and CARES signed a contract for Animal Control Services for the period of June 15, 2011, through May 30, 2014. In May 2013, the City and CARES modified the contract to extend it to May 30, 2016. The Burien CARES staff are available this evening to give a report of animal services for Burien for 2014 (Attachment 1). To provide Council with context, staff has gathered animal service statistics from Regional Animal Services of King County (RASKC) and Washington Federation of Animal Care and Control Agencies (WFACCA) and put them alongside with CARES statistics (Attachment 2).

**Proposal for additional cat service:** At the August 11, 2014 meeting, City Council asked CARES for a service proposal for cats. Staff received from Burien CARES a proposal of $27,000 for cat services (Attachment 3). This proposal would enable Burien CARES to take in healthy stray cats, vaccinate and neuter/spay them, and adopt them out. Burien CARES believes that Trap, Neuter and Return (TNR) is the most effective way to manage the feral cat population. The Humane Society of the United States published a document called “Managing Community Cats, A Guide for Municipal Leaders” that has information on the practice of TNR (Attachment 4). Currently, CARES takes in sick and unhealthy stray cats, abandoned kittens, and cats from hardship cases for no fee and from owner surrender cats and hoarding cases’ cats for a donation. Last year, CARES took in 169 cats at no extra charge to the City. Regional Animal Services of King County (RASKC) doesn’t offer cat services as a separate, stand-alone item from their regular contract for animal control and shelter service.

**New licensing software:** Included in the 2015-2016 budget was the acquisition of new animal licensing software. Before selecting the software, staff will work with the State Auditor’s Office Local Government Performance Center to apply the LEAN process to the City’s animal licensing and renewal process in order to improve overall efficiency, accuracy, and customer service, and to identify the requirements of the new animal licensing software system. The LEAN process seeks to create work flow improvements through the elimination of waste (i.e. - non-value processes). Staff’s facilitated LEAN workshop will be conducted April 28 – 30, 2015.

### OPTIONS (Including fiscal impacts):

#### Administrative Recommendation:
N/A

#### Advisory Board Recommendation:
N/A

#### Suggested Motion:
N/A

Submitted by: Nhan Nguyen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>City Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Today’s Date:
April 20, 2015

### File Code:
R:/CC/Agenda Bill 2015/Animal Services
C.A.R.E.S.
COMMUNITY ANIMAL RESOURCE & EDUCATION SOCIETY / BURIE

2014
4th Quarter and Year End Statistics
## C.A.R.E.S 2014 PHONE LOG

**PHONE CALLS RECEIVED**

*ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICER DISPATCHED*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMAL COMPLAINT / CONCERNS</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
<th>4TH QUARTER TOTALS</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARKING DOG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE CHECK*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOG BITE / HUMAN*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOG / PET ATTACK*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGRESSIVE ANIMAL*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUELTY/NEGLECT*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>296</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C.A.R.E.S. 2014 Phone Log

**Phone Calls Received**

*Animal Control Officer Dispatched*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lost / Found Animal</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>4th Quarter Totals</th>
<th>Year To Date Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lost Dog</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Cats</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found / Loose / Stray Dog*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found / Loose / Stray Cat</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found Other*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>328</strong></td>
<td><strong>1222</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# C.A.R.E.S 2014 Phone Log

**Phone Calls Received**

*Animal Control Officer Dispatched*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous Calls</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>4th Quarter Totals</th>
<th>Year to Date Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Questions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOA*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Issues</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer / Community Service</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Surrender</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptions</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Information / Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>501</strong></td>
<td><strong>1874</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.A.R.E.S 2014 PHONE LOG
PHONE CALLS RECEIVED
*ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICER DISPATCHED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BURIEN POLICE DEPARTMENT EMERGENCY / 911</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
<th>4TH QUARTER TOTALS</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*911 REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C.A.R.E.S 2014 INTAKE DOGS
### INTAKE DETAIL REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOGS</th>
<th>4TH QUARTER TOTALS</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OWNER SURRENDER</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETURN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIZED / CUSTODY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAY</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERRED IN FROM OTHER SHELTER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# C.A.R.E.S 2014 Dog Outcome

## Outcome Detail Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOGS</th>
<th>4th Quarter Totals</th>
<th>Year to Date Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADOPTIONS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUTHANASIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETURN TO OWNER / GUARDIAN</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICED OUT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER OUT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>266</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


# C.A.R.E.S 2014 Intake Cats

**Intake Detail Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cats</th>
<th>4th Quarter Totals</th>
<th>Year to Date Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner Surrender</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seized / Custody</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stray</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transferred In From Other Shelter</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATS</td>
<td>4TH QUARTER TOTALS</td>
<td>YEAR TO DATE TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOPTION</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUTHANASIA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETURN TO OWNER / GUARDIAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE OUT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER OUT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C.A.R.E.S 2014 DOA IN ROADWAY
### DOA DETAIL REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOA</th>
<th>4th Quarter Totals</th>
<th>Year to Date Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUCK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAGULL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPOSSUM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIGEON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RABBIT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACCOON</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUIRREL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C.A.R.E.S. 2014 Stats

**Other Stats**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Year to Date Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Donations to Low Income and White Center Food Bank</td>
<td>1,551 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>120+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money spent at Local Burien Veterinarian Offices</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations Received / Adoption Revenue</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Collected on Behalf of the City (Fines &amp; Pet Licensing)</td>
<td>$14,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Licenses Sold at the C.A.R.E.S. Facility</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Full Time Animal Control Officers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.A.R.E.S 2014 STATS
COMMUNITY GROUP OUTREACH / EDUCATION

- Hazel Valley Elementary
- Sylvester Middle School
- Highline High School
- Big Picture High School
- Kennedy High School
- Numerous Girl Scout Troops / Boy Scouts Groups
- Farmers Market
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOGS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DOGS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DOGS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CATS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CATS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CATS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTAKE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrender</td>
<td>9,996</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14,703</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray</td>
<td>24,076</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>30,728</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers in</td>
<td>6,799</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7,911</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption returns</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>42,594</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>54,653</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OUTCOME</strong></th>
<th>DOGS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DOGS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>DOGS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CATS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CATS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CATS</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>21,895</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32,155</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to Owner</td>
<td>10,597</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred out</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7,486</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthanized (total)</td>
<td>6,325</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12,720</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>43,772</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>53,483</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

Data reported by WFACCA is from the 2013 WFACCA Population Survey (reported by 47 agencies from 19 out of 39 counties in WA)
Data reported by Burien CARES is from the 2014 Burien CARES' Annual Report of Animal Services for the City of Burien
Data reported by RASKC is for the calendar year 2014 by Dr. Gene Mueller, Manager of RASKC
WFACCA: Washington Federation of Animal Care and Control Agencies
RASKC: Regional Animal Services of King County
CARES: Burien Community Animal Resource and Education Society
BURIEN CATS

Understanding our options
Community Cat Program

C.A.R.E.S currently practices the “Community Cat Program” as recommended by the Humane Society of the United States “Managing Community Cats – A Guide for Municipal Leaders”

“A well-managed TNR program will provide both cost control as well as long-term, community cat population control for a municipality.”
C.A.R.E.S.

- Currently takes all Sick and Unhealthy Stray Cats.
- Currently takes abandoned kittens.
- Currently we have Traps to be checked out for a small fee to assist our residents in trapping cats.
- Currently participating in Low Cost Spay / Neuter Programs.
Currently we take owner surrender Cats.
Currently we help low Income owners with cat issues.
Currently we take cats from Hardship cases.
Actively investigates reported Hoarding Situations.
Actively practicing TNR.
In 2014 we have taken in 169 Cats:
  - 29 Owner Surrender
  - 2 Return to Owner
  - 3 Seized
  - 4 Service In
  - 131 Stray
Option (B) to take ALL Cats

- In addition to doing what we are doing add the following:
  - Take all Healthy Stray Cats
OPTIONS

Community Cat Program

- Sick Cats
- TNR of Cats
- Owner Surrender
- Hardship Cases
- Hoarding Cases
- Low Cost Spay / Neuter
- Education
- No Additional Fee as we currently operate in this system.

Options (B) Take ALL

- Everything in Community Cat Program, Plus
- Take Healthy Stray Cats
- Fee per cat $135
- Estimated cost for 2015 would be $27,000 which would cover 200 cats.
The Difference

- The only thing different between what C.A.R.E.S. currently does and Option B is C.A.R.E.S. would take ALL healthy stray cats even if they are: Domestic Healthy Cats – and possibly someone's cat who roamed away.
C.A.R.E.S. Practices the Community Cat Program that is approved by the United States Humane Society
Conclusion

“By working together, municipal agencies, shelters, veterinarians, and cat rescue groups can humanely reduce community cat populations while protecting the public cat populations while protecting the public, cats, and wildlife. The returns are plentiful: fewer community cats; lower cat intake and euthanasia in shelters; municipal cost savings; greater volunteer participation; more adoptions; better use of limited shelter, animal control, and public health resources; increased goodwill towards shelters; and more lives saved.”

Managing Community Cats – A Guide for Municipal Leaders
Managing Community Cats

A Guide for Municipal Leaders

THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES

ICMA
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FOREWORD

Few animal-related issues facing local leaders are potentially more difficult and time-consuming than those involving un-owned cats in the community. Complaints or concerns regarding cats often represent a disproportionate share of animal-related calls to elected officials and local animal care and control agencies.

“Community cats” are typically un-owned or semi-owned cats, comprised of both strays (lost and abandoned former pets who may be suitable for home environments) and ferals (extremely fearful of people and not welcoming of human attention, making them unsuitable for home environments), who are the offspring of other feral or stray cats. Some community cats can be considered loosely owned, meaning that concerned residents feed them and may provide some form of shelter in their own homes or on their own property, but do not always identify the cats as their own personal pets.

This guide examines the role of community cats (sometimes called free-roaming cats) in cat overpopulation and the concerns shared by officials, animal care and control agencies, and constituents about these animals. It provides recommendations for strategies to manage community cat populations.

This guide can assist municipal leaders in evaluating the presence of cats in their communities and determining how to address these populations effectively.
Local officials and agencies are mandated to protect public health and safety by managing animal control issues such as zoonotic diseases, nuisance animals, and animals running at large. Agencies also commonly receive calls from constituents about community cats.

The issue of managing community cats can create unnecessary conflict. Dissent often arises among neighbors; between cat advocates and wildlife advocates; and among animal care and control leaders, local government leaders, and their constituents.

Often excluded from animal care and control budgets and mandates, community cats might not be managed by field officers who neither have the training to handle them nor a holding space to house them. Whether by choice or regulation, many animal care agencies deal with community cats only when there is a specific nuisance complaint about them or concern for their welfare.

In past decades, many local governments approached community cat populations using solutions like trap and remove, which usually involves killing the trapped cats. Those conventional approaches are now widely recognized as mostly ineffective and unable to address the larger community animal issue. New research (Hurley and Levy, 2013) reveals that this non-targeted, selective response to a population which is reproducing at high rates doesn’t help to reduce cat populations and nuisances in our communities, improve cat welfare, further public health and safety, or mitigate the real impact of cats on wildlife.

Instead, sterilization and vaccination programs, such as trap-neuter-return (TNR), are being implemented to manage cat populations in communities across the country. Well-managed TNR programs offer a humane and proven way to resolve conflicts, reduce population, and prevent disease outbreaks by including vaccinations against rabies and other potential diseases. This guide provides you with the tools and information you need to implement a well-planned and effective community cat management program.

“A well-managed TNR program will provide both cost control as well as long-term, community cat population control for a municipality. In Somerdale, we recognize this value and the positive impact it will have on our animal and residential population. We also recognize that this proactive approach is the most humane and effective means by which we can care for and manage our community cat population.”

—Gary J. Passanante, Mayor, Borough of Somerdale, NJ
WHY ARE THERE SO MANY CATS?

Owned Cats

Cats are the most popular pet in the United States according to the American Veterinary Medical Association’s 2012 U.S. Pet Ownership & Demographics Sourcebook (AVMA 2012). Approximately 30% of households own cats, and overall owned cat numbers have been increasing as the number of households in the U.S. rises. The majority (approximately 85%) of owned cats have been spayed or neutered, but they may have had one or more litters—intended or accidental—before being sterilized. In underserved communities, rates of sterilization in owned cats tend to be much lower, with cost and transportation being the biggest barriers. Accessible spay/neuter services for cat owners are critical for the overall welfare and management of cats. Approximately 65% to 70% of owned cats are kept indoors at least at night, and this trend has been on the rise, up from approximately 20% in the 1970s (APPA 2012).
Un-Owned Cats

Unsterilized community cats (un-owned or semi-owned) contribute about 80% of the kittens born each year and are the most significant source of cat overpopulation (Levy & Crawford, 2004). Estimates vary greatly for the number of community cats in the United States, ranging all the way from 10 to 90 million (Loyd & DeVore, 2010). The limited evidence available indicates that the actual number may be in the 30–40 million range (Rowan, 2013). The real problem is that only about 2% of them are spayed or neutered (Wallace & Levy, 2006) and continue to reproduce generations of outdoor cats. For this reason, large-scale and targeted reproductive control of community cats is critical to reduce cat populations in your community.

Community cat population numbers are greatly affected by the community in which they live. Human demographics, types of land usage, climate, presence of predators, and availability of resources all affect the cat population and determine how many cats can be supported in a given area. Population estimates vary greatly and provide only a loose number that can be further refined as program work takes place. Experts differ on recommended calculations, with a range of formulas from human population divided by six (Levy & Crawford, 2004), to human population divided by 15 (PetSmart Charities, 2013). For a mid-range estimate of the number of community cats in your area, divide your human population by 10. This estimate is exactly that—an estimate. Cold weather areas with freezing temperatures or locales with robust predator populations that limit survival, may have fewer cats than estimated, while rural areas with lots of barns and farms may have more than estimated. Warm climates tend to support larger populations of cats. Densely populated areas with shelter and adequate food sources for outdoor cats may have very large concentrations or relatively few cats depending on the neighborhood’s demographics.

“When cat populations are present, the choice is not between having cats or not having cats. The choice is between having a managed community cat population, or an unmanaged one.”

—Bryan Kortis, Program Manager, PetSmart Charities, Phoenix, AZ
MEET THE PLAYERS

Knowing the stakeholders in your community and working cooperatively with them leads to better outcomes and a more cohesive community cat management plan.

Most animal care and control agencies are operated by local governments, but some jurisdictions contract with nonprofit organizations to perform these important functions. Regardless, their primary role is to manage public health, safety, and disease concerns as well as complaints from community residents. These agencies are also expected to take care of and redeem lost pets, as well as re-home pets who no longer have homes. For people concerned with the welfare of outdoor cats or those who find them a nuisance, animal care and control agencies are often the first points of contact. Animal care and control agencies and public health departments need to be prepared to respond effectively to these complaints and proactively address community cat populations when possible.

One of the biggest challenges is maintaining adequate resources (i.e. budget). Few local governments find themselves swimming in the extra money needed to adequately fund a complete animal sheltering operation, including programs addressing community cats. This underscores the importance of volunteers and nonprofit organizations in the community who are willing to devote their resources to helping manage community cats. We strongly encourage municipalities to develop comprehensive

PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENTS’ APPROVAL OF TNR

New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
nyc.gov/html/doh/html/environmental/animals-tnr
Lists local TNR groups on its website

New Jersey State Department of Health & Senior Services
state.nj.us/health/animalwelfare/stray
Lists TNR as an approach for managing feral cats

Baltimore City Health Department
neighborhoodcats.org/uploads/File/Resources/Ordinances/Baltimore_TNRRegs.pdf
Issues regulations for practicing TNR
Private Animal Shelters and Humane Societies

Around three billion public and private dollars are spent each year operating animal shelters across the country (Rowan, 2012). The primary role of most private animal shelters is the housing and adoption of homeless cats and dogs, but shelters are often the receptacle for injured or sick wildlife and cats and dogs who might be considered unadoptable by some. Many community cats fall into this category.

These organizations play an important role in the community, often serving as a point of contact, and are widely recognized by the public for enforcing local and state humane laws and ordinances. They are often involved at a policy level, lobbying for animal protection laws and programs.

Approximately 6–8 million cats and dogs enter U.S. animal shelters annually, with approximately half being euthanized (HSUS, 2013). That number

“After we implemented a shelter, neuter, return (Return to Field) program in 2010, it changed the way we do business and it has improved our ability to do more to help all animals. It convinced us that more was possible. Last year alone, there were 3,000 fewer cats and kittens in our shelter. As a result, the capacity and savings that we have enjoyed have allowed us to do more to help the cats in our care and it has even benefitted the dogs because those resources don’t have to be spent on more cats.”
—Jon Cicirelli, Director, Animal Care and Services, San Jose, CA
includes about 70 percent of cats who enter shelters (ASPCA, 2013). These cat-related intake and euthanasia activities cost more than a billion dollars annually (Rowan, 2012), while affecting only a tiny fraction of the total number of cats in a given community and doing nothing to manage overall cat populations. This haphazard approach has little impact on welfare, environmental, or public health issues. It stresses shelters, overwhelming their resources and far exceeding capacity, and it gives false expectations to citizens coming to these agencies for help resolving problems.

The pie chart from the state of California shows the estimated percentages of outdoor community cats (red) and owned cats (blue) who go outside, compared with the number of cats handled by the California sheltering system who are either euthanized or adopted out (green and purple combined) (CA Dept of Public Health, 2013). Clearly, the tiny sliver of cats handled by the California sheltering system pales in comparison to the total cat population, demonstrating that these hard-working agencies are still making little long-term impact. (Koret, 2013).

**RETURN TO FIELD**

Some shelters care for feral colonies on their own property, either by themselves or in collaboration with local TNR groups. Others with high euthanasia rates for cats are embracing “Return to Field” programs as a way to reduce euthanasia while focusing energy and resources on spaying and neutering.

In the Return to Field program, healthy, un-owned cats are sterilized, eartipped, vaccinated, and put back where they were found. The rationale is that if the shelter has no resources, a healthy cat knows how to survive and should not be euthanized to prevent possible future suffering. Using resources for sterilization has a larger impact than focusing resources on intake and euthanasia.
Animal Rescue Groups

These privately run organizations—usually, but not always, with nonprofit tax status—typically do not have a facility and are foster-based. Rescue groups are primarily focused on finding homes for animals in the community. Often, rescue groups and shelters have cooperative relationships in which shelters transfer animals to the care of rescue groups whose foster homes and volunteers help to stretch resources and increase opportunities for homeless animals. There are many rescue groups that specialize in cat rescue, including those that participate in TNR activities.

TNR Groups

Thousands of nonprofit organizations exist around the country for the primary purpose of assisting community cats. These organizations are often funded by private donations and operate on small budgets, but they work hard—often as unpaid volunteers—to trap, neuter, and return cats living outdoors. They may also be involved in local politics, lobbying for improved animal-related ordinances and funding. Some TNR groups also consider themselves rescue groups, and vice versa.

Wildlife Agencies and Conservation Groups—Public and Private

The federal government has not adopted or taken a specific position on TNR. Federal wildlife agencies, such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, oppose the management of TNR colonies in or near wildlife conservation areas, and individuals in federal agencies have adopted a variety of positions with regard to TNR programs. State wildlife agencies, such as departments of natural resources or fish and wildlife agencies, are
funded through a variety of state and federal sources, such as taxes placed on all firearms and ammunition sold. These state agencies have traditionally focused on the management of game (i.e. hunted) species, but increasingly are becoming involved in broader conservation agendas that include non-game and threatened and endangered species. They typically do not regulate or get involved with TNR programs outside of protected wildlife areas.

Private wildlife groups, such as the National Audubon Society or the World Wildlife Federation, are funded by donations and private grants and operate primarily to protect wildlife from harm and habitat degradation. These groups are often actively involved in lobbying for public policy changes that affect vulnerable wildlife species. Concern regarding outdoor cat predation on wildlife has become a hot topic in the conservation community, but all stakeholders (both cat and wildlife advocates) share the same end goal of reducing outdoor cat populations. See the Concerns about Wildlife section on page 22 for more details.

Veterinarians

Many veterinarians support the concept of TNR and may offer various forms of assistance, but they are also business owners who have a bottom line to meet. While many would like to offer discounted services or to expand their offerings for community cats, they still need to make a living.

The involvement of local veterinarians is a key component of any sterilization program. Communities and organizations need to understand the unique challenges of the veterinary community and to consult local veterinarians when drafting program plans. Sterilization capacity will be determined by how many surgeries your local veterinary partners can handle above and beyond their everyday business. Even if your agency hires a staff veterinarian, you should continue to work with other local veterinarians. They can be strong partners for your program, filling in when extra capacity is needed, helping with injured and ill cats, and providing other kinds of medical support.

“I am very proud to be a part of the profession that puts the “N” in TNR. Nationwide, increasing numbers of veterinary professionals are participating in this life-saving strategy. More and more veterinary practices treat free-roaming cats and the number of high-quality, high-volume spay/neuter clinics continues to grow. This is all in recognition of the fact that discontinuing the breeding cycle and then returning the cats to their original environment is the only scientifically proven effective and humane approach to stabilizing, and ultimately decreasing, free-roaming cat populations, as well as protecting potentially affected wildlife. The veterinary profession should be applauded for being such an integral part of the solution to a problem that has plagued our country for decades.”

—Susan Krebsbach, DVM, Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association Veterinary Advisor, Oregon, WI
The Public

Most people care about cats and want to see them treated humanely. Communities that embrace effective cat management programs will be rewarded with goodwill from their residents. Many communities are learning about what officials in San Jose, California experienced: that a public who readily understands and supports decisions made in the best interest of the cats turns out to be the best at reducing conflicts between cats and humans and cats and other animals.

Some residents might complain about cats in their backyard or cats adversely affecting their property. Many of these complaints can be resolved with information about humane deterrents and civil dialogue with neighbors, which agencies can help facilitate. Animal control officers can be an integral part of this approach, or if there are no resources to support this, other successful models include enlisting the aid of a local nonprofit to help mediate cat-related conflicts.

Large-scale sterilization programs depend on volunteer support. A significant portion of the public (approximately 10% to 12%) already feeds community cats (Levy & Crawford, 2004) and might be willing to help, especially when low-cost, high-quality sterilization programs are available. Non-lethal management programs will be readily supported by the majority in your community, while lethal control will not receive the same support and may actively be opposed by concerned residents. Policies designed to support and enable TNR activities are critical; those that place barriers to public engagement in TNR activities or threaten caretakers with penalties for their goodwill and volunteerism need to be amended or removed. Agencies that do not recognize the need to adopt non-lethal solutions often become the focal point of community criticism over high levels of cat euthanasia in the shelter.
Many conventional strategies have been used over the years to attempt to manage community cats. You might have tried them or have contemplated trying them, but here is why they don’t work.

**Trap and Remove or Relocate**

Trap and remove may at first glance seem to be the logical approach to solving community cat problems. However, unless it is consistently performed with very high levels of resources and manpower and addresses over 50% of a targeted population, it doesn’t offset the root of the problem: ongoing reproduction of un-trapped cats (Andersen and Martin, et al, 2004). The resources (money, manpower, etc.) required to capture this many cats simply do not exist, either in the budgets and capacity of government agencies or in terms of public support. Haphazard lethal control efforts only result in a temporary reduction in the cats’ numbers, essentially putting a band-aid on the problem and further distance from real solutions.

Moreover, while some advocates of this approach claim that the cats just need to be removed and placed elsewhere, there is no “elsewhere.” Relocating cats is a complex task that is usually unsuccessful and creates more problems than it resolves. The vast majority end up “relocated” to shelters that have no other recourse but to perform euthanasia. Euthanasia in shelters is typically performed to end the lives of ill, dangerous, or suffering animals in a humane manner. When euthanasia is performed on healthy but unsocialized cats, it can be characterized as unnecessary, calling into question whether their deaths are actually humane.
Opposition from many in the community who oppose killing cats and insufficient resources to achieve the level of removal/euthanasia necessary to actually achieve results can often prove to be insurmountable barriers to lethal control programs. Communities that use trap and euthanize strategies typically do not realize reductions in the number of cat complaints, and cat intake at local shelters stays constant or continues to rise. Therefore, the only result of trap and remove/euthanize programs is turnover—new feline faces in the community, but not fewer.

“As a nation, we have over 50 years witnessing the ineffectiveness of trap and kill programs and their inability to reduce community cat numbers. It’s time we try the only method documented to work—TNR.”
—Miguel Abi-hassan, Executive Director, Halifax Humane Society, Daytona Beach, FL

Feeding Bans

The logic behind banning the feeding of outdoor cats is that if no one feeds them, they will go away. However, this doesn’t work because cats are strongly bonded to their home territories and will not easily or quickly leave familiar surroundings to search for new food sources. Instead, they tend to move closer to homes and businesses as they grow hungrier, leading to more nuisance complaint calls, greater public concern for the cats’ welfare, and underground feeding by residents. People who feed cats will ignore the ban, even at great personal risk, and enforcement is extremely difficult, resource intensive, and unpopular.

“Bans on feeding feral cats do nothing to manage their numbers. Bans force feral cats to forage through trashcans and kill wildlife, such as birds, squirrels, and rabbits. Establishing feeding stations ensures a healthier colony and allows a human being to interact with the colony and provide care for any cat that is under stress or who needs medical attention. Feeding stations also bring feral cats to a central location and help establish a trust, making trapping [for sterilization] an easier task.”
—Wayne H. Thomas, Councilman, Hampstead, MD

Licensing Laws, Leash Laws, and Pet Limits

Laws intended to regulate pet cats and their owners don’t work to reduce community cat populations, because community cats do not have “owners” in the traditional sense.
Instead, they’re cared for by volunteer resident caretakers who happen upon them. These caretakers should not be penalized for their goodwill; they are essentially supplementing the community’s cat management protocols with their time and resources. Rather, laws should be designed to incentivize people in the community to care for these cats and to protect those who do so.

Caretakers don’t choose how many cats there are, so pet limits are of little use. Because these cats are not owned, caretakers don’t control the cats’ movements, so leash laws are equally ineffective. Requiring community cats to be licensed by caretakers is a bad idea from an enforcement and compliance standpoint, and forcing caretakers to register colony locations often causes people concerned for the cats’ welfare to go underground and off the municipal radar screen. Additionally, cat-licensing projects rarely pay for themselves and further drain already limited resources. Policies that impose penalties on caretakers are barriers to sound community cat management. However, proactive, non-lethal control programs can enlist the support of caretakers by gaining their trust, and they can in turn provide data on the cats people care for.

Relocation and Sanctuaries

Some individuals or organizations may call for un-owned cats to be relocated or placed in sanctuaries. While this may seem like a humane alternative to lethal control, it is unrealistic due to the sheer numbers of cats in communities. Relocation is time-consuming and usually unsuccessful. Cats are strongly bonded to their home areas and may try to return to their outdoor homes. In addition, if the food and shelter that initially attracted the cats cannot be removed, other unsterilized cats will move in to take advantage of the available resources.

Some shelters and rescues have implemented successful barn cat programs, where unsocialized cats can be relocated to barns and farms to provide rodent control. But these programs require management and are by their nature limited. They can’t address the large number of un-owned cats in the community.

Sanctuaries might be available in some areas, but those that provide quality care for animals quickly fill to capacity and are too expensive to maintain for large numbers of un-owned cats. Cat populations vastly out-scale availability at sanctuaries, making them an unrealistic option in most cases. Many unfortunate examples exist of sanctuaries that grew too large and resulted in neglect and cruelty. Moreover, these organizations cause an additional burden on communities, requiring law enforcement intervention and resulting in a large group of cats again needing to be removed and relocated.

If you are able to secure a spot in a sanctuary, always visit it in person before sending the cat there, to ensure that all animals receive proper and humane care.

“While licensing a cat (like dogs) seems responsible, the unintended consequences of it are damaging. Licensing owned cats does not take care of feral cats that are not owned by anyone.”
—Councilman Rod Redcay, VP
Denver Borough Council, PA
MANAGING COMMUNITY CAT POPULATIONS: WHAT DOES WORK

Properly managed sterilization-vaccination programs do not create cat overpopulation—the cats are already there. The choice is between making progress or continuing to experience an unmanaged problem. Well-designed and implemented community cat programs are in line with public opinion and can mobilize an army of compassionate, dedicated people who care about the cats, wildlife, and their communities. To be most effective, these programs must be adopted by more communities and supported by more animal care and control agencies and municipal officials. The HSUS strongly recommends effective community cat management programs (including TNR and other sterilization programs), legislation that allows for and supports non-lethal population control, and coalition-based approaches that involve community leaders, citizens, and stakeholders.

Solving community cat problems requires many strategies, including:

TNR

Trap-Neuter-Return and its variants are non-lethal strategies intended to reduce the numbers of community cats, improve the health and safety of cats, and reduce impacts on wildlife. At minimum, TNRed community cats are spayed or neutered so they can no longer reproduce, vaccinated against rabies, marked to identify them as sterilized (the universally recognized sign of a sterilized cat is an ear-tip, a surgical removal of the top quarter inch of the of the cat's ear, typically the left), and returned to their home territory. Community-wide TNR programs are effective because they:

- Vaccinate cats against rabies (and other diseases, depending on available resources), decreasing public health and safety risks
- Create an immediate reduction in population when kittens young enough to be socialized and friendly stray cats are removed
- Lead to long-term management, reduction, and eventual elimination of outdoor cat populations
- Potentially save or better allocate municipal funds associated with trapping, holding, euthanizing, and disposing of community cats because trapping is typically done by volunteers
- Further save funds by reducing the flood of kittens into shelters each spring and fall kitten season
- Decrease nuisance complaints by eliminating or dramatically reducing noise from cat fighting and mating and odor from unneutered male cats spraying urine to mark their territory
- Attract volunteers, gain caretaker cooperation, and create goodwill for shelters and animal control agencies (if the cats were going to be harmed, there would be few volunteers willing to participate)
- Bring in sources of private funding from nonprofits and individuals willing to pay for the cats' spay/neuter surgeries and care
- Allow private nonprofit organizations that help community cats and volunteers to mediate conflicts between the cats and residents of surrounding communities
- Maintain the health of colony cats (cats living together in a given territory) and allow caretakers to trap new cats who join the colony for TNR or adoption
Targeting Efforts

TNR and sterilization efforts are constantly evolving and improving. Through better data collection on cat intake, complaint calls, and euthanasia, and with the advent of GIS software, we are now able to target and focus resources on areas where projects can have the biggest impact. Many projects have had success focusing their funding and efforts within certain zip codes, neighborhoods, or specific locations, such as apartment complexes.

Through an assessment of the data for a given community, geographical “hotspots” become visible. By targeting the appropriate amount of resources—including trappers, surgeries, and marketing—to fully address that target zone, programs can effectively stop the reproduction and get a handle on that population set before moving on to the next target area. This approach has a much faster and more visible impact on cat populations than a scattered, random approach centered on complaint calls across a wide geographical area. Targeted efforts allow you to reach a high enough rate of sterilization (ideally as close to 100% as possible) to quell population growth. Assessing your community, mapping cat hot spots, and targeting your approach can also help reduce impacts on wildlife by identifying sensitive and vulnerable wildlife areas and focusing efforts in those areas.

“One of the most important recent advances in TNR is the strategy of targeting. By focusing resources like surgeries, outreach, and trappers on areas with high concentrations of free-roaming cats, populations can be reduced faster and more efficiently, resulting in lower intake and euthanasia at shelters as well as fewer complaints.”

—Bryan Kortis, Program Manager, PetSmart Charities, Phoenix, AZ
Animal Control/Shelter Innovations

In their efforts to combat cat overpopulation, the majority of municipal agencies and private organizations are spaying and neutering animals before they are adopted, providing subsidized spay/neuter for pet owners with low incomes, and supporting community cat caretakers with low-cost spay/neuter services, training, equipment and increased legal protections. Programs like these can also attract private funding and grants and engender public goodwill. Most citizens want to do the right thing for their cats, but barriers such as cost or transportation exist in communities across the country. In order to truly address cat overpopulation, these barriers need to be removed for all members of our communities.

“Veterinary students at the University of Florida have been performing TNR in the Gainesville area since 1998. Since Operation Catnip started focusing on litter prevention in community cats, the euthanasia rate for cats at our local shelter has plummeted from more than 4,000 in 1998 to less than 400 in 2012. Residents were wary at first, but 40,000 cats later, it’s well-recognized that the program to sterilize, vaccinate, and treat parasites in free-roaming cats has made our community better for people and for cats.”

—Julie Levy, DVM, PhD, Diplomate ACVIM, Director, Maddie’s® Shelter Medicine Program at the University of Florida Gainesville

Services for Pet Owners

Services for pet owners in the community must be accessible to all residents. They should include preventative and wellness care, such as vaccinations, tips for finding pet-friendly rental housing, and information on keeping pets in their homes by resolving unwanted behaviors and managing allergies. It’s important to promote keeping cats indoors and using collars, visible identification, and possibly microchipping for pet cats so that those who do go missing can be reunited with their families. It’s also important to let community members know that shelters and rescue groups provide adopters with resources when they face problems with their cats. Shelters and rescues can provide behavior assistance and potentially medical assistance when cats face severe injury or disease.
Collaboration

Each community is different. There is no one-size-fits-all solution for managing community cats. Stakeholders must work together to create programs that address specific needs and maximize their community’s available resources. By working together, municipal agencies, shelters, veterinarians, and cat rescue groups can humanely reduce community cat populations while protecting the public, cats, and wildlife. The returns are plentiful: fewer free-roaming cats; lower cat intake and euthanasia; municipal cost savings; greater volunteer participation; more adoptions; better use of limited shelter, animal control, and public health resources; increased goodwill towards shelters; and more lives saved.

“One of the new programs we created was our TNR program, the Apartment Cat Team (ACT). Our data showed us that apartment complexes and mobile home parks were “ground zero” for abandoned cats, feral cats, and litters of unwanted kittens. The ACT program focuses on teaching and empowering apartment residents and managers in the benefits of TNR, spay-neuter, rabies vaccination, and microchips. In addition, we are recruiting kitten foster homes and rescuing kittens out of feral life, socializing them, and adopting them into new homes. The ACT program is a vital program that is contributing to a reduction in euthanasia—along with other innovative programs we have recently put into place to save cats and kittens. The ACT program gives us a chance to try a different approach that is not only more humane, but that also builds rapport between manager and tenant. The result is a public better educated about humane treatment of animals.”

—Mike Oswald, Director, Multnomah County Animal Services, Troutdale, OR
ADDRESSING CONCERNS ABOUT COMMUNITY CATS

Concern

The cost to the municipality

Long-term solutions like TNR may sound expensive, but they usually end up costing less than repeated cycles of trap-house-euthanize. TNR is a long-term investment in a community. The cost of TNR is often covered out-of-pocket by individuals who care about community cats and by nonprofit organizations. But animal care and control agencies and nonprofit organizations with self-funded TNR programs have often found the cost of TNR less expensive than admitting, holding, euthanizing, and disposing of healthy cats. The money saved can be put towards more TNR. There are also many grant opportunities available for targeted TNR programs that can offset budgets and improve efforts.

Concern

By allowing TNR, the municipality may be liable for any future conflicts with cats

A municipality would be liable for an injury or damage only if it committed an act of negligence. Implementing or permitting a TNR program to reduce the community cat population and resolve nuisance complaints is reasonable government behavior, not negligent conduct. In addition, liability for harm caused by animals typically stems from ownership—but no one “owns” a community cat just as no one “owns” a squirrel who might cause damage. Even if a person is bitten or scratched, a TNRed cat likely would have been vaccinated against rabies. Rabies prophylaxis treatment will likely still be advisable, but the real risk of rabies is reduced. Consider an alternate situation, where a person is bitten and sues the municipality because officials turned down a TNR program that would have dealt with an overpopulation issue and vaccinated cats against the disease. At least 34 states require rabies vaccination for cats, and efforts should be made to revaccinate cats when possible (AVMA, 2013).
Many animals, both wild and domestic, can pass diseases to people. Rabies is a disease of significant concern, and focusing on prevention is the best medicine. Vaccination against rabies should be a standard protocol for TNR practitioners.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2013), over the last 100 years, rabies in the United States has changed dramatically. The number of rabies-related human deaths in the United States has declined from more than 100 annually at the turn of the century to one or two per year in the 1990s (CDC, 2013). In the United States, human fatalities associated with rabies occur in people who fail to seek medical assistance, usually because they were unaware of their exposure. Modern day prophylaxis has proven nearly 100% successful (CDC, 2013). The CDC also reports that the number of reported cases of rabies is decreasing in both wild and domestic animals. In 2010, wild animals accounted for 92% of reported cases of rabies (CDC, 2013). The World Health Organization hasn’t recommended removing dogs to control rabies since 1983 because vaccine programs have been more successful (WHO, 1984).

Although the majority of rabies cases occur in wildlife, domestic animals are the source of the majority of human cases that require post-exposure treatment because people are more likely to handle unknown dogs and cats than wildlife. Most rabies cases in cats occur in areas with large raccoon populations, like the Northeast.

Vaccinating community cats against rabies as part of a TNR program should be supported as a preventative measure against the potential spread of the disease. Some public health officials have concerns about revaccinating community cats when vaccines expire. Because the lifespan of community cats is typically much shorter than that of pet cats, a vaccine with three-year immunity may provide protection for the life of many community cats. It’s clearly better than no vaccine at all. Well-managed programs should attempt to re-trap cats for further vaccinations. These programs also have the benefit of potentially reducing cat roaming. They can manage feeding so that fewer people come into contact with the cats. In this way, while the risk of rabies transmission from cats may not be entirely eliminated, it can be significantly reduced.

Sterilized cats are typically healthier overall (Scott et al., 2002) and have greater immunity against a host of other diseases and parasites (Fischer, et al., 2007). Sterilized cats are also less likely to transmit feline diseases that are largely spread through mating behavior and mating-related fighting (Finkler, et al., 2011). People who feed community cats should use feeding strategies that do not attract wildlife (e.g. not leaving food out overnight), as should people who feed their pet cats outdoors. Not all states have mandatory rabies vaccination laws for cats, so it is important to determine whether your state does (or should). You should offer low-cost vaccination options for low-income cat owners. Refer to the appendix for additional public health information and documents about rabies and other diseases.
Concern

Cats will continue to be a nuisance to residents

With TNR, nuisance behaviors can be drastically reduced or eliminated. Neutered cats typically don’t yowl late at night or fight over mates (Finkler et al., 2011), so noise is greatly reduced. The odor from male urine spray is mostly eliminated because testosterone is no longer present, and spraying to mark territory may stop entirely. Altered cats, no longer in search of mates, may roam much less frequently (Scott et al., 2002) and become less visible. Because they can no longer reproduce, over time there will be fewer cats, which in itself will result in fewer nuisance behaviors, complaint calls, and a reduced impact on wildlife.

To prevent community cats from entering areas where they’re unwanted, such as yards or gardens, residents can try blocking access to shelter areas and securing garbage containers. If these solutions don’t work, many humane cat-deterrent products are available in stores and online. Check the appendix for a list of simple solutions to common complaints.

Remember that many cat nuisance cases are the result of neighbor disputes. Facilitating dialogue and mutually agreed-upon resolutions in those cases is often a much more effective outcome than removing the cat(s) in question.
Concern

TNR is illegal in our community

Some existing ordinances may have components that pose barriers to practicing TNR. Ordinances are typically written for pet cats, so it’s important to review local and state laws to know where amendments are needed to allow your community to implement TNR. For example, laws might ban feeding animals outdoors, limit the number of cats that can be owned (with “owners” defined in a way that includes colony caretakers), prohibit returning cats to the community under abandonment language, prohibit cats from roaming freely, or require that all cats be licensed. In order for an effective TNR program to thrive, your community should amend these provisions to exempt managed community cats and their caretakers or enact an ordinance that explicitly legalizes TNR. Our website and the appendix include examples.

Even when conflicting regulations don’t exist, some municipalities may still choose to enact an ordinance authorizing TNR and defining the roles and duties of all parties. Or a community might prefer, as a matter of local culture, to allow TNR informally. In such cases, a TNR ordinance might be unnecessary and actually hinder the functioning and growth of an already successful program.

The goal of a TNR ordinance is a successful sterilization program. Your program will succeed only if your community encourages participation and full engagement by caretakers and removes overly burdensome requirements and restrictions that discourage their involvement.

“Carroll County has a law that is in effect in Hampstead, which states that if you care for an animal for more than three days, the animal is considered yours. Therefore, anyone caring for feral cats for more than three days would be considered their owner and if it were more than three cats, that person would be in violation of the Hampstead limit of three cats.

The code change I proposed and got passed exempted persons participating in a TNR program with continued care of feral cats from the limit of three cats. This allowed citizens to participate in the TNR programs and management of feral cat populations.”

—Wayne H. Thomas, Councilman, Hampstead, MD
Concern

Welfare of cats

The idea that community cats are at great risk for suffering and untimely death if not admitted to a shelter is a long-standing one. However, a growing body of evidence suggests that this is not the case. Data from clinics that sterilized more than 100,000 cats nationwide revealed that they are generally fit and healthy, with less than one percent requiring euthanasia to end suffering (Wallace & Levy, 2006). Common feline diseases, such as feline immunodeficiency virus (FIV) or feline leukemia virus (FeLV), occur at the same rate as in the pet cat population (Lee et al., 2002). Our article “Keeping Feral Cats Healthy” (animalsheltering.org/resources/magazine/sep_oct_2008/keeping_feral_cats_healthy.html) offers more details.

Concern

Welfare of wildlife

There are no easy answers to the issue of cat predation on wildlife. What to do about it has been a concern for more than 100 years. However, neither cats nor wild animals are well served by a polarized, divisive, and expensive “cats vs. wildlife” controversy. Practical solutions include humanely reducing cat populations using TNR and managing cats (individuals and colonies) so they do not impinge on designated wildlife areas and at-risk wildlife populations. Not all cat colony situations are the same. For example, cats may need to be removed when they congregate in or near a sensitive wildlife habitat, whereas they could be effectively managed behind a shopping center in a suburban town.

When predation by community cats is an issue, respectful dialogue and productive collaboration between cat and wildlife advocates is essential. There are several examples of such dialogue (e.g. in Portland, Oregon, and New Jersey) that communities might seek to follow. It is not always easy to arrive at a solution that protects all interests to the greatest extent. Effective TNR programs seek to reduce the population of community cats, eventually bringing it to zero. Although TNR might not work as quickly as some would like, there are numerous successful examples of population reduction.

Wildlife and cat advocates can also help protect wildlife by joining forces in non-controversial collaborative projects such as informing cat owners about keeping owned cats indoors, seeking support and funds for installing cat-proof fences around sensitive natural areas, humanely relocating cat colonies that pose unacceptable risks to wildlife, and, of course, continuing community cooperation to improve the efficiency and economy of TNR programs.
Adequate funding is critical to a successful TNR program. When all stakeholders are engaged in targeted efforts to reduce cat populations they’ll likely offer resources to help the program succeed. Municipalities that operate TNR programs through their agency or a contracting agency should include funding for these activities in the budget, but financial assistance and grant opportunities can offset budgets and help stretch dollars. A successful community TNR program can also generate savings through lower intake and euthanasia—funds that can help the program continue running.

If an incorporated nonprofit animal welfare organization runs the TNR program, it can raise funds through direct mail, grants, and special events. Many grant-making organizations exist; some provide grants to government agencies, whereas others focus their efforts on nonprofit organizations. Many states have local or statewide community foundations that may support a program that encompasses law enforcement, public health, animal welfare, and wildlife conservation. Grant-makers are very interested in collaborations between private organizations and municipal agencies—an additional incentive to partnerships between those stakeholders.

For a list of grant-making agencies to get you started, please check out our list in the appendix. You can find information on necessary supplies, vaccines, etc. that require funding in the Neighborhood Cats Handbook (neighborhoodcats.org/uploads/File/Resources/NC TNR Handbook_WEB_v5-4.pdf).
FINAL THOUGHTS

Properly managed TNR programs do not create cat overpopulation—the cats are already there. Your community must choose between progress or an unmanaged, ever-growing problem. Well-designed and well-implemented programs that focus on non-lethal control and involve all community stakeholders are in line with public opinion. They can mobilize an army of compassionate, dedicated people who care about the cats, wildlife, and their communities.

By working together, municipal agencies, shelters, veterinarians, and cat rescue groups can humanely reduce community cat populations while protecting the public, cats, and wildlife. The returns are plentiful: fewer community cats; lower cat intake and euthanasia in shelters; municipal cost savings; greater volunteer participation; more adoptions; better use of limited shelter, animal control, and public health resources; increased goodwill towards shelters; and more lives saved.

Doing nothing or repeating failed approaches is no longer an option. Proactive, effective approaches exist and need to be fully embraced and implemented in a majority of our communities if we’re going to have a lasting impact. Please join us in making our communities safer for all.

“Trap, neuter and return works. It is a humane solution and we are thrilled that in such a short time the TNR program is showing significant results in Fairfax County. With the help of citizen trappers, we are able to spay or neuter these cats before they contribute to our community’s homeless cat population. TNR is saving lives in Fairfax County.”

—Dr. Karen Diviney, Former Director, Fairfax County Animal Shelter, Fairfax, VA
RESOURCES
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Appendix

TNR is supported by The Humane Society of the United States and many other national groups, including:

- Alley Cat Allies
- American Animal Hospital Association
- American Association of Feline Practitioners
- American Humane Association
- American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA)
- Association of Shelter Veterinarians
- Best Friends Animal Society
- Cat Fanciers’ Association
- Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association
- National Animal Control Association
- Petco Foundation
- Petfinder
- PetSmart Charities

Find Local Organizations and Agencies in the United States and Canada Supporting TNR
humanesociety.org/assets/maps/feral-cats.html

Links Found Throughout the Document

**Municipal Programs**

Pittsburgh, PA: pittsburghpa.gov/animalcontrol/spay_neuter.htm

Elk Grove, CA: elkgrovecity.org/animals/feral-cats.asp

Dallas, TX: dallasanimalservices.org/trap_neuter_return.html

Sacramento County, CA: animalcare.saccounty.net/SpayNeuter/Pages/FeralCatsandKittens.aspx

San Jose, CA: sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?nid=2382

Camden County, NJ: ccasnj.org/spay_neuter_clinic/feral_cats.html

**Departments of Health**


State of New Jersey: state.nj.us/health/animalwelfare/stray.shtml

Articles


“Prowling the Divide” animalsheltering.org/resources/magazine/jul_aug_2009/creature_feature_prowling_the_divide.html


Videos

“Fixing Cat Overpopulation” youtube.com/watch?v=fTCTuJRkvnG

“How to Perform a Mass Trapping” neighborhoodcats.org
Other Online Resources

The HSUS’s Position Statement on Cats
humanesociety.org/animals/cats/facts/cat_statement.html

FAQs
humanesociety.org/issues/feral_cats/qa/feral_cat_FAQs.html

Handouts
“Can You Help This Cat?”
marketplace.animalsheltering.org/product/can_you_help_this_cat

“Helping Homeless Cats” handout in English and Spanish (can be printed on both sides of paper)
humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/helping-homeless-cats_english.pdf
humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/helping-homeless-cats-spanish.pdf

Self-Paced Online TNR Course for Caretakers and Webinar Series
humanesociety.org/outdoorcats

Community Assessment Toolkit: HSUS Pets for Life program
animalsheltering.org/how-we-help/work-for-change/pets-for-life/pets-for-life-toolkit.html

Community cat information sheets on cat ordinances, protecting public health, rabies concerns, humane deterrents, and more can be found on our website: humanesociety.org/outdoorcats

Books (Available at marketplace.animalsheltering.org)
Publicity to the Rescue shows how you can use the power of publicity to raise more money, recruit volunteers, and boost adoptions.

Coalition Building for Animal Care Organizations describes how coalition building can maximize the positive impact of animal-related organizations on their communities. The book demonstrates that, by finding common ground and putting aside their differences, groups can tackle difficult problems that can’t be solved by any one agency.

Fund-Raising for Animal Care Organizations demystifies the fund-raising process and breaks down this daunting task into practical, manageable steps.

Funds to the Rescue will save you from wasting time as you search for new revenue streams to support your humane organization. The book begins with "The Hows and Whys of Fundraising" and follows with 101 entertaining and creative ideas.

Neighborhood Cats Handbook, 2nd Edition:
neighborhoodcats.org/RESOURCES_BOOKS_AND_VIDEOS
Data from Successful Targeted TNR Programs
(Provided by PetSmart Charities)

### DECREASES IN INTAKE AND EUTHANASIA IN RURAL MONTANA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTAKE</th>
<th>EUTHANASIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>519 cats in 2009</td>
<td>236 cats in 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>334 cats in 2012</td>
<td>30 cats in 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **36% decline in cat intake**
- **87% decline in euthanasia**

**Group:** Fox Hollow Animal Project

**Target area:** Ravalli County, MT (pop. 40,000; 2400 sq. miles)

**Project:** 1,329 spays/neuters of community cats from July 1, 2010 through 2012

**Results:** Cat intake from Ravalli County to the Bitter Root Humane Association (open admission) went from 519 in 2009 to 334 in 2012 (36% decline) and cat euthanasia went from 236 in 2009 to 30 in 2012 (87% decline).
**Group:** Thompson River Animal Care Shelter (TRACS)

**Target area:** The five towns located in Sanders County, MT (pop. 11,000; 2700 sq. miles)

**Project:** 755 spays/neuters of community cats from July 1, 2010 through July 1, 2012

**Results:** Cat-related calls to TRACS, the only animal shelter in the county, went from 1,032 in 2009 to 166 in 2011 (84% decline).

**Group:** PETS Low Cost Spay and Neuter Clinic

**Target area:** Wichita Falls, TX (pop. 104,000)

**Project:** 1,188 spays/neuters of community cats from 2011 through 2012

**Results:** Community cat related complaint calls to Wichita Falls Animal Control went from 1,958 in 2010 to less than 200 in 2012 (at least 90% decline).
Group: Alley Cat Advocates

Target area: Began as one zip code in Louisville, KY (later expanded to total of five zip codes)

Project: 2,000 spays/neuters of community cats in the five zip codes

Results: Cat intake excluding owner surrenders from the original zip code to Metro Animal Services went from 1,119 in 2009 to 550 in 2011 (51% decline). Cat intake excluding owner surrenders in the rest of the shelter’s service area went from 4,016 to 3,206 (20% decline). As a result of the project, the Councilwoman for the original target zip code sponsored TNR-enabling ordinance that passed the City Council.
Other Organizations’ Policies

American Animal Hospital Association, aahenet.org/Library/AAFPPosition.aspx

American Association of Feline Practitioners, catvets.com/guidelines/position-statements/free-roaming-abandoned-and-feral-cats

American Humane Association, americanhumane.org/assets/pdfs/about/position-statements/animal-position.pdf


Association of Shelter Veterinarians, sheltervet.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/FeralCommunityCatMgmt.pdf

Best Friends Animal Society, bestfriends.org/What-We-Do/Our-Work/Initiatives/Cat-Initiatives/

Cat Fanciers’ Association, cfainc.org/CatCare/OverpopulationLegislativeIssues/FeralCats.aspx

Humane Society Veterinary Medical Association, hsvma.org/legislation#feralcats

National Animal Control Association, nacanet.org/guidelines.html#community

Petfinder, petfinder.com/helping-pets/feral-cats/what-is-a-feral-cat/

PetSmart Charities, petsmartcharities.org/pro/grants/spayneuter-grants/free-roaming-cat-spayneuter-grants

This publication (Managing Community Cats) is intended to provide general information about community cats. The information contained in this publication is not legal advice and cannot replace the advice of qualified legal counsel licensed in your state. The Humane Society of the United States does not warrant that the information contained in the Managing Community Cats publication is complete, accurate, or up-to-date and does not assume and hereby disclaims any liability to any person for any loss or damage caused by errors, inaccuracies, or omissions.

This publication is the product of The Humane Society of the United States, which we are pleased to make available to ICMA members. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of ICMA.
About The HSUS

The HSUS is the nation’s largest and most powerful animal protection organization—backed by 11 million Americans, or one in every 28. Established in 1954, The HSUS seeks a humane and sustainable world for all animals, including people. We are America’s mainstream force against cruelty, exploitation, and neglect, and also the nation’s most trusted voice extolling the human-animal bond.
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THE HUMANE SOCIETY
OF THE UNITED STATES

2100 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20037
humanesociety.org
**Agenda Subject:** Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule  
**Meeting Date:** April 27, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>City Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Monica Lusk, City Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>(206) 248-5517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachments:** Proposed Meeting Schedule

**Fund Source:** N/A  
**Activity Cost:** N/A  
**Amount Budgeted:** N/A  
**Unencumbered Budget Authority:** N/A

** Adopted Initiative:** Yes  
** Initiative Description:** N/A

**PURPOSE/REQUIRED ACTION:**

The purpose of this agenda item is for Council to review the proposed City Council meeting schedule. New items or items that have been rescheduled are in bold.

**BACKGROUND (Include prior Council action & discussion):**

Per the City Council Meeting Guidelines, the proposed meeting schedule is reviewed at each meeting.

Please note that the Staff-identified Future Agenda Items are in the process of being scheduled.

**OPTIONS (Including fiscal impacts):**

1. Review the schedule and add, delete, or move items.
2. Review the schedule and make no modifications.

**Administrative Recommendation:** Review the schedule and provide direction to staff.

**Advisory Board Recommendation:** N/A

**Suggested Motion:** None required.

**Submitted by:** Administration  
**City Manager**

**Today’s Date:** April 22, 2015  
**File Code:** R:/CC/Agenda Bills 2015/042715cm-2 Rev Agenda Schedule
May 4, 7 pm Regular Meeting
  Presentation of the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP).
  (City Manager – Rescheduled from 4/6)
  
  Discussion on City Council Meeting Guidelines. (Tentative)
  (City Manager)
  Discussion on the City’s Advisory Boards and Commissions to Actively Engage Them in Helping to Advance the Council’s Priorities.
  (City Manager – High Priority from Council Retreat on 1/24)
  
  Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
  (City Manager)

May 18, 6 pm Executive Session - Discuss the performance of a public employee per RCW 42.30.110(1)(g)
7 pm Regular Meeting
  Presentation on WRIA 9 Interlocal Agreement.
  (Public Works – Rescheduled from 5/4)
  Presentation of the 2014 Annual Police Report Summary.
  (Police – Rescheduled from 6/1))
  Debrief/Discussion on the Sustainable Airport Master Plan (SAMP).
  (City Manager – Rescheduled from 4/6)
  Presentation on Adopt-a-Park Program Update.
  (Parks – Rescheduled from 4/20)
  Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
  (City Manager)

May 25, Study Session – CANCELED (Memorial Day Holiday)

SUMMER SCHEDULE (June – August)

June 1, 6:30 pm Executive Session - discuss the performance of a public employee per RCW 42.30.110(1)(g)
  Tentative - Special Meeting – BEDP Interviews
  7 pm Regular Meeting
  Public Hearing and Discussion on the 2016 through 2021 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program.
  (Public Works)
  Appoint Voting Delegate to the 2015 Association of Washington Cities (AWC) Annual Business Meeting.
  (City Manager)
  Tentative - Motion to Approve Appointments to the Business & Economic Development Partnership.
  (City Manager)
  Update on “Roadmap to Address Homelessness in Burien” Project.
  (City Manager – Rescheduled from 5/4)
  (Community Development – Rescheduled from 5/18)
  Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
  (City Manager)

June 15, 7 pm Regular Meeting
  Motion to Approve Resolution No. xxx, Adopting the 2016 through 2021 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program.
  (Public Works)
  Discussion and Possible Approval of Memorandum Regarding City Manager’s One-Year Performance Review.
  (Human Resources)
June 15 cont’d.
Discussion and Possible Adoption of the Critical Areas Ordinance Update.
   *(Community Development – Rescheduled from 6/1)*
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule. *(City Manager)*

July 6, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Discussion on Imposing Term Limits for the City Council.
   *(Legal and City Manager – Council High Priorities (1/24 Council Retreat))*
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
   *(City Manager)*

July 20, 7 pm Regular Meeting
7:05 pm Recess to Transportation Benefit District (TBD No. 1) Board Meeting
Council Update on Off-Leash Dog Park Project.
   *(Parks)*
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
   *(City Manager)*

August 3, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
   *(City Manager)*

August 17, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
   *(City Manager)*

September 7, Regular Meeting – CANCELED (Labor Day Holiday)

September 21, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Public Hearing and Update on Revenue Sources and Expenditures for the 2015-2016
   Mid-biennial Budget Review.
   *(Finance)*
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
   *(City Manager)*

September 28, 7 pm Study Session
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule. *(City Manager)*

October 5, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Discussion on 2016 Federal and State Legislative Priorities.
   *(City Manager)*
Revisions to BMC Concerning Low Impact Development.
   *(Public Works)*
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
   *(City Manager)*

October 19, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Motion to Adopt the 2016 State and Federal Legislative Priorities.
   *(City Manager)*
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
   *(City Manager)*

October 28, 7 pm Study Session
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.
   *(City Manager)*

November 2, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Discussion of Ordinance No. XXX, Increasing the City’s Surface Water Management Service
   *(Finance)*
November 2, cont’d.
Discussion of Ordinance No. XXX, Adopting the City’s 2016 Property Tax Levy.  
(Finance)
Presentation of the 2015-2016 Mid-biennial Budget Modification.  
(Finance)
Presentation of the 2016 Financial Policies.  
(Finance)
Public Hearing and Update on Revenue Sources and Expenditures for the 2015-2016 
Mid-Biennial Budget Review.  
(Finance)
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.  
(City Manager)

November 16, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Motion to Approve Ordinance No. XXX, Adopting the City’s 2016 Property Tax Levy.  
(Finance)
Motion to Approve Ordinance No. XXX, Increasing the City’s Surface Water Management 
Service Charges and Amending Chapter 13.10 of the Burien Municipal Code.  
(Finance)
Discussion of Ordinance No. XXX, Amending the 2015-2016 Biennial Budget.  
(Finance)
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.  
(City Manager)

November 23, 7 pm Study Session
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.  
(City Manager)

December 7, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Arts Commission Recommendations on 1%-for-Art Fund.  
(Parks)
Motion to Adopt Ordinance No. XXX, Amending the 2015-2016 Biennial Budget.  
(Finance)
Motion to Adopt the 2016 Financial Policies.  
(Finance)
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.  
(City Manager)

December 21, 7 pm Regular Meeting
Review of Council Proposed Agenda Schedule.  
(City Manager)

December 28, 7 pm Study Session

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (identified by Council)
Medium Priorities (1/24 Council Retreat)
  a. Discussion on Community Recreation Center (Council direction on 12/1/14)
  b. Discussion on Garbage Service for Businesses (Council direction on 4/28/14)
  c. Discussion on Developing a Youth Council (Council direction on 9/22/14)
  d. Discussion on Banning Plastic Bags (Council direction on 11/17/14)
Low Priorities (1/24 Council Retreat)
  e. Discussion on Wi-Fi Service in Common Areas (Council direction on 9/15/14)
  f. Discussion on Requesting the State to Conduct an In-Depth Study of the Effects of Toxic Materials from 
the SeaTac Airport and the Aircraft that Arrive and Depart from It (Council direction on 9/22/14)
  g. Discussion on Establishing Multiple Rates Within the Business and Occupation (B&O) Tax According to 
Different Sizes or Types of Businesses (Council direction on 11/17/14)
FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (identified by Staff)
1. BMC Revisions Regarding Right-of-Way (Staff on 10/14/14)
2. Presentation and Discussion of Ordinance No. xxx, Adopting the 2014 National Electrical Code (Staff on 12/16/14)
3. Public Works Fee Schedule Modifications (Staff on 1/9/15)
4. Addressing Impediments to Development (Staff on 1/9/15)
5. Establishing Development Fee Implementation Dates and Credit Card Limits (Staff on 1/9/15)
6. Development Permit Technology Fee In Anticipation of Permit Tracking Software Acquisition and Maintenance (Staff on 1/9/15)
7. BMC Airport Sound Code Update to Reflect Completion of Part 150 Noise Study (Staff on 1/9/15)
8. Sign Code Amendment Relating to Temporary Signs (Pending SCOTUS City of Gilbert Ruling) (Staff on 1/9/15)
9. Council Adoption of Criteria for Use of Capital Partnership Fund (Public Works/Finance on 1/10/15)
10. Sound Transit Long Range Plan (Mid-year) (Staff on 1/15/15)
11. Update Water and Sewer Franchises (Staff on 1/15/15)
12. New Seattle Public Utilities Franchise (Staff on 1/15/15)
13. New Telecom Franchise (Staff on 1/15/15)

2016 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (identified by Staff)
1. 2015 – 2016 Permit Tracking System Modification/Replacement (Including Electronic Permit Integration) (Staff on 1/9/15)
2. Late 2015 – 2016 Title 17 Subdivision Code Major Revision (Staff on 1/9/15)
3. Late 2015 – 2016 Adoption of 2015 International Building Code and Property Maintenance Code Amendments (Staff on 1/9/15)
4. Late 2015 – 2016 Downtown Center Planning Effort (Consolidation of Downtown Vision, Policies and Actions with Outside Planning Assistance, incorporating issues such as Hotel/Entertainment/Arts District, Parking, Traffic Flow and Street Network, Pedestrian Way Finding, Sidewalk Art and Park Space with Participation by all City Departments, Downtown focused Organizations and Businesses) (Staff on 1/9/15)