# **Seattle City Light**

# Jorge Carrasco, Superintendent

## **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-3000

City of Seattle General Information: (206) 684-2489 TTY: (206) 615-0476

On the Web at: http://www.seattle.gov/light/

## **Department Description**

Seattle City Light was created by the residents of Seattle in 1902 to provide affordable, reliable, and environmentally sound electric power to the City of Seattle and neighboring suburbs. Owned by the community it serves, City Light is a nationally recognized leader in energy efficiency, renewable resource development, and environmental stewardship.

Seattle City Light provides electric power to more than 376,000 residential, business, and industrial customers. Its service area of 131.3 square miles includes the City of Seattle, areas north of Seattle including areas of the City of Shoreline and parts of Lake Forest Park, areas of unincorporated King County, and areas south of Seattle including the cities of Burien, Tukwila, and SeaTac.

Seattle City Light owns about 2,000 megawatts of very low cost, environmentally responsible hydroelectric generation capacity. In an average year, Seattle City Light meets about 60% of its load with owned hydroelectric generation and obtains the remainder primarily through the Bonneville Power Administration. City Light is now the nation's seventh largest publicly-owned electric utility in terms of customers served.

# **Proposed Policy and Program Changes**

City Light continues its transformation announced in December of 2004 aimed at operating more strategically and effectively in four key elements of its work: power production; energy delivery and customer service; managing money and risk; and developing and supporting the Utility's workforce. The Utility continues to operate under the four business line structure produced by Phase 1 effort of the transformation initiative. Phase 2 defined an organizational structure with 27 divisions. This budget proposes five new divisions to implement the new structure: a Security Division, Asset Management Divisions in the Customer Service and Energy Delivery and Power Supply & Environmental Affairs lines of business, a Boundary Relicensing Division, and an Alaskan Way Project Team Division.

The Security Division will monitor and control access to City Light facilities and sites to prevent destructive and criminal acts aimed at utility facilities, equipment, and employees. This division will prepare and administer the utility's emergency preparedness plan. The Asset Management groups will design and administer processes for ensuring that the utility manages, maintains, and develops its generation, distribution, and ancillary assets at the lowest lifecycle cost for the benefit of its customers. The Boundary Relicensing Division will manage preparation of the Utility's application to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for renewal of the Operators License for the Boundary Hydroelectric Project, a facility that accounts for 50% of City Light owned resource capacity. The Alaskan Way Project Team will coordinate the Utility's planning, design and relocation of City Light infrastructure with those of other agency participants in the project.

Phase 3 of City Light's transformation initiative will complete the selection of the new directors and managers within the newly reorganized business units; complete and recommend for approval an Integrated Resource Plan; implement customer electric installation recommendations; and implement an integrated Asset Management program and risk management plan. Phase 3 will also introduce several management initiatives to transform business processes. These initiatives include the design and implementation of performance management and

corporate performance programs, and continued work on programmatic budgeting and prioritization of the utility's capital program.

In July 2006, the Mayor proposed a 4.8% reduction in the average retail customer rate, including reductions of 2.2% for residential customers and 14% for medium-sized commercial customers, to take effect January 1, 2007. The proposed rates will generate sufficient revenue to operate the utility, maintain physical plant and infrastructure, and pay down long-term debt incurred as a result of the energy crisis. The Proposed Budget includes funding for utility relocation necessitated by the Alaskan Way Tunnel project, increased tree trimming and vegetation management to reduce system outages, and continued work to relicense the Boundary facility. The Proposed Budget also reflects various measures by the utility to control costs and improve efficiency, including reductions in funding for supplies, training and travel, and contractor payments.

The table that follows lists 2005 actual expenditures for the utility had it been configured as is proposed to be configured in 2007, adopted appropriations for 2006, and proposed appropriations by 2007 and 2008 budget control levels.

	Summit	2005	2006	2007	2008
Appropriations Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs O&M	Code SCL220	Actual 25,022,584	Adopted 23,144,233	Proposed 23,789,461	Proposed 25,220,932
Budget Control Level Customer Services and Energy Delivery - CIP Budget Control Level	SCL350	57,641,787	67,299,143	95,943,638	109,437,590
Customer Services Budget Control Level	SCL320	16,061,355	18,043,893	18,352,297	18,633,305
Debt Service Budget Control Level	SCL810	133,792,698	137,192,623	136,508,997	137,175,911
Distribution Services Budget Control Level	SCL310	49,446,789	50,363,999	55,257,675	57,550,022
Financial Services - CIP Budget Control Level	SCL550	5,106,482	8,731,696	3,911,935	3,694,864
Financial Services - O&M Budget Control Level	SCL500	26,741,846	25,584,940	25,068,005	25,952,827
General Expenses Budget Control Level	SCL800	50,507,479	53,634,635	58,807,109	62,192,995
Human Resources Budget Control Level	SCL400	3,592,368	3,434,324	4,430,166	4,546,132
Office of Superintendent Budget Control Level	SCL100	3,302,941	3,204,788	3,517,306	3,599,701
Power Supply & Environmental Affairs - CIP Budget Control Level	SCL250	18,711,523	22,507,072	27,058,529	32,425,331
Power Supply O&M Budget Control Level	SCL210	34,504,162	39,060,764	51,944,005	55,096,088
Purchased Power Budget Control Level	SCL700	345,727,197	386,983,751	355,145,654	350,793,045
<b>Taxes Budget Control Level</b>	SCL820	60,843,080	63,951,676	62,817,129	64,090,606
Department Total		831,002,291	903,137,537	922,551,907	950,409,348
Department Full-time Equivalents To * FTE totals are provided for informational purpos		1,734.10 es in FTEs resulting	<b>1,752.10</b> from City Council of	<b>1,752.33</b> or Personnel Directo	<b>1,752.33</b> or actions

\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Resources	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Other	831,002,291	903,137,537	922,551,907	950,409,348
Department Total	831,002,291	903,137,537	922,551,907	950,409,348

# <u>Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs O&M Budget Control</u> <u>Level</u>

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs - O&M Budget Control Level is to ensure that the Utility generates and delivers energy in a manner that is environmentally responsible, and to design and implement demand-side measures that offset the need for additional generation resources to meet the Utility's load.

#### **Summary**

Increase funding by \$50,000 for support of the City Green Building Team housed at the Department of Planning and Development. The team seeks to encourage private sector adoption of environmentally-friendly building practices, and support City Light's customers in conserving energy and securing certification under the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System.

Increase funding by \$108,000 associated with organizational changes related to City Light's transformation initiative.

Reduce funding for SCL's Lighting Design Lab by \$125,000 to reflect lower levels of external funding anticipated for the program in 2007 and 2008.

Reduce 0.25 FTE Office Maintenance Aide to more accurately reflect actual staffing levels.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, increase the budget by \$612,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$645,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Conservation Resources and Environmental	25,022,584	23,144,233	23,789,461	25,220,932
Affairs O&M				
Full-time Equivalents Total*	85.11	86.00	85.75	85.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Customer Services and Energy Delivery - CIP Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Customer Services and Energy Delivery - CIP Budget Control Level is to provide for the installation, maintenance, rehabilitation and/or replacement of transmission lines, substations, distribution feeders, transformers, services connections, and meters to meet customer demand. This budget control level's capital program coordinates the Utility's plant improvements with the efforts of other agencies involved in the implementation of large projects such as the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall, South Lake Union redevelopment, and Sound Transit light rail.

#### **Summary**

In 2007, this Budget Control Level provides funding for utility design work and relocations necessitated by the South Lake Union Streetcar, the Sound Transit Light Rail system, and the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall project. This BCL also connects new customers to the electric system, performs major maintenance on the transmission and distribution system throughout the City Light service area, performs underground design and relocation work for franchise customers in Shoreline and Burien, and continues work to rehabilitate the downtown network.

Major projects funded in 2007 include the following:

\$24.0 million for Utility Relocations for the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall

\$15.9 million for Sound Transit Light Rail - City Light

\$7.5 million for Network Adds and Services: Broad Street Substation

\$5.3 million for Localized Transportation Driven Relocations

\$5.3 million for Network Adds and Services: First Hill, Massachusetts, Union & University District

\$5.3 million for Medium Overhead and Underground Services

(Note that the amounts shown in the project list above include indirect costs funded by appropriations in other BCLs in City Light's Proposed Budget.)

Transfer 5.0 FTE into this BCL from the Power Supply and Environmental Affairs - CIP BCL and reclassify an existing 13 positions, all for work on the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall project.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Customer Services and Energy Delivery - CIP	57,641,787	67,299,143	95,943,638	109,437,590
Full-time Equivalents Total*	274.49	277.38	282.38	282.38

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Customer Services Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Customer Services Budget Control Level is to provide outstanding customer care and service through efficient, accurate metering and billing, and effective customer account management.

### **Summary**

Increase funding by \$81,000 to implement organizational changes related to City Light's transformation initiative.

Reduce 0.25 FTE Office Maintenance Aide to more accurately reflect actual staffing levels.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and other technical changes increase the budget by \$227,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$308,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Customer Services	16,061,355	18,043,893	18,352,297	18,633,305
Full-time Equivalents Total*	172.19	174.00	173.75	173.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Debt Service Budget Control Level**

# **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Debt Service Budget Control Level is to meet principal repayment and interest obligations on funds borrowed to meet City Light's capital expenditure requirements.

### **Summary**

Reduce funding by \$684,000, reflecting a reduction in City Light's debt service requirements.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Debt Service - BCL	133,792,698	137,192,623	136,508,997	137,175,911

2000

# <u>Distribution Services Budget Control Level</u>

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Distribution Services Budget Control Level is to provide reliable electricity to customers through cost-effective operation and maintenance of City Light's overhead and underground distribution systems, substations, and transmission systems.

#### **Summary**

Increase funding for tree trimming and vegetation management by \$4.3 million to establish a four-year cycle to provide transmission and distribution line clearance, for a total vegetation management budget of \$7.6 million. This cycle is consistent with North American Electric Reliability Council reliability criteria and will reduce vegetation-related outages, which have increased in the last four years. SCL contracts with an external firm for this work. Budget cuts in previous years had eliminated much of the funding for preventative tree trimming. This increase restores that funding.

Provide \$168,000 to fully fund the utility's Electric Utility Executive Compensation Program.

Reduce funding by \$1.2 million, reflecting measures to control costs and improve efficiency. The proposed cuts include reductions of \$200,000 in Energy Delivery Operations & Engineering, \$449,000 in supplies expense and \$294,000 in training and travel expense for Energy Delivery Operations, and \$135,000 in information technology disaster recovery systems equipment.

Reduce funding by \$324,000 associated with organizational changes related to City Light's transformation initiative.

Add 1.0 FTE Material Supplier, Electrical to SCL's 2007 FTE count. This existing position was omitted from the 2006 Adopted Budget position list.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs (including costs related to the City's contract with Local 77), changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and other technical adjustments, increase the budget by \$1.9 million, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$4.9 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Distribution Services	49,446,789	50,363,999	55,257,675	57,550,022
Full-time Equivalents Total*	583.86	590.00	591.00	591.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Financial Services - CIP Budget Control Level

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Financial Services - CIP Budget Control Level is to rehabilitate and replace the Utility's information technology infrastructure, such as servers and routers, and fund the development of large software applications.

#### **Summary**

In 2007, this Budget Control Level continues to provide modern and efficient information systems and related services to meet City Light's business objectives. In 2007, funding for many information technology projects has been realigned from this BCL to the Budget Control Levels using those services.

Major projects funded in 2007 include the following:

\$3.7 million for Information Technology Infrastructure \$356,000 for Work Process Management System

(Note that the amounts shown in the project list above include indirect costs funded by appropriations in other BCLs in City Light's Proposed Budget.)

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Financial Services - CIP	5,106,482	8,731,696	3,911,935	3,694,864
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.14	6.71	6.71	6.71

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Financial Services - O&M Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Financial Services - O&M Budget Control Level is to ensure City Light's financial health through prudent planning, risk mitigation, and financial discipline.

#### **Summary**

Reduce the budget for data processing services by \$1.4 million to reflect a change in billing practice for Combined Customer Service System (CCSS) Data Center charges. The Department of Information Technology (DoIT) will bill Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) directly for SPU's non-labor share of the CCSS Data Center. This is a change from the current model under which DoIT bills SCL and SCL in turn bills SPU.

Reduce funding by \$450,000, reflecting measures to control costs and improve efficiency. The proposed cuts include reductions in overtime and special pay, training and travel, and contractor payments.

Reduce funding by \$133,000 to implement organizational changes related to City Light's transformation initiative.

Increase budget for DoIT allocations and rates by \$826,000. Services that DoIT provides to City Light include data center facilities management, telephone services, and maintenance of the city's data backbone network.

Provide \$64,000 to fully fund the utility's Electric Utility Executive Compensation Program.

Reduce 0.5 FTE Office Maintenance Aide to more accurately reflect actual staffing levels.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and other miscellaneous adjustments increase the budget by \$576,000, for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$517,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Financial Services - O&M	26,741,846	25,584,940	25,068,005	25,952,827
Full-time Equivalents Total*	198.91	201.00	200.50	200.50

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **General Expenses Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the General Expenses Budget Control Level is to budget, track, and monitor the expenses of the Utility that, for the most part, are not directly attributable to a specific organizational unit. These expenditures include insurance, bond issue costs, bond maintenance fees, audit costs, Law Department legal fees, external legal fees, employee benefits (medical and retirement costs), industrial insurance costs, general claims costs, and services provided by the City's internal services departments through the central cost allocation mechanism.

#### **Summary**

Provide \$1.6 million for increased City central service department cost allocation charges. These charges reflect services that City Light receives from other city departments including the Law Department, the City Clerk, and the Department of Executive Administration, as well as City Light's share of the cost of maintaining the City's financial and human resources information systems.

Increase the budget for workers compensation costs by \$983,000, reflecting increased costs in this area.

Increase funding for the Duwamish Superfund Cleanup by \$2 million for environmental remediation. City Light and Seattle Public Utilities are both participating in the Duwamish Waterway Sediment Superfund Cleanup.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and other miscellaneous changes increase the budget by \$596,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$5.2 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
General Expenses	50,507,479	53,634,635	58,807,109	62,192,995

## **Human Resources Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Human Resources Budget Control Level is to transform City Light into a safe, high performance organization through excellence in safety, organizational development and training, employee and management services, and labor relations.

#### **Summary**

Provide \$391,000 to enable the Apprenticeship Program to add 30 apprentices in 2007-2008 to address shortages of skilled electrical workers and the approaching retirement eligibility of a significant portion of SCL's craft-skilled workforce.

Provide \$269,000 to implement cost-neutral organizational changes related to City Light's transformation initiative.

Provide \$21,000 to fully fund the Utility's Electric Utility Executive Compensation Program.

Reduce 0.25 FTE Office Maintenance Aide and 0.5 FTE Planning and Development Specialist II, to more accurately reflect actual staffing levels.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and other miscellaneous adjustments increase the budget by \$315,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$996,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Human Resources	3,592,368	3,434,324	4,430,166	4,546,132
Full-time Equivalents Total*	40.59	41.02	40.27	40.27

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Office of Superintendent Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Office of the Superintendent Budget Control Level is to assemble high-level staff to assure the effective delivery of reliable electric power in an environmentally sound manner, and enable the Superintendent to focus on the Utility's broad departmental policy direction and leadership, its financial health, and stakeholder relations.

#### **Summary**

Provide \$100,000 for additional communication and public outreach.

Provide \$23,000 associated with organizational changes related to City Light's transformation initiative.

Reduce 0.25 FTE Office Maintenance Aide to more accurately reflect actual staffing levels.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and other miscellaneous adjustments increase the budget by \$190,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$313,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Office of Superintendent	3,302,941	3,204,788	3,517,306	3,599,701
Full-time Equivalents Total*	22.27	22.50	22.25	22.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Power Supply & Environmental Affairs - CIP Budget Control Level

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Power Supply & Environmental Affairs - CIP Budget Control Level is to provide and maintain the physical generating plant required to meet the electrical needs of City Light customers, provide the physical plant and grounds needed by the Utility, and comply with license and regulatory requirements.

## **Summary**

This Budget Control Level funds projects related to Generation, Utility Services, Environmental Affairs, and Vehicle Replacement. This includes projects to improve and enhance City Light's hydroelectric generating facilities. These facilities include seven major plants on the Skagit, Pend Oreille, Cedar, and Tolt Rivers, which on average meet 63% of City Light's annual electrical power demands.

Major projects funded in 2007 include the following:

- \$5.7 million for Vehicle Replacement
- \$4.7 million for Diablo Powerhouse Rebuild Generator Unit 31
- \$1.9 million for Skagit Facilities Minor Improvements Program
- \$1.8 million for Ross Powerhouse Unit 44 Generator Rebuild
- \$1.7 million for Summer Falls BPA Interconnection
- \$1.4 million for Boundary Minor Improvements Program
- \$1.1 million for Diablo Powerhouse Replace 5 kV Switchgear
- \$1.0 million for Diablo Minor Improvements Program

(Note that the amounts shown in the project list above include indirect costs funded by appropriations in other BCLs in City Light's Proposed Budget.)

Transfer 5.0 FTE from this BCL into the Customer Services and Energy Delivery - CIP BCL for work on the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall project.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Power Supply & Environmental Affairs - CIP	18,711,523	22,507,072	27,058,529	32,425,331
Full-time Equivalents Total*	74.48	75.26	70.26	70.26

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Power Supply O&M Budget Control Level

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Power Supply - O&M Budget Control Level is to provide clean, safe, economic, efficient, reliable sources of electric power for City Light customers.

#### **Summary**

Provide \$6.3 million for space rent. This change includes eliminating the payment of rent to an outside landlord, since SCL will start paying FFD rent in 2007, and transferring \$6.3 million in space rent budget into this BCL from the General Expenses BCL. Also included in this change is an increase of \$1.6 million as part of a citywide increase in space rent as described in the Budget Overview, and eliminating \$1 million that SCL was previously budgeted to pay as part of citywide debt service related to facilities.

Increase funding by \$7.3 million for the Boundary Relicensing Program. The facility operates under a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license that expires in September 2011 and is City Light's largest generation asset. A successful relicense will allow the Utility to continue to produce low-cost, environmentally responsible electricity at this facility for another 30 to 50 years.

Provide \$230,000 to fully fund the Utility's Electric Utility Executive Compensation Program.

Reduce funding by \$26,000 to implement organizational changes related to City Light's transformation initiative.

Add 1.0 FTE Pool Maintenance Lead Worker to SCL's 2007 FTE count. This position was omitted from the 2006 Adopted Budget position list. Make an additional 0.23 FTE adjustment in the FTE count for this BCL.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and other miscellaneous adjustments reduce the budget by \$885,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$12.9 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Power Supply O&M	34,504,162	39,060,764	51,944,005	55,096,088
Full-time Equivalents Total*	275.06	278.23	279.46	279.46

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Purchased Power Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Purchased Power Budget Control Level (BCL) is to acquire power, transmission and other services associated with wholesale power purchases in a cost-effective manner to meet the day-to-day electricity needs of City Light's retail customers.

### **Summary**

Reduce funding by \$31.8 million as a result of changes in risk management practices and several resource changes including the removal of Box Canyon and Klamath Falls agreements, replacement of Priest Rapids agreement, and increase in Bonneville Power Administration block purchases.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Purchased Power	345,727,197	386,983,751	355,145,654	350,793,045

# **Taxes Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Taxes Budget Control Level is to calculate and pay City Light's legally required tax payments for state, city, and local jurisdictions. This Budget Control Level includes funding for franchise contract payments negotiated with local jurisdictions in City Light's service territory.

## **Summary**

Reduce the budget by \$1.1 million as a result of the Mayor's proposed reduction in City Light rates and resulting lower retail revenue.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Taxes	60,843,080	63,951,676	62,817,129	64,090,606

# 2007 - 2008 Estimated Revenues for the City Light Fund

Summit Code	Source	2005 Actuals	2006 Adopted	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
431010	Operating Grants	1,652,388	0	0	0
431200	BPA Conservation & Renewables Credit	2,032,080	2,570,634	2,215,000	2,215,000
431200	BPA Payments for Conservation Deferred	4,825,323	4,051,200	0	0
431200	NW Energy Efficiency Alliance - SCL	338,742	300,000	300,000	300,000
	Lighting Design Lab Contract				
443250	Other O&M Revenue	3,920,581	3,546,554	3,148,800	4,004,068
443250	Revenue From Damage	919,391	1,567,761	1,436,400	1,475,183
443310	Energy Sales to Customers	562,548,318	581,309,591	551,390,591	563,537,875
443310	Sales from Priest Rapids	1,699,238	6,100,300	8,765,424	8,765,424
443310	Seattle Green Power	246,062	240,000	240,000	240,000
443345	Article 49 Sale to PO Country	1,348,119	1,381,800	1,568,000	1,610,300
443345	Basis Sales	946,981	2,500,000	1,026,000	1,053,702
443345	Box Canyon Forced Outage Reserve	153,550	0	0	0
443345	BPA Credit for South Fork Tolt	3,065,648	3,032,900	3,043,900	3,003,500
443345	Other Power Related Services	6,308,050	6,854,013	7,457,600	7,455,300
443345	SCL Green Tags	793,388	300,000	165,000	260,000
443345	Surplus Energy Sales	149,649,844	154,408,769	232,072,502	189,339,754
443380	Account Change Fees	527,735	674,328	1,401,847	1,413,061
443380	Construction & Miscellaneous Charges	625,612	1,102,995	1,195,373	1,226,596
443380	Late Payment Fees	3,464,511	3,073,016	3,148,050	3,228,826
443380	Pole Attachments	774,995	792,678	1,000,000	1,000,000
443380	Property Rentals	1,829,023	1,540,378	1,744,200	1,791,293
443380	Reconnect Charges	216,512	219,699	225,064	230,839
443380	Transmission Attach. & Cell Sites	621,653	618,223	630,240	643,723
443380	Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals	122,325	165,999	170,052	174,415
461100	Interest	6,657,616	4,812,117	7,136,835	4,452,538
461100	Sale of Property, Material & Equip.	2,466,000	1,995,000	9,526,000	1,053,702
462900	North Mountain Substation (snopud)	183,155	272,500	323,500	327,000
462900	Transmission Sales	4,238,799	1,200,000	2,952,005	4,959,317
469990	Conservation - Customer Payments	37,211	7,771	7,922	8,092
473010	Capital Fees and Grants	5,243,693	0	0	0
482000	Contributions in Aid of Construction	11,622,188	27,966,599	27,564,000	21,798,000
541830	Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP	1,004,690	0	0	0
541830	Reimbursement for CCSS - O&M	1,797,077	2,163,229	815,895	839,378

# 2007 - 2008 Estimated Revenues for the City Light Fund

Summit Code	Source	2005 Actuals	2006 Adopted	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
Tota	l Revenues	781,880,498	814,768,054	870,670,200	826,406,886
379100	Transfers from Construction Fund	49,121,793	88,369,483	51,881,707	124,002,462
Tota	l Resources	831,002,291	903,137,537	922,551,907	950,409,348

# **City Light Fund**

	2005 Actuals	2006 Adopted	2006 Revised	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
<b>Beginning Cash Balance</b>	157,538,409	145,072,141	177,712,629	176,956,305	139,751,978
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	69,296,013	38,614,260	63,749,333	14,677,380	75,065,555
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	781,880,498	814,768,054	838,631,880	870,670,200	826,406,886
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	831,002,291	903,137,537	903,137,537	922,551,907	950,409,348
<b>Ending Cash Balance</b>	177,712,629	95,316,918	176,956,305	139,751,978	90,815,071
Less: Reserves Against Cash Balances					
Restricted accounts	10,815,079	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Contingency reserve	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
<b>Total Reserves</b>	35,815,079	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
Ending Unreserved Cash Balance*	141,897,550	60,316,918	141,956,305	104,751,978	55,815,071

<sup>\*</sup>Includes required minimum balance of \$30,000,000.

# **Seattle Department of Transportation**

# **Grace Crunican, Director**

#### **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-7623

City of Seattle General Information: (206) 684-2489 TTY: (206) 615-0476

On the Web at: http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/

## **Department Description**

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) develops, maintains, and operates a transportation system that promotes the safe and efficient mobility of people and goods, and enhances the quality of life, environment, and economy of Seattle and the surrounding region. The major assets of the City's transportation system are 1,534 lane-miles of arterial streets; 2,412 lane-miles of non-arterial streets; 150 bridges; 582 retaining walls; 22 miles of seawalls; 1,000 signalized intersections; 32 miles of bike trails and 90 miles of bike routes; 34,000 street trees; 4,799 parking meters and pay stations; 24,000 curb ramps; and 1.6 million lane markers. The transportation infrastructure is valued at \$7.6 billion.

SDOT is composed of 11 different Budget Control Levels (BCLs) grouped into three Lines of Business (LOB):

- The Transportation Capital Improvement Program LOB is responsible for the major maintenance and replacement of SDOT's capital assets, as well as the development and construction of additions to the City's transportation infrastructure. This LOB contains the Major Maintenance/Replacement, Major Projects, and Mobility-Capital BCLs.
- The Operations and Maintenance LOB handles the day-to-day operations and routine maintenance to keep people and goods moving throughout the City. This LOB includes operation of the City's movable bridges, traffic signals, street cleaning, pothole repairs, permit issuance, tree maintenance, and engineering and transportation planning. The six BCLs in this area are Bridges and Structures, Engineering Services, Mobility-Operations, Right-of-Way Management, Street Maintenance, and Urban Forestry.
- The Business Management and Support LOB provides policy direction and business support for SDOT. These services are contained in two BCLs. Departmental support is in the Department Management BCL. The General Expense BCL includes debt service, judgment and claims, and the allocated City central costs the Department pays for overall support services it receives from other departments.

# **Proposed Policy and Program Changes**

Major adjustments to SDOT's 2007-2008 Proposed Budget include the addition of new funding under "Bridging the Gap," a funding initiative to repair and improve Seattle's streets, bike trails, sidewalks and bridges. The City of Seattle has faced declining dedicated transportation funds over the past 15 years, resulting in deferred maintenance and mounting problems with the transportation system.

As a result, in May 2006, the Mayor proposed "Bridging the Gap," a 20-year funding initiative to repair and improve Seattle's streets, bike trails, sidewalks and bridges. Revenues were to be derived from a property tax levy, a commercial parking tax, and a business transportation tax. The combination of sources was intended to ensure those who use the streets most also contribute to fixing them.

The City Council approved a modified version of the Mayor's proposal in July. This included a property tax measure to be placed before voters in November, plus the commercial parking tax and business transportation tax. The latter two sources do not require voter approval and would be phased in gradually starting in July 2007.

In September, the Mayor and several Councilmembers announced a new plan for the property tax measure. The term of the levy would be reduced to nine years and the annual growth rate in levy revenue would be capped at one percent, plus the value of new construction. This new plan is under discussion as the Proposed Budget is being completed. The commercial parking tax and business parking tax would remain as in the July plan.

The Proposed Budget includes a total from these revenue sources of \$39.9 million in 2007 and \$52.9 million in 2008 to help improve bike safety and trails, repair or construct sidewalks to increase pedestrian safety, speed up transit to improve convenience and reliability, improve freight delivery, and start rebuilding the city's streets and bridges. The budget reflects the Executive's proposed funding package, which is still subject to change during review by the City Council. The funding levels shown in the 2007 and 2008 Proposed Budgets are based on the July plan and will need to be adjusted if the September proposal is adopted instead.

Approval of the Bridging the Gap plan will require increased staffing. The Proposed Budget explains where staff changes will likely occur but does not include specific position proposals. These will be proposed in late 2006 or early 2007.

The Proposed Budget also includes funding and staff for the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall Project. In December 2004, the Executive and Council named a cut-and-cover tunnel as their preferred alternative for replacing the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall, which are at the end of their useful lives. The current project timeline calls for utility work to begin in 2008, with major construction beginning in 2010. SDOT's 2007-2008 Proposed Budget provides a total of \$11.8 million for this project, including \$7.2 million from the Washington State Department of Transportation (which is the lead for the project) and \$4.6 million in city funding. Additional funding is included in the budgets of Seattle Public Utilities and Seattle City Light, for utility relocations necessitated by the tunnel project, and the Law Department's budget. The funding in SDOT's budget will cover the City's planning costs, a portion of the cost of the SDOT staff working on project, outreach to waterfront businesses, and initial work to replace the north seawall.

Consistent with policies proposed by the Executive in 2006 governing the use of Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) revenues, the budget includes funding of over \$9 million in 2007 and over \$5 million in 2008 from REET for SDOT capital projects. Major projects funded with REET revenues in 2007 include arterial major maintenance, extension of the Burke-Gilman Trail, and NE Northgate Way Intersection and Pedestrian Improvements, and in 2008 development of the West Thomas Street Overpass. The budget also includes funds to install parking pay stations in the South Lake Union neighborhood, remove graffiti on traffic signs and signals within 48 hours of a call to the City's graffiti hotline, and develop transportation plans for the University District and South Downtown. Funding is also provided to control the water quality impacts of transportation projects and facilities and conduct an inventory of the city's street trees.

Additional staff are added to the budget to restore utility cuts in city streets (on a reimbursable basis) and for street use inspection and review of shoring plans, to protect the city's investment in its transportation assets. Positions are also added to work on regional priorities including the SR-520 Replacement Project and Sound Transit Phase II.

For 2007-2008, SDOT has reorganized its budget to highlight the projects, activities, and services being delivered, rather than the organizational units delivering those services. This change does not reflect a reorganization of the department itself, but rather is an effort to improve simplicity and efficiency in preparing, explaining, and administering the department's budget. The table that follows lists 2005 actual expenditures and 2006 adopted appropriations from the Transportation Operating Fund for the department had it been configured as it is proposed to be configured in 2007, and proposed appropriations for 2007 and 2008.

	Summit	2005	2006	2007	2008
Appropriations	Code	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
<b>Bridges &amp; Structures Budget Control</b>	Level				
Bridge Operations		3,187,559	2,110,839	2,498,382	2,599,712
Structures Engineering		609,166	774,458	749,126	778,334
Structures Maintenance		838,905	7,035,496	3,775,422	3,808,008
Bridges & Structures Budget Control Level	17001	4,635,630	9,920,793	7,022,930	7,186,054
Department Management Budget Con	trol Level				
Director's Office		1,265,413	1,694,886	1,856,940	1,835,924
Division Management		19,606,747	18,366,557	26,852,533	27,252,971
Human Resources Indirect Cost Recovery - Department Management		1,029,063 (27,895,219)	1,253,189 (26,192,266)	1,502,038 (36,394,650)	1,456,051 (36,924,525)
Public Information		423,082	824,215	657,877	780,287
Resource Management		4,953,071	6,884,833	8,118,604	8,493,529
Revenue Development		617,843	3,470,059	1,022,114	960,689
Department Management Budget Control Level	18001	0	6,301,473	3,615,455	3,854,927
Engineering Services Budget Control Level	17002	1,907,519	1,027,468	2,350,285	2,386,354
General Expense Budget Control Leve	el				
City Central Costs		8,885,098	9,418,340	8,878,705	9,097,595
Debt Service		2,600,295	4,835,000	5,138,652	8,074,720
Indirect Cost Recovery - General Exp	ense	(8,885,099)	(9,418,340)	(8,878,705)	(9,097,595)
Judgment & Claims		1,790,825	2,212,685	2,505,800	2,505,800
General Expense Budget Control Level	18002	4,391,119	7,047,685	7,644,452	10,580,520

	Summit	2005	2006	2007	2008
Appropriations	Code	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Major Maintenance/Replacement Budg	get Contro	l Level			
Bridges & Structures		9,402,491	17,454,099	11,927,000	27,261,000
Landslide Mitigation		494,511	900,001	400,000	400,000
Roads		5,034,464	9,327,002	17,086,000	25,438,000
Sidewalk Maintenance		313,183	333,000	1,483,000	1,856,000
Trails and Bike Paths		708,015	335,000	3,587,000	3,836,000
Urban Forestry		0	87,001	0	0
Major Maintenance/Replacement Budget Control Level	19001	15,952,664	28,436,103	34,483,000	58,791,000
Major Projects Budget Control Level					
Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall		2,340,879	5,319,998	8,051,000	3,726,000
Magnolia Bridge Replacement		911,203	750,001	3,450,000	23,500,000
Mercer Corridor		1,992,692	2,500,000	2,912,000	47,988,000
Spokane Street Viaduct		1,192,256	15,330,192	225,000	30,534,000
SR-520		162,659	54,000	381,000	384,000
Major Projects Budget Control Level	19002	6,599,689	23,954,191	15,019,000	106,132,000
Mobility-Capital Budget Control Level					
Corridor & Intersection Improvements		18,370,541	10,685,369	6,452,000	11,010,000
Freight Mobility		1,995	227,000	46,000	6,839,000
Intelligent Transportation System		2,887,093	2,356,598	2,222,000	2,486,000
Neighborhood Enhancements		6,512,168	6,397,100	6,356,000	2,152,000
New Trails and Bike Paths		4,419,910	4,551,829	4,226,000	14,792,000
Sidewalks & Pedestrian Facilities		962,197	1,940,959	1,974,000	2,079,000
Transit & HOV		12,393,735	10,285,998	27,236,000	16,434,000
Mobility-Capital Budget Control Level <sup>(1)</sup>	19003	45,547,639	36,444,853	48,512,000	55,792,000

<sup>(1)</sup> None of the money appropriated for 2007 for the Seattle Department of Transportation's Mobility-Capital Budget Control Level can be spent to pay for the Corridor Projects project, Project ID: TC366860, until authorized by ordinance.

	Summit	2005	2006	2007	2008
Appropriations	Code	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
<b>Mobility-Operations Budget Control</b>	Level				
Commuter Mobility		6,731,593	9,224,946	12,170,193	12,834,480
Neighborhoods		1,870,632	1,793,445	4,301,432	4,025,117
Parking		5,929,735	6,255,352	6,832,002	5,854,479
Signs & Markings		2,711,767	4,362,735	4,750,607	4,868,899
Traffic Signals		5,385,072	6,992,168	7,711,786	8,374,406
Mobility-Operations Budget Control Level	17003	22,628,799	28,628,646	35,766,020	35,957,382
ROW Management Budget Control Level	17004	9,486,075	10,626,985	12,012,943	11,242,067
Street Maintenance Budget Control L	evel				
Emergency Response		523,420	589,076	588,171	608,842
Operations Support		4,625,802	4,669,797	4,705,849	4,892,197
Pavement Management		281,752	294,725	280,366	291,334
Street Cleaning		3,323,747	3,576,038	3,594,724	3,731,431
Street Repair		11,335,003	12,359,563	13,814,321	14,308,800
Street Maintenance Budget Control Level	17005	20,089,724	21,489,199	22,983,430	23,832,603
<b>Urban Forestry Budget Control Level</b>					
Arborist Services		0	1,629,578	790,694	817,992
Tree & Landscape Maintenance		2,255,356	1,621,360	3,343,612	3,257,528
Urban Forestry Budget Control Level	17006	2,255,356	3,250,938	4,134,306	4,075,521
<b>Department Total</b>		133,494,214	177,128,334	193,543,822	319,830,426
Department Full-time Equivalents To		622.50	642.25	678.00	678.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Resources	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
General Subfund	32,878,523	40,244,847	43,378,608	43,023,078
Other	100,615,691	136,883,487	150,165,214	276,807,348
Department Total	133,494,214	177,128,334	193,543,822	319,830,426

# **Bridges & Structures Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Bridges and Structures Budget Control Level is to maintain the City's bridges and structures to provide for the safe and efficient movement of people, goods and services throughout the City.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Bridge Operations	3,187,559	2,110,839	2,498,382	2,599,712
Structures Engineering	609,166	774,458	749,126	778,334
Structures Maintenance	838,905	7,035,496	3,775,422	3,808,008
Total	4,635,630	9,920,793	7,022,930	7,186,054
Full-time Equivalents Total *	49.91	51.50	51.50	51.50

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Bridges & Structures: Bridge Operations Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Bridge Operations Program is to ensure the safe and efficient operation and preventive maintenance for over 180 bridges throughout the City of Seattle.

### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes increase the budget by \$388,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Bridge Operations	3,187,559	2,110,839	2,498,382	2,599,712
Full-time Equivalents Total*	27.14	28.00	28.00	28.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Bridges & Structures: Structures Engineering Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Structures Engineering program is to provide engineering services on all the bridges and structures within the City of Seattle to ensure the safety of transportation users as they use or move in proximity to these transportation facilities.

### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes decrease the budget by \$25,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Structures Engineering	609,166	774,458	749,126	778,334
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.60	4.75	4.75	4.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Bridges & Structures: Structures Maintenance Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Structures Maintenance program is to provide for the maintenance of all of the City of Seattle's bridges, structures, and stairways.

### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, increase budget by \$929,000 for the addition of one Bridge Maintenance crew and one Stairway & Structures maintenance crew.

There is a reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget of \$3.99 million in reimbursable authority in this program due to changes in budgeting procedures.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, decrease the budget by \$202,000, for a net decrease from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$3.26 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Structures Maintenance	838,905	7,035,496	3,775,422	3,808,008
Full-time Equivalents Total*	18.17	18.75	18.75	18.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Department Management Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Department Management Budget Control Level is to provide leadership and operations support services to accomplish the mission and goals of the Department.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Director's Office	1,265,413	1,694,886	1,856,940	1,835,924
Division Management	19,606,747	18,366,557	26,852,533	27,252,971
Human Resources	1,029,063	1,253,189	1,502,038	1,456,051
Indirect Cost Recovery - Department	-27,895,219	-26,192,266	-36,394,650	-36,924,525
Management				
Public Information	423,082	824,215	657,877	780,287
Resource Management	4,953,071	6,884,833	8,118,604	8,493,529
Revenue Development	617,843	3,470,059	1,022,114	960,689
Total	0	6,301,473	3,615,455	3,854,927
Full-time Equivalents Total *	112.91	116.50	121.00	121.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Department Management: Director's Office Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Director's Office program is to provide overall direction and guidance to accomplish the mission and goals of the Department.

#### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes increase the budget by \$162,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Director's Office	1,265,413	1,694,886	1,856,940	1,835,924
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.78	7.00	7.00	7.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Department Management: Division Management Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Division Management program is to provide division leadership and unique transportation technical expertise to accomplish the division's goals and objectives in support of the Department's mission.

#### **Program Summary**

Increased budget and workforce due to the Transportation Funding Package and Major Projects work results in higher support costs for 2007 and 2008.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, including significant growth in space rent as described in the Budget Overview, and departmental technical changes increase the budget by \$8.49 million from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Division Management	19,606,747	18,366,557	26,852,533	27,252,971
Full-time Equivalents Total*	40.71	42.00	42.00	42.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Department Management: Human Resources Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Human Resources program is to provide employee support services, safety management, and other personnel expertise to the Department and its employees.

## **Program Summary**

Reduce 0.50 FTE Personnel Specialist as this work will be supported by the Personnel Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes increase the budget by \$249,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Human Resources	1,029,063	1,253,189	1,502,038	1,456,051
Full-time Equivalents Total*	9.93	10.25	9.75	9.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Department Management: Indirect Cost Recovery - Department Management

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Indirect Cost Recovery - Department Management program is to allocate departmental indirect costs to all transportation activities and capital projects and equitably recover funding from them to support these departmental management and support services that are essential to the delivery of transportation services to the public.

#### **Program Summary**

Increased budget and workforce due to the Transportation Funding Package and Major Projects work results in higher indirect support costs that are recovered in this BCL.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes decrease the budget by \$10.2 million from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Indirect Cost Recovery - Department	-27,895,219	-26,192,266	-36,394,650	-36,924,525

# **Department Management: Public Information Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Public Information program is to manage all community and media relations and outreach for the Department, including all public information requests and inquiries from the City Council and other government agencies. Public Information also maintains the ROADS hotline and the SDOT web site for both citizens and department staff.

#### **Program Summary**

Add 1.0 FTE Paralegal and \$70,000 for creating a central point of contact to gather and maintain documents and other material for public disclosure and lawsuits which involve SDOT.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes decrease the budget by \$236,000, for a net decrease from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$166,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Public Information	423,082	824,215	657,877	780,287
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.82	6.00	7.00	7.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Department Management: Resource Management Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Resource Management program is to provide the internal financial, accounting, information technology, and space management support for all SDOT business activities.

#### **Program Summary**

Add 1.0 FTE Accountant, Sr in an effort to reorganize and streamline operations in the SDOT Accounting section within existing budget as well as reclassify 2.0 FTE Accountant, Principal to Manager 1, Finance, Budget, & Accounting.

Add 2.0 FTE Info Technology Professional for work currently being performed by consultant staff within existing budget.

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, increase budget by \$2.2 million reflecting an increase in finance, accounting, and information technology support to the department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes reduce the budget by \$1 million, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.23 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Resource Management	4,953,071	6,884,833	8,118,604	8,493,529
Full-time Equivalents Total*	43.13	44.50	47.50	47.50

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Department Management: Revenue Development Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Revenue Development program is to identify funding, grant and partnership opportunities for transportation projects and provide lead coordination for grant applications and reporting requirements.

#### **Program Summary**

Add 1.0 Strategic Advisor 1 and \$98,000 to administer the establishment of Local Improvement Districts.

There is a reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget of \$2.1 million in reimbursable authority in this program due to changes in departmental budgeting practices.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes decrease the budget by \$446,000, for a net decrease from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.45 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Revenue Development	617,843	3,470,059	1,022,114	960,689
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.54	6.75	7.75	7.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Engineering Services Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Engineering Services Budget Control Level is to provide engineering support for street vacations, the scoping of neighborhood projects, and other transportation activities requiring transportation engineering expertise.

### **Summary**

Increase budget by \$155,000 and 1.0 FTE Executive 2 for a Major Projects Director to provide coordination, issue resolution, and management of resources among major capital projects and between associated agencies.

Add \$238,000, of which \$45,000 is one-time funding, to develop and implement pollution prevention plans and strategies for SDOT's facilities and projects. Add 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 1 to conduct facilities assessments, identify strategies to prevent stormwater pollution in any of SDOT's new or redeveloped facilities, and develop pollution prevention training for SDOT employees. This funding implements the City's Restore Our Waters Strategy by reducing the impact of city facilities on Seattle's water bodies.

As part of a technical adjustment add 0.25 FTE Administrative Specialist I, 0.25 FTE Administrative Specialist II, and 0.25 Manager 3, Engineering and Plans Review.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes increase the budget by \$930,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.32 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Engineering & Operations Support	1,907,519	1,027,468	2,350,285	2,386,354
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.85	5.00	7.75	7.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **General Expense Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the General Expense Budget Control Level is to account for certain City business expenses that are necessary to the overall effective and efficient delivery of transportation services. It equitably recovers funding from all transportation funding sources to pay for these indirect cost services. It also includes SDOT Judgment and Claims contributions and debt service payments made by SDOT.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
City Central Costs	8,885,098	9,418,340	8,878,705	9,097,595
Debt Service	2,600,295	4,835,000	5,138,652	8,074,720
Indirect Cost Recovery - General Expense	-8,885,099	-9,418,340	-8,878,705	-9,097,595
Judgment & Claims	1,790,825	2,212,685	2,505,800	2,505,800
Total	4,391,119	7,047,685	7,644,452	10,580,520

# **General Expense: City Central Costs Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the City Central Costs program is to allocate the City's general services costs to SDOT in a way that benefit the delivery of transportation services to the public.

#### **Program Summary**

Adjustments to this program decrease the budget by \$540,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
City Central Costs	8,885,098	9,418,340	8,878,705	9,097,595

# General Expense: Debt Service Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Debt Service program is to meet principal repayment and interest obligations on debt proceeds that are appropriated in SDOT's budget.

#### **Program Summary**

This program includes funding for SDOT to repay a series of Public Works Trust Fund loans extending back to 1988, as well as pay debt service on more recent Limited Tax General Obligation (LTGO) debt issued for work on SR-519 and new parking pay stations. Additional transportation-related debt service is appropriated in other City funds.

New debt service includes \$70,000 in 2007 and \$787,000 in 2008 for the expansion of pay stations into the South Lake Union neighborhood.

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Parking Tax, provide \$2.7 million in 2008 to service new debt to be issued for Mercer Corridor Project, Spokane St. Viaduct, King Street Station Multimodal Terminal, and S Lander St. Grade Separation.

Although not included in this program or the SDOT budget, \$2.4 million of Cumulative Reserve Subfund is funding debt service in 2007 for the following transportation projects: Alaskan Way Viaduct/Tunnel and Seawall, Bridge Way North and Fremont Circulation, Fremont Bridge Approaches & Electrical Major Maintenance, Mercer Corridor, and SR-519.

Other adjustments to this program increase the budget by \$234,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$304,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Debt Service	2,600,295	4,835,000	5,138,652	8,074,720

# **General Expense: Indirect Cost Recovery - General Expense Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Indirect Cost Recovery - General Expense program is to equitably recover funding from all transportation activities and capital projects to pay for allocated City-services indirect costs that are essential to the delivery of transportation services to the public.

#### **Program Summary**

Adjustments to this program increase the budget by \$540,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Indirect Cost Recovery - General Expense	-8,885,099	-9,418,340	-8,878,705	-9,097,595

# **General Expense: Judgment & Claims Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Judgment and Claims program is to represent SDOT's annual contribution to the City's centralized self-insurance pool from which court judgments and claims against the City are paid.

#### **Program Summary**

Adjustments to this program increase the budget by \$293,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Judgment & Claims	1,790,825	2,212,685	2,505,800	2,505,800

## Major Maintenance/Replacement Budget Control Level

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Major Maintenance/Replacement Budget Control Level is to provide maintenance and replacement of roads, trails, bike paths, bridges and structures.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Bridges & Structures	9,402,491	17,454,099	11,927,000	27,261,000
Landslide Mitigation	494,511	900,001	400,000	400,000
Roads	5,034,464	9,327,002	17,086,000	25,438,000
Sidewalk Maintenance	313,183	333,000	1,483,000	1,856,000
Trails and Bike Paths	708,015	335,000	3,587,000	3,836,000
Urban Forestry	0	87,001	0	0
Total	15,952,664	28,436,103	34,483,000	58,791,000
Full-time Equivalents Total *	18.90	19.50	19.50	19.50

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### Major Maintenance/Replacement: Bridges & Structures Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Bridges & Structures program is to provide for safe and efficient use of the City's bridges and structures to all residents of Seattle and adjacent regions to ensure movement of people, goods and services throughout the City.

#### **Program Summary**

In 2007, work continues on the Fremont Bridge Approaches and Electrical Major Maintenance project and other projects to repair or replace the city's bridges and transportation structures. There is also significant funding from the Bridging the Gap funding package in 2007. As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, provide \$1.0 million for the Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement Program and \$987,000 for the Bridge Seismic - Phase 2 project. Additional funding is provided in 2008 as part of the Transportation Funding Package Parking Tax, including \$685,000 for the Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement Program and \$1.5 million for the Bridge Seismic - Phase 2 project.

Also as part of the Transportation Funding Package Business Transportation Tax, in 2008 provide \$1.5 million for the Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement Program and \$440,000 for the Bridge Retrofit Seismic - Phase 2 project.

Provide \$2 million from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for the following projects: Bridge Painting Program, Bridge Seismic Retrofit Phase II, Fremont Bridge Approaches and Electrical Major Maintenance, Hazard Mitigation Program - Areaways, Retaining Wall Repair and Restoration, and Stairway Rehabilitation Program.

Major projects funded in 2007 include: \$8 million Fremont Bridge Approaches and Electrical Major Maintenance, \$1.1 million for Bridge Seismic Retrofit - Phase 2, \$1 million for Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement, \$650,000 for Bridge Painting Program, \$400,000 for Retaining Wall Repair and Restoration, and \$386,000 for Stairway Rehabilitation Program.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Bridges & Structures	9,402,491	17,454,099	11,927,000	27,261,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.09	5.25	5.25	5.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Major Maintenance/Replacement: Landslide Mitigation Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Landslide Mitigation program is to proactively identify and address potential areas of landslide concerns that affect the right-of-way.

#### **Program Summary**

Provide \$200,000 from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for Hazard Mitigation Program - Landslide Mitigation Projects. In 2007, work includes constructing a wall designed to stabilize the partially closed street on 41st Ave NE near NE 142nd Street.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Landslide Mitigation	494,511	900,001	400,000	400,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.45	1.50	1.50	1.50

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Major Maintenance/Replacement: Roads Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Roads program is to provide for the safe and efficient use of the City's roadways to all residents of Seattle and adjacent regions to ensure movement of people, goods and services throughout the City.

### **Program Summary**

In 2007, significant new funding is provided to begin working down the backlog in major maintenance on the city's roads.

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Parking Tax, in 2008 provide \$2.5 million for the Arterial Asphalt and Concrete program.

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, provide \$12.7 million for the Arterial Asphalt and Concrete program.

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Business Transportation Tax, in 2008 provide \$2.8 million for the Arterial Asphalt and Concrete program.

Provide \$2.7 million from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for the Arterial Asphalt and Concrete program.

Major projects funded in 2007 include the following: \$15.3 million for Arterial Asphalt and Concrete Program, \$883,000 for Arterial Major Maintenance, \$217,000 for Non-Arterial Asphalt Street Resurfacing, and \$183,000 for Non-Arterial Concrete Rehabilitation.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Roads	5,034,464	9,327,002	17,086,000	25,438,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.00	8.25	8.25	8.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### Major Maintenance/Replacement: Sidewalk Maintenance Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Sidewalk Maintenance program is to maintain and provide safe and efficient use of the City's sidewalks to all residents of Seattle and adjacent regions to ensure movement of people, goods and services throughout the City.

#### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, provide \$1.1 million for Sidewalk Safety Repair.

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Business Transportation Tax, in 2008 provide \$700,000 for Sidewalk Safety Repair.

Provide \$341,000 from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for Sidewalk Safety Repair.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Sidewalk Maintenance	313,183	333,000	1,483,000	1,856,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.18	2.25	2.25	2.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Major Maintenance/Replacement: Trails and Bike Paths Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Trails and Bike Paths program is to maintain and provide safe and efficient use of the City's trails and bike paths to all residents of Seattle and adjacent regions to ensure movement of people, goods and services throughout the City.

### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, provide \$2.8 million for Bike Master Plan Implementation and \$489,000 for Trail Major Maintenance. Provide \$338,000 from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for the Bike Spot Safety Improvements program.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Trails and Bike Paths	708,015	335,000	3,587,000	3,836,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.18	2.25	2.25	2.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Major Maintenance/Replacement: Urban Forestry Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Urban Forestry program is to maintain the City's trees and landscaping, keeping the urban forest healthy and safe for all residents of Seattle and adjacent regions.

### **Program Summary**

No capital expenditures are anticipated in 2007 and 2008. Trees will be replaced under the Urban Forestry Budget Control Level in the operating budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Urban Forestry	0	87,001	0	0

### **Major Projects Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Major Projects Budget Control Level is to design, manage and construct improvements to the transportation infrastructure for the benefit of the traveling public including freight, transit, other public agencies, pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
•	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall	2,340,879	5,319,998	8,051,000	3,726,000
Magnolia Bridge Replacement	911,203	750,001	3,450,000	23,500,000
Mercer Corridor	1,992,692	2,500,000	2,912,000	47,988,000
Spokane Street Viaduct	1,192,256	15,330,192	225,000	30,534,000
SR-520	162,659	54,000	381,000	384,000
Total	6,599,689	23,954,191	15,019,000	106,132,000
Full-time Equivalents Total *	22.05	22.75	35.75	35.75

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Major Projects: Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall program is to fund the City's involvement in the replacement of the seismically vulnerable Viaduct and Seawall. The Alaskan Way Viaduct is part of State Route 99, which carries one-quarter of the north-south traffic through downtown Seattle and is a major truck route serving the City's industrial areas.

#### **Program Summary**

Provide \$8.1 million in 2007 and \$3.7 million in 2008 for the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall Project. Approximately \$4.8 million in 2007 and \$2.3 million in 2008 of the totals are paid by the Washington State Department of Transportation.

Add 12.0 FTE for this project, including 1.0 FTE Admin Specialist II, 1.0 FTE Civil Engineering Supervisor, 0.5 FTE Civil Engineer Associate, 1.0 FTE Civil Engineer Specialist Associate, 1.0 FTE Executive 2, 1.0 FTE Planner Associate, 4.5 FTE Strategic Advisor 1, General Government, and 2.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, General Government.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall	2,340,879	5,319,998	8,051,000	3,726,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	10.90	11.25	23.25	23.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### Major Projects: Magnolia Bridge Replacement Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program is to evaluate the possible locations and bridge types for the replacement of the Magnolia Bridge and ultimately replace the bridge, which was damaged by a landslide in 1997 and the Nisqually earthquake in 2001.

#### **Program Summary**

In 2007, provide \$209,000 from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for the Magnolia Bridge Replacement project. Total funding proposed from all sources is \$3.5 million in 2007 (including federal grant funding) and \$23.5 million in 2008 (from fund sources to be determined). Fund sources for construction of this project have not yet been identified.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Magnolia Bridge Replacement	911,203	750,001	3,450,000	23,500,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.94	2.00	2.00	2.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### Major Projects: Mercer Corridor Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Mercer Corridor Program is to use existing street capacity along the Mercer Corridor and South Lake Union more efficiently and enhance all modes of travel, including pedestrian mobility.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$2.9 million for the Mercer Corridor Project in 2007 as part of the Transportation Funding Package Parking Tax. In 2008, provide \$15 million as part of the Transportation Funding Package Parking Tax Bond Issuance in 2008, and provide \$33 million in Regional Transportation Improvement District (RTID) funds. A public vote on the RTID funding package is anticipated in November 2007.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Mercer Corridor	1,992,692	2,500,000	2,912,000	47,988,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.91	3.00	3.00	3.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Major Projects: Spokane Street Viaduct Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Spokane Street Viaduct program is to improve the safety of the Spokane Street Viaduct by building a new structure parallel and connected to the existing one and widening the existing viaduct.

#### **Program Summary**

In 2008 provide \$5 million for the Spokane Viaduct Widening project as part of the Transportation Funding Package Bond Issuance and provide \$20 million in Regional Transportation Improvement District (RTID) funds. A public vote on the RTID funding package is anticipated in November 2007.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Spokane Street Viaduct	1,192,256	15,330,192	225,000	30,534,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.09	5.25	5.25	5.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Major Projects: SR-520 Purpose Statement

The purpose of the SR-520 Program is to provide policy, planning and technical analysis support and to act as the City's representative in a multi-agency group working on the replacement of the SR-520 bridge.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$381,000 and add 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 3, General Government to provide expertise on design and review of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) documents on the SR-520 Replacement Project.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
SR-520	162,659	54,000	381,000	384,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.21	1.25	2.25	2.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### **Mobility-Capital Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Mobility Capital Budget Control Level is to help maximize the movement of traffic throughout the City by enhancing all modes of transportation including corridor and intersection improvements, transit and HOV improvements and sidewalk and pedestrian facilities.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Corridor & Intersection Improvements	18,370,541	10,685,369	6,452,000	11,010,000
Freight Mobility	1,995	227,000	46,000	6,839,000
Intelligent Transportation System	2,887,093	2,356,598	2,222,000	2,486,000
Neighborhood Enhancements	6,512,168	6,397,100	6,356,000	2,152,000
New Trails and Bike Paths	4,419,910	4,551,829	4,226,000	14,792,000
Sidewalks & Pedestrian Facilities	962,197	1,940,959	1,974,000	2,079,000
Transit & HOV	12,393,735	10,285,998	27,236,000	16,434,000
Total	45,547,639	36,444,853	48,512,000	55,792,000
Full-time Equivalents Total *	56.24	58.00	59.00	59.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Mobility-Capital: Corridor & Intersection Improvements Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Corridor and Intersection Improvements program is to analyze and make improvements to corridors and intersections to move traffic more efficiently. Examples of projects include signal timing, left turn signals and street improvements.

#### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, provide \$2.6 million for Corridor Projects, Collision Evaluation Program, Left Turn Program and New Traffic Signals Program.

Provide \$3 million in 2007 from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for the following projects: 14th Ave S Street Improvements, NE Northgate Way Intersection and Pedestrian Improvements, and SR 519.

Major projects funded in 2007 include the following: \$2.2 million for Corridor Projects, \$1.3 million for SR-519, \$1.2 million for NE Northgate Way Intersection and Pedestrian Improvements, and \$510,000 for New Traffic Signals.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Corridor & Intersection Improvements	18,370,541	10,685,369	6,452,000	11,010,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	11.87	12.25	12.25	12.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Mobility-Capital: Freight Mobility Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Freight Mobility Program is to help move freight through the city in a safe and efficient manner.

#### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Bond Issuance, provide \$5 million in 2008 for the South Lander Street Overpass. In 2007, provide \$46,000 for the Duwamish Truck Mobility Improvement Program.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Freight Mobility	1,995	227,000	46,000	6,839,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.73	0.75	0.75	0.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Mobility-Capital: Intelligent Transportation System Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) program is to fund projects identified in the City's ITS Strategic Plan and ITS Master Plan. Examples of projects include implementation of transit signal priority strategies; installation of closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras to monitor traffic in key corridors; and development of parking guidance, traveler information, and real-time traffic control systems.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$412,000 to match federal funding for work on enhanced traffic signal operations, advanced/enhanced traffic management, traffic surveillance, and traveler information and communication system enhancements. Add 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2 for this body of work.

In 2007, major projects funded include \$1.3 million for Duwamish ITS and \$934,000 for ITS Plan Implementation.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Intelligent Transportation System	2,887,093	2,356,598	2,222,000	2,486,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.15	3.25	4.25	4.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Mobility-Capital: Neighborhood Enhancements Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Neighborhood Enhancements Program is to make safe and convenient neighborhoods by improving sidewalks, traffic circles, streetscape designs and the installation of pay stations.

### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, provide \$1.8 million for neighborhood projects in the Neighborhood Street Fund/Cumulative Reserve Subfund (NSF/CRF) Neighborhood program.

Provide \$3.4 million for the purchase of 285 pay stations for the South Lake Union neighborhood.

Provide \$823,000 from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for 5th Ave NE Improvements project and the NSF/CRF Neighborhood Program.

In 2007, major projects funded include the following: \$3.4 million for Pay Stations, \$2.5 million for NSF/CRF Neighborhood Program and \$355,000 for Traffic Control Program.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Neighborhood Enhancements	6,512,168	6,397,100	6,356,000	2,152,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.00	8.25	8.25	8.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Mobility-Capital: New Trails and Bike Paths Purpose Statement

The purpose of the New Trails and Bike Paths program is to construct new trails and bike paths that connect with existing facilities to let users transverse the City on a dedicated network of trails and paths.

#### **Program Summary**

Provide \$1.7 million from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for the following projects: Burke-Gilman Trail Extension, Chief Sealth Trail, and Lake Union Ship Canal Trail.

Provide \$1.9 million from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund to pay for a change in project scope to the Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas Street Project to cross not only the railroad tracks (as originally planned) but also Elliott Avenue with the overpass. This new project scope will increase access to Myrtle Edwards Park.

In 2007, major projects funded include the following: \$2.3 million for Burke-Gilman Trail Extension, \$901,000 for Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail, \$453,000 for Chief Sealth Trail, and \$385,000 for Duwamish Bikeway.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
New Trails and Bike Paths	4,419,910	4,551,829	4,226,000	14,792,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.54	6.75	6.75	6.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### Mobility-Capital: Sidewalks & Pedestrian Facilities Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Sidewalk and Pedestrian Facilities program is to install new facilities that help pedestrians move safely along the City's sidewalks by installing or replacing sidewalks, modifying existing sidewalks for elderly and handicap accessibility and increasing pedestrian lighting.

#### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, provide \$973,000 for the sidewalk development program.

Provide \$800,000 from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund for the following projects: Pedestrian Lighting - Capital Costs, Pedestrian/Elderly Handicapped Accessibility and Sidewalk Development Program.

In 2007, major projects funded include the following: \$1.1 million for Sidewalk Development Program, \$500,000 for Pedestrian/Elderly Handicapped Accessibility, \$118,000 for Sand Point Way NE Pedestrian Improvements and \$100,000 for Pedestrian Lighting - Capital Costs.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Sidewalks & Pedestrian Facilities	962,197	1,940,959	1,974,000	2,079,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.05	7.25	7.25	7.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Mobility-Capital: Transit & HOV Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Transit and HOV Program is to move more people in less time throughout the City. Projects include the South Lake Union Streetcar, Center City Access Programs, and working with Sound Transit to ensure an easy transition when the downtown bus tunnel re-opens at the end of 2007.

#### **Program Summary**

In 2007, funding is provided for the Aurora Transit, Pedestrian and Safety Improvements project (\$130,000 from the Cumulative Reserve Subfund), and for the Westlake Multimodal Transportation Hub to provide an important transfer point for passengers from North Seattle and East King County into the downtown core (\$831,000). As part of the Transportation Funding Package Bond Issuance, in 2008 provide \$5 million for King Street Station Multimodal Terminal.

Reduce 0.5 FTE Public Relations Specialist, Senior and 0.5 FTE Capital Projects Coordinator, Senior, and add 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, General Government for work on the South Lake Union Streetcar Project.

Major projects funded in 2007 include: \$2.3 million for South Lake Union Streetcar; \$1.9 million for Aurora Transit, Pedestrian, and Safety Improvements; \$1 million for Center City Access Strategy Program; and \$831,000 for Westlake Multimodal Transportation Hub.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Transit & HOV	12,393,735	10,285,998	27,236,000	16,434,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	18.90	19.50	19.50	19.50

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Mobility-Operations Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Mobility Operations Budget Control level is to ensure the safe and efficient operation of all transportation modes in the City of Seattle. This includes managing the parking, pedestrian, and bicycle infrastructure; implementing neighborhood plans; encouragement of alternative modes of transportation; and maintenance and improvement of signals and the non-electrical transportation management infrastructure.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Commuter Mobility	6,731,593	9,224,946	12,170,193	12,834,480
Neighborhoods	1,870,632	1,793,445	4,301,432	4,025,117
Parking	5,929,735	6,255,352	6,832,002	5,854,479
Signs & Markings	2,711,767	4,362,735	4,750,607	4,868,899
Traffic Signals	5,385,072	6,992,168	7,711,786	8,374,406
Total	22,628,799	28,628,646	35,766,020	35,957,382
Full-time Equivalents Total *	146.11	150.75	152.25	152.25

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

---

• • • •

# **Mobility-Operations: Commuter Mobility Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Commuter Mobility program is to provide a variety of services including enforcement of City commercial vehicle limits, transit coordination, and planning designed to increase mobility and transportation options to the citizens of Seattle.

#### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package, \$2.13 million from levy lid lift revenues and \$750,000 from parking tax revenues for corridor project development and other mobility improvements in the amount of \$1.3 million and payments to King County for improved transit service in the amount of \$1.5 million.

Increase budget by \$815,000 to fund intergovernmental payments pursuant to an agreement with King County Metro for operation of the South Lake Union Streetcar.

Add \$145,000 for design review services for the Sound Transit University Link Light Rail.

Add \$90,000 for work with Washington State Ferries (WSF) to cover staff costs for planning coordination of the WSF Colman Dock Replacement Project.

Add \$100,000 in one-time funding for a road-pricing study that examines the legal authority to impose cordon charges along urban arterials, options for funding transit with pricing revenues, and opportunities for dedicated lanes to serve transit and freight. This funding implements the recommendations of the Green Ribbon Commission by exploring strategies for decreasing car trips and travel times along Seattle's streets.

Add \$100,000 to continue SDOT's travel options and incentive programs. This funding continues 1.0 FTE position, funded by grants that end in 2006, that educate employers, commuters, and residents on travel options, and it provides resources for transportation incentives to Seattle households that reduce car trips. This funding implements the recommendations of the Green Ribbon Commission by reducing the number of car trips by Seattle residents and employees.

Increase \$145,000 of budget authority for reimbursable work with Sound Transit for Phase II and add 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2 for this body of work.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 1 and 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2 that were associated with the Green Line Monorail project in accordance with Ordinance 121321.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes decrease the budget by \$1.18 million, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.95 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Commuter Mobility	6,731,593	9,224,946	12,170,193	12,834,480
Full-time Equivalents Total*	43.13	44.50	43.50	43.50

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Mobility-Operations: Neighborhoods Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Neighborhoods Program is to plan and forecast the needs of specific neighborhoods including neighborhood and corridor planning, development of the coordinated transportation plans, traffic control spot improvements, and travel forecasting. The program also constructs minor improvements in neighborhoods based on these assessments.

#### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, increase budget by \$1.9 million for safety programs and the Pedestrian Master Plan implementation.

Increase budget by \$40,000 to fund a coordinated effort with King County Metro Transit and the Downtown Seattle Association to expand transit service, manage parking, and build capacity for sustained promotion of travel options in the South Lake Union neighborhood.

Add \$350,000 in 2007 only for transportation studies in the University District and South Downtown.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes increase the budget by \$182,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.5 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Neighborhoods	1,870,632	1,793,445	4,301,432	4,025,117
Full-time Equivalents Total*	11.63	12.00	12.00	12.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Mobility-Operations: Parking Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Parking Program is to manage the City's parking resources, maintain and operate pay stations and parking meters for on-street parking, and develop and manage the City's carpool program and Residential Parking Zones for neighborhoods.

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$1.6 million in 2007 and 0.5 FTE Transportation Planner, Associate for installation and operation of parking pay stations in the South Lake Union neighborhood. In 2008, add \$460,000 for ongoing operations costs.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes decrease the budget by \$1 million, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$577,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Parking	5,929,735	6,255,352	6,832,002	5,854,479
Full-time Equivalents Total*	28.35	29.25	29.75	29.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Mobility-Operations: Signs & Markings Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Signs and Markings program is to design, fabricate, and install signage as well as provide pavement, curb, and crosswalk markings to facilitate the safe movement of vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists throughout the City.

### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, add \$1.57 million for sign evaluation and replacement and improved curb and pavement markings.

Add \$115,000 and 2.0 FTE Maintenance Laborer for 48-hour graffiti removal from traffic signs and signals and related assets.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes decrease the budget by \$1.3 million, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$388,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Signs & Markings	2,711,767	4,362,735	4,750,607	4,868,899
Full-time Equivalents Total*	23.02	23.75	25.75	25.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Mobility-Operations: Traffic Signals Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Traffic Signals Program is to operate the Traffic Management Center that monitors traffic movement within the City and to maintain and improve signals and other electrical transportation management infrastructure.

#### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, add \$1.7 million for traffic signals maintenance.

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Parking Tax, in 2008 add \$686,000 for traffic signals maintenance.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes reduce the budget by \$1 million, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$720,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Traffic Signals	5,385,072	6,992,168	7,711,786	8,374,406
Full-time Equivalents Total*	39.98	41.25	41.25	41.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### **ROW Management Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Right-of-Way Management BCL is to ensure that projects throughout the city meet code specifications for uses of the right-of-way and to provide plan review, utility permit and street use permit issuance, and utility inspection and mapping services.

### **Summary**

Add \$320,000 and 2.0 FTE Civil Engineer Specialist, Associate to enforce city permit conditions and standards. This add addresses increased levels of construction activity in the city.

Increase budget by \$42,000 and 0.5 FTE Civil Engineer Specialist, Associate to bring an existing part-time position to full-time.

Add \$140,000 and 1.0 FTE Civil Engineer, Senior position to review and permit the increasing number of high-rise construction projects in Seattle that will require shoring permit review to protect the right-of-way.

Increase budget by \$140,000 and 1.0 FTE Civil Engineer, Senior position to provide customer service at the Department of Planning and Development Application Support Center.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes increase the budget by \$744,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.39 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Street Use Permitting & Enforcement	9,486,075	10,626,985	12,012,943	11,242,067
Full-time Equivalents Total*	58.15	60.00	64.50	64.50

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Street Maintenance Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Street Maintenance Budget Control Level is to keep Seattle's investment in its roadways and sidewalks safe, clean, and in good repair. Repair and maintenance of the right-of-way promotes safety, enhances mobility, and protects the environment. Through planned maintenance, cleaning, and spot repairs of streets, alleys, pathways, and stairways, Street Maintenance improves the quality of life and business climate in the City.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
-	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Emergency Response	523,420	589,076	588,171	608,842
Operations Support	4,625,802	4,669,797	4,705,849	4,892,197
Pavement Management	281,752	294,725	280,366	291,334
Street Cleaning	3,323,747	3,576,038	3,594,724	3,731,431
Street Repair	11,335,003	12,359,563	13,814,321	14,308,800
Total	20,089,724	21,489,199	22,983,430	23,832,603
Full-time Equivalents Total *	129.88	134.00	142.00	142.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Street Maintenance: Emergency Response Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Emergency Response program is to respond to safety and mobility issues such as pavement collapses, severe weather such as ice and snow storms, landslides, and other emergencies to make the right-of-way safe for moving people and goods. This program includes proactively addressing landslide hazards to keep the right-of-way open and safe.

#### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes result in a decrease of approximately \$1,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Emergency Response	523,420	589,076	588,171	608,842
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.18	2.25	2.25	2.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Street Maintenance: Operations Support Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Operations Support program is to provide essential operating support services necessary for the daily operation of SDOT's equipment and field workers dispatched from three field locations in support of street maintenance activities. These functions include warehousing, bulk material supply and management, tool cleaning and repair, equipment maintenance and repair, project accounting and technical support, and crew supervision.

### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes result in a increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$36,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Operations Support	4,625,802	4,669,797	4,705,849	4,892,197
Full-time Equivalents Total*	33.20	34.25	34.25	34.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Street Maintenance: Pavement Management Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Pavement Management program is to assess the condition of asphalt and concrete pavements and establish Citywide paving priorities for annual resurfacing and repair programs.

### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes result in a decrease of approximately \$14,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Pavement Management	281,752	294,725	280,366	291,334
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.21	1.25	1.25	1.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Street Maintenance: Street Cleaning Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Street Cleaning program is to keep Seattle's streets, improved alleys, stairways, and pathways clean, safe, and environmentally friendly by conducting sweeping, hand-cleaning, flushing, and mowing on a regular schedule.

#### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes result in a increase of approximately \$19,000 from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Street Cleaning	3,323,747	3,576,038	3,594,724	3,731,431
Full-time Equivalents Total*	21.57	22.25	22.25	22.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Street Maintenance: Street Repair Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Street Repair program is to preserve and maintain all streets and adjacent areas such as sidewalks and road shoulders by making spot repairs and conducting annual major maintenance paving and rehabilitation programs.

### **Program Summary**

Add \$800,000 and 8.0 FTE of street repair crew staff to enable the Street Maintenance Division to keep up with reimbursable street repair demand. The added staff include 1.0 FTE Asphalt Raker, 1.0 FTE Cement Finisher, 1.0 FTE Construction and Maintenance Equipment Operator, 3.0 FTE Maintenance Laborer, and 2.0 FTE Truck Driver.

For 2007, budget legislation proposes to increase utility cut restoration fees to reflect changes in the cost of labor, materials, and equipment.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes increase the budget by \$655,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.45 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Street Repair	11,335,003	12,359,563	13,814,321	14,308,800
Full-time Equivalents Total*	71.72	74.00	82.00	82.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### **Urban Forestry Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Urban Forestry Budget Control Level is to administer, maintain, protect, and expand the City's urban landscape in the street right-of-way through the maintenance and planting of new trees and landscaping to enhance the environment and aesthetics of the City. It maintains City owned trees to ensure the safety of Seattle's residents and visitors.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Arborist Services	0	1,629,578	790,694	817,992
Tree & Landscape Maintenance	2,255,356	1,621,360	3,343,612	3,257,528
Total	2,255,356	3,250,938	4,134,306	4,075,521
Full-time Equivalents Total *	23.50	24.25	24.75	24.75

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Urban Forestry: Arborist Services Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Arborist Services program is to maintain, protect, and preserve City street trees and to regulate privately owned trees in the right-of-way by developing plans, policies, and procedures to govern and improve the care and quality of street trees.

### **Program Summary**

Add \$111,000 and 0.5 FTE Administrative Specialist II to update and maintain the City's street tree inventory. This funding supports implementation of the City's Urban Forest Management Plan by providing SDOT with accurate information about the condition of trees along Seattle's streets, which will enable the department to identify trees that need maintenance and areas where new trees could be planted. Increasing the Seattle's tree canopy cover through maintenance and planting is a central goal of the City's Green Seattle Initiative.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes decrease the budget by \$950,000, for a net decrease from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$839,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Arborist Services	0	1,629,578	790,694	817,992
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.12	4.25	4.75	4.75

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Urban Forestry: Tree & Landscape Maintenance Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Tree and Landscape Maintenance program is to provide planning, design, construction, and construction inspection services for the landscape elements of transportation capital projects, as well as guidance to developers on the preservation City street trees and landscaped sites during construction of their projects.

#### **Program Summary**

As part of the Transportation Funding Package Levy Lid Lift, provide \$1.07 million for an additional tree crew and increase in tree replacement.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, and departmental technical changes increase the budget by \$650,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.72 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Tree & Landscape Maintenance	2,255,356	1,621,360	3,343,612	3,257,528
Full-time Equivalents Total*	19.38	20.00	20.00	20.00

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## 2007 - 2008 Estimated Revenues for the Transportation Operating Fund

Summit Code	Source	2005 Actuals	2006 Adopted	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
422490	Other Street Use & Curb Permit	5,223,443	11,442,458	11,897,270	12,521,060
422990	Other Non-Business Licenses/PE	509,768	604,230	598,988	621,139
436087	City Street Fund (Mtr Veh Fuel Tx)	10,179,785	8,198,560	0	0
436088	Arterial City Street Subfund (Mtr Veh Fuel Tx)	2,155,911	4,804,440	14,003,951	14,421,168
441930	Private Reimbursements	0	2,404,644	3,250,000	0
442490	Other Protective Inspection FE	1,416,995	0	0	0
444100	Street Maintenance & Repair CH	642,234	3,035,704	4,696,198	4,824,188
444900	Other Charges - Monorail	0	0	0	0
444900	Other Charges - Sound Transit	0	633,846	610,997	675,002
444900	Other Charges - Transportation	18,839,727	10,328,351	7,760,739	8,787,291
462500	Bldg/Other Space Rental Charge	0	51,044	95,712	95,712
469990	Other Miscellaneous Revenue	(39,808)	0	0	0
471010	Federal Grants	22,952,393	39,067,284	15,614,469	62,605,328
474010	State Grants	8,411,441	4,197,031	5,877,427	34,189,626
477010	Interlocal Grants	(192,285)	4,154,000	349,300	35,488,769
481100	General Obligation Bond Proceeds	0	15,325,426	6,320,330	5,216,000
481800	Long-Term Intergovernmental Loan Proc	2,750,000	2,465,688	3,074,413	0
541990	If Other Gen Govtl Svc Chrgs-MI	0	5,306,106	6,889,169	7,078,976
543210	Service to DWU (TCIP)	0	1,750,000	2,328,500	330,000
544900	If Other Gen Govtl Svc Chrgs-MI	10,592,627	0	0	0
569990	IF - Miscellaneous Revenue	1,123,151	0	0	0
587001	Oper Tr IN-FR General Fund	32,878,523	40,244,841	43,378,608	43,023,078
587102	Oper Tr IN-FR Park Department	0	49,000	0	0
587116	Oper TR IN-FR Cumulative Rsv S	5,950,509	19,779,787	11,921,000	7,014,500
587157	Oper TR IN-FR HEAD TAX	0	0	0	5,507,000
587158	Oper TR IN-FR COMMERCIAL PARKING TAX	0	0	3,662,000	8,872,000
587159	Oper TR IN-FR LEVY LID LIFT	0	0	36,216,000	38,552,000
587310	Oper TR IN-FR PARKING PAY STATIONS	9,002,144	0	0	0
587316	Oper TR IN-FR LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (SLU)	0	0	15,700,000	0
587316	Oper TR IN-FR Transport Bond F	185,671	0	0	0
587331	Oper TR IN-FR PARK	65,775	0	0	0
	RENOVATION/IMPROV				
587336	Oper TR IN-FR Open Space & TRA	43,671	0	0	0
587338	Oper TR IN-FR 2000 Parks Levy	1,274,101	783,000	294,000	2,616,000
587348	Oper TR IN-FR 2003 LTGO Alaskn	627,800	0	0	0
587349	Oper TR IN-FR GP BOND ISSUE	0	0	0	30,000,000
587410	Oper TR IN-FR SEATTLE CITY LIGHT FUND	0	0	351,500	530,000
587624	Oper TR IN-FR GEN TRUST FUND	54,485	0	0	0

## 2007 - 2008 Estimated Revenues for the Transportation Operating Fund

Summit Code	Source	2005 Actuals	2006 Adopted	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
587630	Oper TR IN-FR 2001 SLU CFB FUND	0	0	290,583	0
587640	Oper TR IN-FR 2002 W SEATTLE SWING BR CFB FUND	0	0	111,006	0
587650	Oper TR IN-FR 2002 UNIVERSITY AVE L&S CFB FUND	0	0	670,446	0
587760	Oper TR IN-FR 2002B LTGO SDOT IMP BOND FUND	0	0	468,862	0
587830	Oper TR IN-FR 2003 LTGO SR519 BOND FUND	0	0	113,431	0
587840	Oper TR IN-FR 2003 LTGO AWV/SEAWALL BOND FUND	0	0	236,390	0
587900	Oper TR IN-FR CDBG	0	0	0	200,000
Tota	l Revenues	134,648,061	174,625,440	196,781,289	323,168,837
379100	Contribution to Cash Decrease/(Increase)	(1,153,847)	2,502,894	(3,237,467)	(3,338,411)
Tota	l Resources	133,494,214	177,128,334	193,543,822	319,830,426

### **Transportation Operating Fund**

	2005 Actuals	2006 Adopted	2006 Revised	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	9,478,596	3,130,409	10,634,993	7,187,324	10,424,791
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	2,550	0	0	0	0
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	134,648,061	174,625,440	176,024,167	196,781,289	323,168,837
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	133,494,214	177,128,334	179,471,836	193,543,822	319,830,426
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	10,634,993	627,515	7,187,324	10,424,791	13,763,202
Continuing Appropriations	18,117,142		18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
<b>Total Reserves</b>	18,117,142	0	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Ending Unreserved Fund Balance	(7,482,149)	627,515	(10,812,676)	(7,575,209)	(4,236,798)

Note: A large portion of the Continuing Appropriations Reserve shown above will be funded by revenues from other City departments, other governments, and private entities. These revenues will be received in future years, but are not reflected in the revenue forecasts for 2006 through 2008.

### **Capital Improvement Program Highlights**

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) is responsible for maintaining, upgrading, and monitoring the use of the City's system of streets, bridges, retaining walls, seawalls, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and traffic control devices. SDOT's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) outlines the Department's plan for repairing. improving, and adding to this extensive infrastructure. The CIP is financed from a variety of revenue sources that include the City's General and Cumulative Reserve Subfunds, state gas tax revenues, state and federal grants, Public Works Trust Fund loans, partnerships with private organizations and other public agencies, and bond proceeds.

The 2007-2012 Proposed CIP includes such key projects as preliminary engineering for the replacement of the Magnolia Bridge; environmental, design, and permitting work for the replacement of the Alaskan Way Viaduct/Seawall; construction on the approaches to the Fremont Bridge and related improvements; City support of Sound Transit Projects; design and construction of the South Lake Union Streetcar; and continued major maintenance and paving of the City's arterial and non-arterial streets.

Most capital appropriations for SDOT are included within the Budget Control Level (BCL) appropriations displayed at the start of this chapter. These appropriations are funded by a variety of revenue sources, most of which do not require separate authority to be transferred to the Transportation Operating Fund (TOF). Revenue sources which do require separate authority to transfer to the TOF include the Cumulative Reserve Subfund (commonly referred to as the CRF), Limited Tax General Obligation Bond (LTGO) proceeds, and Local Improvement District (LID) assessment proceeds. Table 1 below authorizes those transfers for the CRF and the dollars so transferred to the TOF may be expended only for the programs shown in the table. (See the informational Table 4 on the following page titled "2007-2008 Proposed SDOT Cumulative Reserve Subfund Programs Detail" for a list of the specific CRF-funded projects by program.)

The Debt Service Program is the exception to having most capital appropriations in the SDOT BCLs and requires a separate appropriation. Funding for debt service from the CRF is not included within the SDOT BCLs and is appropriated below in Table 2. (See Table 4 and the 2007-2012 Proposed CIP project, Debt Service – CRF, for specific projects for which the CRF is being used to pay debt service).

Table 3 authorizes the transfers of LTGO bond proceeds and Local Improvement District (LID) assessment proceeds to the TOF. These dollars may be expended only for the projects shown in that table below.

The last table titled "Capital Improvement Budget Control Level Outlay" shows that portion of the various SDOT appropriations that represent the Department's CIP outlays. Consistent with RCW 35.32A.080, if any portion of these outlays remains unexpended or unencumbered at the close of the fiscal year, that portion shall be held available for the following year, except if abandoned by the City Council by ordinance. A detailed list of all programs and projects in SDOT's CIP can be found in the 2007-2012 Proposed Capital Improvement Program document.

#### **Capital Improvement Program**

Table 1: Cumulative Reserve Subfund Transfers to the Transportation Operating Fund

Programs Bridges & Structures Program: 19001A	2007 Proposed	2008 Endorsed
Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal	2,023,000 <b>2,023,000</b>	1,913,000 <b>1,913,000</b>
Corridor & Intersection Improvements Program: 19003A		
Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount	3,004,000	121,000
Subtotal	3,004,000	121,000

## **Capital Improvement Program Highlights**

Programs Landslide Mitigation Program: 19001B Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program: 19002B Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program: 19002B Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003D Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003D Subtotal  Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal	2008
Landslide Mitigation Program: 19001B  Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Cumulative Reserve Subfund - Street Vacation Subaccount Subtotal  Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program: 19002B  Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003D  Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003D  Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  823,000 13	
Cumulative Reserve Subfund - Street Vacation Subaccount Subtotal  Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program: 19002B Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003D Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  823,000 13	
Subtotal200,000200Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program: 19002B Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal209,000Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003D Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal823,0001Subtotal823,0001	0,000
Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program: 19002B  Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003D  Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  823,000 13	0
Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003D Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal  823,000 13	),000
Subtotal209,000Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003DCumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount823,0001Subtotal823,0001	
Neighborhood Enhancements Program: 19003D  Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount Subtotal 823,000 1 323,000 1	0
Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount823,0001Subtotal823,0001	0
Subtotal 823,000 13	
	3,000
	3,000
New Trails and Bike Paths Program: 19003E	
	1,000
Subtotal 1,766,000 1,977	1,000
Roads Program: 19001C	
	4,000
Subtotal 2,285,000 1,984	1,000
Sidewalk & Pedestrian Facilities Program: 19003F	
	4,000
Subtotal 800,000 464	1,000
Sidewalk Maintenance Program: 19001D	
	0,000
Subtotal 341,000 350	),000
Trails and Bike Paths Program: 19001F	
Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount 340,000	0
Subtotal 340,000	0
Transit & HOV Program: 19003G	
Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II Subaccount 130,000	0
Subtotal 130,000	0
Table 2: Cumulative Reserve Subfund Appropriations	
Debt Service Program - CRF: 18002D	
	4,000
Subtotal 2,361,000 2,794	1,000
Total Cumulative Reserve Subfund 14,282,000 9,810	,000

Table 3: Bond & Local Improvement District Fund Transfers to the Transportation Operating Fund

	2007 Proposed	2008 Endorsed
Alaskan Way Tunnel & Seawall Study Project : TC366050		
2007 Multipurpose LTGO Bond	2,920,000	1,082,000
Subtotal	2,920,000	1,082,000
Fremont Bridge Approaches and Electrical Major Maintenance: TC365790		
2001 LTGO Bond	291,000	0
2002B LTGO Bond	1,250,000	0
2003 LTGO Bond	350,000	0
2008 Multipurpose LTGO Bond	0	4,134,000
Subtotal	1,891,000	4,134,000
King Street Station Multimodal Terminal Project: TC366810		
Transportation Funding Package Bonds	0	5,000,000
Subtotal	0	5,000,000
Mercer Corridor Project: TC365500		
Transportation Funding Package Bonds	0	15,000,000
Subtotal	0	15,000,000
Pay Station Project: TC366350		
2007 Multipurpose LTGO Bond	3,400,000	0
Subtotal	3,400,000	0
South Lake Union Streetcar: TC366260		
Local Improvement District Fund	15,700,000	0
Subtotal	15,700,000	0
South Lander Street Grade Separation Project: TC366150		
Transportation Funding Package Bonds	0	5,000,000
Subtotal	0	5,000,000
Spokane Street Viaduct Project: TC364800		
Transportation Funding Package Bonds	0	5,000,000
Subtotal	0	5,000,000
Total David Duogoods	22 011 000	25 216 000
Total Bond Proceeds	23,911,000	35,216,000

Table 4: 2007- 2008 Proposed SDOT Cumulative Reserve Subfund Program Detail (in \$1,000s)

\*Infomational Only\*\*

			2008
Project #	Program - Project Detail	2007	
1 1 0 <b>,000</b>	110grunn 110grunn	Proposed	_
	Bridges & Structure Program (19001A)	•	
TG2 : 7000			25/
TC365980	12th Ave S - Jose Rizal Bridge Deck Repair	650	350
TC324900	Bridge Painting Program	650	
TC365810	Bridge Seismic Retrofit Phase II	75	
TC365790	Fremont Bridge Approaches	423	
TC365480	Hazard Mitigation Program - Areaways	200	
TC365890	Retaining Wall Repair and Replacement Program	400	
TC366590	Stairway Rehabilitation	275	
	Subtotal - Bridges & Structures Program (19001A)	\$ 2,023	\$ 1,913
	Corridor & Intersection Improvements Program (19003A)		
TC366220	14th Ave S Street Improvements	500	)
TC366380	Greenwood Avenue North		- 121
TC366830	NE Northgate Way Intersection and Pedestrian Improvements	1,200	)
TC365020	SR-519	1,304	1
	Subtotal -Corridor & Intersection Improvements Program (19003A)	\$ 3,004	\$ 121
	Debt Service Program - CRF (18002D)		
TC320060	Alaskan Way Tunnel - debt service	860	1,293
TC320060	Bridge Way North and Fremont Circulation - debt service	278	3 277
TC320060	Fremont Bridge Approaches - debt service	112	2 109
TC320060	Mercer Corridor - debt service	460	5 471
TC320060	SR-519 - debt service	645	
	Subtotal -Debt Service Program - CRF (18002D)	\$ 2,361	
	Landslide Mitigation Program (19001B)		
TC365510	Hazard Mitigation Program - Landslide Mitigation	200	200
	Subtotal -Landslide Mitigation Program (19001B)	\$ 200	
	Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program (19002A)		
TC366060	Magnolia Bridge Replacement	209	
	Subtotal - Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program (19002A)		
	Neighborhood Enhancements Program (19003D)		
TC366230	5th Avenue NE Improvements	25	13
TC365770	NSF/CRF Neighborhood Program	798	
	Subtotal - Neighborhood Enhancements Program (19003D)		

2007- 2008 Proposed SDOT Cumulative Reserve Subfund Program Detail (in \$1,000s) (cont.)

Project #	Program - Project Detail	Pı	2007 roposed	2008 roposed ndorsed
	New Trails and Bike Paths Program (19003E)			
TC366210	Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas St.		_	1,971
TC364830	Burke-Gilman Trail Extension		1,548	-
TC365690	Chief Sealth Trail		57	-
TC327000	Lake Union Ship Canal Trail		161	-
	Subtotal - New Trails and Bike Paths Program (19003E)	\$	1,766	\$ 1,971
	Roads Program (19001C)			
TC365440	Arterial Asphalt and Concrete ProgramPaving		1,382	936
TC365940	Arterial Major MaintenancePaving		683	828
TC323920	Non-Arterial Asphalt Street Resurfacing		167	167
TC323160	Non-Arterial Concrete Rehabilitation		53	53
	Subtotal - Roads Program (19001C)	\$	2,285	\$ 1,984
	Sidewalk Maintenance Program (19002A)			
TC323140	Pedestrian/Elderly Handicapped Accessibility		500	264
TC366480	Sidewalk Development Program		200	-
TC366450	Pedestrian Lighting Program		100	200
	Subtotal - Sidewalk Maintenance Program (19002A)	\$	800	\$ 464
	Sidewalk Pedestrian Facilities Program (19003F)			
TC365120	Sidewalk Safety Repair		341	350
	Subtotal - Sidewalk Pedestrian Facilities Program (19003F)	\$	341	\$ 350
	Trails and Bike Paths Program (19001F)			
TC322290	Bike Spot Safety		340	_
	Subtotal - Trails and Bike Paths Program (19001F)	\$	340	\$ -
	Transit & HOV Program (19003G)			
TC366250	Aurora Transit, Pedestrian and Safety Improvements		130	-
	Subtotal - Transit & HOV Program (19003G)	\$	130	\$ 
	CRF Total	\$	14,282	\$ 9,810

NOTE: All dollars are REET II unless otherwise noted

## **Transportation Operating Fund**

## **Capital Improvement Budget Control Level Outlay**

	2007	2008
<b>Budget Control Level</b>	Proposed	<b>Endorsed</b>
Major Maintenance/Replacement	34,483,000	58,791,000
Major Projects	15,019,000	106,132,000
Mobility-Capital	48,512,000	55,792,000
Subtotal	98,014,000	220,715,000
Total Capital Improvement Program Outlay	98,014,000	220,715, 000

## **Seattle Public Utilities**

## **Chuck Clarke, Director**

#### **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-3000

City of Seattle General Information: (206) 684-2489 TTY: (206) 615-0476

On the Web at: http://www.seattle.gov/util/

## **Department Description**

Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) is composed of three major direct-service providing utilities: the Water Utility, the Drainage & Wastewater Utility, and the Solid Waste Utility. The Water Utility provides more than 1.3 million customers in King County with a reliable water supply; the Drainage & Wastewater Utility collects and disposes of sewage and stormwater; and the Solid Waste Utility collects and processes recycling and yard waste, and collects and disposes of residential and commercial garbage. All three utilities strive to operate in a cost-effective, innovative and environmentally responsible manner. SPU also houses the Engineering Services line of business, serving both City departments and outside agencies by providing efficient, customer-oriented engineering services that assist clients with replacing, improving, and expanding facilities with the least possible disruption to the community.

## **Proposed Policy and Program Changes**

SPU's 2007-2008 Proposed Budget continues to provide funding for services benefiting customers in a variety of ways while also achieving new efficiencies. Investments in basic infrastructure and operations will enable SPU to provide reliable and high-quality water to customers, manage stormwater and wastewater properly, and provide the residents of Seattle with sufficient recycling and solid waste services for the next 30 years.

The Proposed Budget reflects the completion of SPU's reorganization, which saw the creation of several new programs and the consolidation of others in an effort to achieve greater efficiency and accountability. Both operating and capital budget structures have been altered accordingly, and this document reflects the new structure, re-casting 2005 and 2006 amounts as though they had been budgeted under the new structure.

SPU is continuing its asset management approach for selecting what capital projects to build and when. The utility is also in the process of applying asset management to its operating budget and programs in order to achieve efficiencies there. This triple bottom line approach includes evaluation of projects and procedures on their economic, social and environmental benefits and their ability to meet customer service levels. The approach provides an elaborate analytical and modeling framework to find the most economical balance between capital investments and operation and maintenance expenditures to minimize life cycle costs of any facility.

The Water Utility's 2007-2008 Proposed Budget and 2007-2012 Proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) reflect the continued application of asset management business practices in water infrastructure renewal and replacement decisions. As a result, nearly \$10 million in low priority water pipeline replacement and pressure improvement work has been canceled. The biggest addition to the CIP is utility relocation work supporting the Alaska Way Tunnel and Seawall project, which is being separately budgeted for the first time. In addition, SPU is continuing the reservoir undergrounding program and expanding the water pipe worker apprenticeship program by eight positions to fill the rising need for trained SPU staff. The budget and CIP are supported through 2008 by water rates enacted earlier in 2006.

The Drainage & Wastewater 2007-2008 Proposed Budget and 2007-2012 Proposed CIP provide for continued implementation of the City's Comprehensive Drainage Plan. This includes continued investments in flood control and landslide protection; improvements to storm water quality and protection of Seattle's aquatic

## **SPU**

resources; and more efficient maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement of the City's drainage and sewer systems. As with water, the largest drainage and wastewater CIP addition in 2007 involves utility relocations necessitated by the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall project. The budget and CIP are in turn supported by the proposed 2007 drainage rates, as well as accompanying wastewater passthrough legislation to reflect higher King County treatment costs. For 2008 and later, a revised and expanded system of drainage rates will be proposed, and this budget provides for database and program development work toward that end.

The Solid Waste Utility's 2007-2008 Proposed Budget and 2007-2012 Proposed CIP fund implementation of the Solid Waste Facilities Master Plan, which seeks to improve the City's transfer stations and develop an intermodal facility in partnership with neighboring jurisdictions. (Note - the intermodal facility is subject to a proviso pending further Council discussion). The budget also includes funds to continue implementation of the 60% recycling initiative and significant adds to the Clean Cities program, which, among other initiatives, will seek to remove graffiti from publicly owned structures within 48 hours of a call to the graffiti hotline.

One note about the program summary statements that follow: For operating programs and budget control levels, the descriptions identify 2007 changes relative to the 2006 Adopted budget. For capital budget control levels, the descriptions identify 2007 changes relative to the amounts shown for 2007 in the 2006-2011 Adopted CIP.

					SPU
	Summit	2005	2006	2007	2008
Appropriations <u>Drainage &amp; Wastewater Utility</u>	Code	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Administration Budget Control Lev	vel				
Administration		6,930,249	7,128,316	7,287,997	7,441,490
General and Administrative Credit		(4,569,406)	(4,700,000)	(4,795,027)	(4,623,517)
Administration Budget Control Level	N100B-DW	2,360,843	2,428,316	2,492,970	2,817,973
Control Structures Budget Control Level	C310B	3,330,379	3,281,000	6,995,000	5,308,000
Customer Service Budget Control Level	N300B-DW	6,913,950	7,111,551	6,636,422	7,132,261
General Expense Budget Control L	evel				
Debt Service		23,908,285	24,591,585	24,873,522	26,543,997
Other General Expenses		94,368,796	97,065,862	108,192,210	108,610,749
Taxes		23,248,716	23,913,166	26,084,087	27,106,231
General Expense Budget Control Level	N000B-DW	141,525,798	145,570,613	159,149,819	162,260,977
Landslide Mitigation & Special Programs Budget Control Level	C335B	6,260,829	6,168,000	6,028,000	6,000,000
Low Impact Development Budget Control Level	C334B	3,387,222	3,337,000	4,022,000	4,370,000
Other Operating Budget Control L	evel				
Engineering Services		2,922,646	3,006,175	2,618,001	2,707,290
Field Operations		12,124,089	12,470,596	13,260,834	13,369,910
Science, Sustainability & Watersho	ed	3,489,121	3,588,840	4,342,854	4,504,276
Utility Systems Management		2,771,991	2,851,215	6,355,624	6,707,676
Other Operating Budget Control Level	N400B-DW	21,307,847	21,916,826	26,577,313	27,289,152
Protection of Beneficial Uses Budget Control Level	С333В	1,802,729	1,776,000	4,567,000	3,658,000
<b>Sediments Budget Control Level</b>	C350B	3,858,205	3,801,000	4,667,000	3,740,000
Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level	C410B-DW	7,131,742	7,026,000	11,973,000	31,596,000
Stormwater & Flood Control Budget Control Level	C332B	3,947,530	3,889,000	4,768,000	7,939,000

3,597,338

3,544,000

3,810,000

3,971,000

Technology Budget Control Level C510B-DW

					SPU
	Summit	2005	2006	2007	2008
Appropriations	Code	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Wastewater Conveyance Budget Control Level	C320B	9,108,045	8,973,000	8,841,000	7,971,000
Total Drainage & Wastewater Util	ity	214,532,456	218,822,306	250,527,523	274,053,363
<b>Engineering Services</b>					
Administration Budget Control Lev	vel				
Administration		3,488,860	2,903,384	2,841,958	2,877,085
General and Administrative Credit		(3,245,689)	(2,701,020)	(3,080,179)	(3,155,924)
Administration Budget Control Level	N100B-ES	243,171	202,364	(238,220)	(278,840)
General Expense Budget Control L	evel				
Other General Expenses		271,403	225,858	265,573	280,853
Taxes		0	0	2,000	2,000
General Expense Budget Control Level	N000B-ES	271,403	225,858	267,573	282,853
Other Operating Budget Control L	evel				
Engineering Services		7,022,789	5,844,274	7,773,654	7,774,927
Utility Systems Management		0	0	126,766	130,064
Other Operating Budget Control Level	N400B-ES	7,022,789	5,844,274	7,900,419	7,904,991
<b>Total Engineering Services</b>		7,537,364	6,272,496	7,929,772	7,909,004
Solid Waste Utility					
Administration Budget Control Lev	vel				
Administration		3,589,549	3,945,744	3,579,996	3,646,689
General and Administrative Credit		(1,157,673)	(1,272,550)	(1,120,000)	(1,149,000)
Administration Budget Control Level	N100B-SW	2,431,876	2,673,194	2,459,996	2,497,689
Customer Service Budget Control Level	N300B-SW	11,505,445	12,647,145	13,818,229	14,105,569
General Expense Budget Control L	evel				
Debt Service		7,390,114	8,123,445	8,743,965	9,856,258
Other General Expenses		62,033,293	68,188,936	67,559,062	69,516,333
Taxes		19,055,848	20,946,784	19,665,367	20,494,445
General Expense Budget Control Level	N000B-SW	88,479,255	97,259,165	95,968,394	99,867,036
New Facilities Budget Control Level*	C230B	4,857,888	8,561,000	14,354,000	43,371,000

<sup>\*</sup>None of the money appropriated for 2007 for Seattle Public Utilities' New Facilities Budget Control Level can be spent to acquire land for, design or construct an intermodal facility under the Facilities Master Plan project (ID: C204002) until authorized by ordinance.

## SPU

	Summit	2005	2006	2007	2008
Appropriations	Code	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Other Operating Budget Control L	evel				
Engineering Services		113,650	124,928	83,583	86,207
Field Operations		8,352,808	9,181,668	9,938,098	10,090,192
Science, Sustainability & Watersh	ed	543,152	597,050	724,831	732,222
Utility Systems Management		1,276,422	1,403,083	2,525,558	2,385,718
Other Operating Budget Control Level	N400B-SW	10,286,033	11,306,729	13,272,070	13,294,339
Rehabilitation and Heavy Equipment Budget Control Level	C240B	1,117,865	1,970,000	1,824,000	1,851,000
Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level	C400B-SW	464,737	819,000	876,000	226,000
<b>Technology Budget Control Level</b>	C500B-SW	677,528	1,194,000	1,569,000	1,226,000
<b>Total Solid Waste Utility</b>		119,820,626	136,430,233	144,141,689	176,438,633
Water Utility					
Administration Budget Control Lev	vel				
Administration		11,413,099	11,649,288	11,079,881	11,293,647
General and Administrative Credit	t	(8,092,724)	(8,260,200)	(8,466,000)	(8,678,000)
Administration Budget Control Level	N100B-WU	3,320,374	3,389,088	2,613,881	2,615,647
<b>Customer Service Budget Control</b> <b>Level</b>	N300B-WU	9,477,397	9,673,528	9,447,207	9,747,223
Distribution Budget Control Level	C110B	20,404,020	24,016,000	26,658,000	16,156,000
General Expense Budget Control L	evel				
Debt Service		60,773,798	62,031,486	59,291,000	63,591,000
Other General Expenses		8,545,927	8,722,781	13,728,085	14,069,496
Taxes		20,432,168	20,855,003	22,629,470	23,815,078
General Expense Budget Control Level	N000B-WU	89,751,892	91,609,270	95,648,555	101,475,574
Habitat Conservation Program Budget Control Level	C160B	4,590,395	5,403,000	11,565,000	8,820,000

C	DI I	ı
J	$\Gamma$ U	,

	Summit	2005	2006	2007	2008
Appropriations	Code	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Other Operating Budget Control L	evel				
Engineering Services		2,513,953	2,565,978	3,142,178	3,188,654
Field Operations		15,029,218	15,340,241	16,927,569	17,556,748
Science, Sustainability & Watersh	ed	9,543,605	9,741,106	10,151,075	10,368,648
<b>Utility Systems Management</b>		10,490,130	10,707,219	8,731,428	8,846,715
Other Operating Budget Control Level	N400B-WU	37,576,906	38,354,544	38,952,250	39,960,765
Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level	C410B-WU	15,648,803	18,419,000	19,052,000	15,756,000
<b>Technology Budget Control Level</b>	C510B-WU	3,563,227	4,194,000	5,721,000	6,087,000
Transmission Budget Control Leve	l C120B	1,338,122	1,575,000	1,574,000	1,066,000
Water Quality & Treatment Budget Control Level	C140B	10,034,639	11,811,000	26,680,000	16,296,000
Water Resources Budget Control Level	C150B	6,050,009	7,121,000	9,966,000	8,155,000
Watershed Stewardship Budget Control Level	C130B	3,586,166	4,221,000	8,751,000	3,972,000
Total Water Utility		205,341,950	219,786,430	256,628,893	230,107,209
Department Total		547,232,396	581,311,465	659,227,877	688,508,209
Department Full-time Equivalents  * FTE totals are provided for informational purpoutside of the budget process may not be detailed	ooses only. Change	<b>1,399.40</b> s in FTEs resulting	<b>1,402.40</b> from City Council o	<b>1,446.06</b> r Personnel Directo	<b>1,452.56</b> r actions

outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Resources	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
General Subfund	2,210,376	2,404,535	1,298,925	1,313,937
Other	545,022,020	578,906,930	657,928,952	687,194,272
Department Total	547,232,396	581,311,465	659,227,877	688,508,209

## **Drainage & Wastewater Utility**

## **Administration Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Administration Budget Control Level is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and more specifically, for the Drainage and Wastewater Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
-	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Administration	6,930,249	7,128,316	7,287,997	7,441,490
General and Administrative Credit	-4,569,406	-4,700,000	-4,795,027	-4,623,517
Total	2,360,843	2,428,316	2,492,970	2,817,973
Full-time Equivalents Total *	61.73	61.73	61.23	61.23

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Administration: Administration Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Administration program is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and more specifically, for the Drainage and Wastewater Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department.

## **Program Summary**

Transfer 0.5 FTE General Government Strategic Advisor 1 to the Office of Sustainability per a Memorandum of Agreement for work on common environmental initiatives.

Decrease \$100,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$260,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$160,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Administration	6,930,249	7,128,316	7,287,997	7,441,490
Full-time Equivalents Total*	61.73	61.73	61.23	61.23

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Administration: General and Administrative Credit Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility General and Administrative Credit program is to eliminate double-budgeting related to implementation of capital projects and equipment depreciation.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Adopted Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
General and Administrative Credit	-4,569,406	-4,700,000	-4,795,027	-4,623,517

## Control Structures Budget Control Level

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Control Structures Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by wastewater revenues, is to design and construct facilities to control overflows from the combined sewer system.

#### **Summary**

The Control Structures Budget Control Level was formerly called Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs). Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. Control Structures now encompasses work related to combined sewer overflows and pump stations. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$2 million net increase to this BCL. An additional \$1.4 million in programmatic increases is proposed. Among the highlights:

- -- Three large CSO Control projects -- Windermere, Genesee, and Henderson -- will move forward through project development and preliminary engineering in 2007.
- -- The CSO Facility Retrofit project will continue to make minor improvements to facilities to provide more accurate analysis and more cost-effective design.
- -- Several small projects will be started in 2007 to comply with conditions of Seattle's revised National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) CSO Permit.
- -- The CSO-Wastewater System Monitoring project is moved to the SCADA business area within the Shared Costs BCL.
- -- The recent Force Main/Pump Stations Plan has resulted in the development of two programs to rehabilitate these aging facilities over time. The Pump Station Improvements and Force Main Improvements programs will each consist of many small projects that will be carried out largely by SPU personnel.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Control Structures	3,330,379	3,281,000	6,995,000	5,308,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	24.55	24.55	24.55	24.55

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## <u>Customer Service Budget Control Level</u>

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Customer Service Budget Control Level is to provide exceptional customer service in the direct delivery of essential programs and services that anticipate and fully respond to customer expectations.

#### **Summary**

Provide \$84,000 and 1.0 FTE Senior Management Systems Analyst to upgrade the drainage billing data management system as part of drainage rate reform.

Decrease \$788,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$229,000 for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$475,000.

Notable increases for 2008 include \$605,000 for education, outreach and customer support for the drainage rate reforms slated to begin that year.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Customer Service	6,913,950	7,111,551	6,636,422	7,132,261
Full-time Equivalents Total*	57.33	57.33	58.33	58.33

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **General Expense Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility General Expense Budget Control Level is to appropriate funds to pay the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's general expenses.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Debt Service	23,908,285	24,591,585	24,873,522	26,543,997
Other General Expenses	94,368,796	97,065,862	108,192,210	108,610,749
Taxes	23,248,716	23,913,166	26,084,087	27,106,231
Total	141,525,798	145,570,613	159,149,819	162,260,977
Full-time Equivalents Total *	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## General Expense: Debt Service Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Debt Service program is to provide appropriation for debt service on Drainage and Wastewater Utility bonds.

#### **Program Summary**

Provide \$282,000 to reflect SPU's estimate of 2007 debt service.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Debt Service	23.908.285	24,591,585	24.873.522	26,543,997

## **General Expense: Other General Expenses Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Other General Expenses program is to appropriate funds for payment to King County Metro for sewage treatment, and the Drainage and Wastewater Fund's share of City central costs, claims, and other general expenses.

## **Program Summary**

Provide \$8.4 million for increased King County wastewater treatment costs.

Provide \$86,000 to pay King County for increased drainage billing administration costs.

This program saw a space rent increase of \$1.9 million. Other citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, increase the budget by \$1.1 million for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$11.1 million.

All amounts are shown in SPU's new, reorganized structure. Amounts for 2005 are estimates.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Other General Expenses	94,368,796	97,065,862	108,192,210	108,610,749
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## General Expense: Taxes Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Taxes program is to provide appropriation for payment of city and state taxes.

## **Program Summary**

Provide \$2.2 million to reflect SPU's estimate of 2007 taxes.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Taxes	23,248,716	23,913,166	26,084,087	27,106,231

## **Landslide Mitigation & Special Programs Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Landslide Mitigation & Special Programs Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage and wastewater revenue, is to protect SPU drainage and wastewater infrastructure from landslides, provide drainage improvements where surface water generated from the city right-of-way is contributing to landslides, and manage stormwater policy and grants, interdepartmental coordination and programs, and citizen response activities.

#### Summary

The Landslide Mitigation and Special Programs Budget Control Level was formerly called Public Asset Protection. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area for this BCL is also called landslide mitigation and special programs. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$4.4 million net increase to this BCL. An additional \$1.5 million in programmatic decreases is proposed. Among the highlights:

- -- The Burke Gilman/N.E. 144th St. project will be completed in 2006, ahead of schedule.
- -- The 47th St. S.W. & S.W. Maplewood Pl. Landslide and 1500-2600 Aurora Ave. N. Landslide projects have been deferred until 2008.
- -- The drainage portion of the Other Agency Opportunity project is reduced for 2007 and 2008 because candidate projects have not been identified for this time period.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Landslide Mitigation & Special Programs	6,260,829	6,168,000	6,028,000	6,000,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Low Impact Development Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Low Impact Development Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage revenues, is to develop multiple functionality stormwater facilities for achieving the primary goals of flood protection, surface water quality improvement and/or habitat enhancement.

#### **Summary**

The Low-Impact Development Budget Control Level was formerly called Other Drainage CIP. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area for this BCL is also called low-impact development. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$614,000 net decrease net to this BCL. An additional \$420,000 in programmatic decreases is proposed. Among the highlights:

- -- Spending on the Venema Creek project is reduced in 2007-2008 to reflect a later construction schedule.
- -- A Capital Planning project for this BCL is added.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Low Impact Development	3,387,222	3,337,000	4,022,000	4,370,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.81	7.81	7.81	7.81

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Other Operating Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Other Operating Budget Control Level is to fund the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's operating expenses for Engineering Services, Field Operations, Science, Sustainability & Watersheds and Utility Systems Management programs.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Engineering Services	2,922,646	3,006,175	2,618,001	2,707,290
Field Operations	12,124,089	12,470,596	13,260,834	13,369,910
Science, Sustainability & Watershed	3,489,121	3,588,840	4,342,854	4,504,276
Utility Systems Management	2,771,991	2,851,215	6,355,624	6,707,676
Total	21,307,847	21,916,826	26,577,313	27,289,152
Full-time Equivalents Total *	189.08	189.08	198.58	199.58

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Other Operating: Engineering Services Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Engineering Services program is to provide engineering design and support services, construction inspection, and project management services to Drainage and Wastewater Utility's capital improvement projects and to the managers of drainage and wastewater facilities.

## **Program Summary**

Decrease \$492,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

This program saw a space rent increase of \$2,000. Other citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, increase the budget by \$101,000 for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$388,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Engineering Services	2,922,646	3,006,175	2,618,001	2,707,290
Full-time Equivalents Total*	24.91	24.91	24.91	24.91

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Other Operating: Field Operations Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Field Operations program is to operate and maintain drainage and wastewater infrastructure that protects the public's health, and protects and improves the environment.

#### **Program Summary**

Provide \$100,000 and 1.0 FTE Senior Management Systems Analyst to improve automated scheduling of work orders for wastewater pipe maintenance.

Provide \$123,000 for landscape maintenance on previously completed drainage and wastewater projects.

Provide \$133,000 and 1.0 FTE Senior Gardener to conduct channel and landscape maintenance on natural drainage systems projects.

Provide \$308,000 to establish and operate a drainage and wastewater apprenticeship program.

Decrease \$278,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$404,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$790,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Field Operations	12,124,089	12,470,596	13,260,834	13,369,910
Full-time Equivalents Total*	94.18	94.18	96.18	96.18

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Other Operating: Science, Sustainability & Watershed Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Science, Sustainability & Watersheds program is to ensure SPU's investments, operations, services and programs are scientifically sound, promote environmental sustainability and provide stewardship of watersheds and aquatic resources.

#### **Program Summary**

Provide \$20,000 for the Drainage and Wastewater share of Climate Protection efforts to implement recommendations from a greenhouse gas inventory study.

Provide \$154,000 and 1.5 FTE Associate Civil Engineering Specialist for greater inspection efforts and an improved illicit connections program in anticipation of NPDES permit requirements.

Provide \$200,000 of General Fund and 1.0 FTE Senior Planning and Development Specialist for work on Restore Our Waters and technical assistance on aquatic habitat grants.

Increase \$257,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$122,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$754,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Science, Sustainability & Watershed	3,489,121	3,588,840	4,342,854	4,504,276
Full-time Equivalents Total*	27.86	27.86	30.36	31.36

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Other Operating: Utility Systems Management Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's Utility Systems Management program is to ensure that each SPU utility system and associated assets are properly planned, developed, operated and maintained and that asset management principles and practices are applied to achieve established customer and environmental service levels at the lowest life cycle cost.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$172,000 to improve automated scheduling of work orders for wastewater pipe maintenance.

Add 1.0 FTE Utility Manager 2 to be the landslides business area manager, coordinating landslide work with external agencies and within SPU.

Provide \$477,000 and 1.0 FTE Senior Civil Engineering Specialist to implement and document a pollution prevention program per state NPDES permit requirements and extend the Geotivity data system contract while the new Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system is being phased in.

Provide \$205,000 for consultant work on a variety of efforts, including the wastewater systems plan, strategic asset management plans, condition assessment, risk management and maintenance strategies.

Provide \$51,000 and 1.0 FTE Utility Manager 3 for maintenance and further development of the SCADA control system, with salary to be split between capital and operating budgets.

Provide \$256,000 and 1.0 FTE Senior Civil Engineer to provide engineering support on several initiatives, including demand management, revision of the stormwater code, and the Green Building Team. This includes, as part of drainage rate reform, one-time money to develop rate- and non-rate incentives for customers to manage stormwater on their properties.

Provide \$205,000 and 1.0 FTE Senior Environmental Analyst to develop a water quality monitoring program in anticipation of NPDES permit requirements.

Increase \$2 million for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$97,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$3.5 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Utility Systems Management	2,771,991	2,851,215	6,355,624	6,707,676
Full-time Equivalents Total*	42.13	42.13	47.13	47.13

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## <u>Protection of Beneficial Uses Budget Control Level</u>

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Protection of Beneficial Uses Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage revenues, is to make improvements to the City's drainage system to reduce the harmful effects of stormwater runoff on creeks and receiving waters by improving water quality and protecting or enhancing habitat.

#### **Summary**

Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area associated with this BCL is also called protection of beneficial uses. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$684,000 net decrease to this BCL. An additional \$746,000 in programmatic decreases is proposed. Among the highlights:

- -- The Combined System Overflow Wastewater System Monitoring project is moved to the SCADA business area within the Shared Costs BCL.
- -- The Sound Transit IDP project is moved to the Major Interagency Projects business area within the Shared Costs BCL.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Protection of Beneficial Uses	1,802,729	1,776,000	4,567,000	3,658,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	14.47	14.47	14.47	14.47

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Sediments Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Sediments Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage and wastewater revenues, is to restore and rehabilitate natural resources in or along Seattle's waterways.

## Summary

This budget control level was formerly called Habitats and Sediments. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area associated with this BCL is also called sediments. About \$829,000 in programmatic decreases is proposed, as Superfund-type projects and discussions with regulators and other parties are moving slower than planned.

Adds 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, General Government for sediments-related CIP work.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Sediments	3,858,205	3,801,000	4,667,000	3,740,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.72	5.72	6.72	6.72

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level, a Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program, is to implement the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's share of capital improvement projects that receive funding from multiple SPU funds benefiting the Utility.

## Summary

Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The Shared Cost Projects budget control level is associated with security and emergency response, fleets, facilities, major interagency projects, and the SCADA system. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$1.6 million net increase to this BCL. An additional \$7.8 million in programmatic increases is proposed. Among the highlights:

- -- \$3.3 million in funding and 6.0 FTEs are added for utility relocation due to the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall project. New positions include two Strategic Advisor 2, Utilities (0.5 FTE each), four Senior Civil Engineers (0.5 FTE each), one Associate Civil Engineers (0.5 FTE), one Senior Management Systems Analyst (0.5 FTE), one Assistant Management Systems Analyst (0.5 FTE), one Senior Financial Analyst (0.5 FTE), and one Senior Environmental analyst (1.0 FTE).
- -- Funding for additional phases of Sound Transit-related work is added.
- -- Funding for review and utility planning analysis of three new Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) projects is added.
- -- Funding for several additional new facilities improvement projects is added.
- -- The Combined System Overflow (CSO) Wastewater Monitoring project is increased as part of a major department-wide SCADA initiative. This project will provide the infrastructure for SPU to eventually take over and improve the CSO compliance monitoring to meet the conditions of the revised NPDES CSO Permit. This work is currently done by a vendor.
- -- The Facility Security Upgrades DRN and Facility Security Upgrades WW projects are added as part of the Security program.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Shared Cost Projects	7,131,742	7,026,000	11,973,000	31,596,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	28.84	28.84	34.84	39.34

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Stormwater & Flood Control Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Stormwater & Flood Control Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage revenues, is to make improvements to the City's drainage system to alleviate and prevent flooding in Seattle, with a primary focus on the protection of public health, safety and property.

#### **Summary**

The Stormwater and Flood Control Budget Control Level was formerly called Flood Control and Local Drainage. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area for this BCL is also called stormwater and flood control. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$3.9 million net decrease to this BCL. An additional \$4.1 million in programmatic decreases is proposed. Among the highlights:

- -- Several projects moved to other business areas, including Low Impact Development and Landslide Mitigation & Special Programs.
- -- Two top priority projects, MLK Way/Norfolk St. Storm Improvements and the 4th Ave. South/South Trenton Storm Drain, are ramping up in 2007-2008.
- -- The Madison Valley Long Term Solution project has been added.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Stormwater & Flood Control	3,947,530	3,889,000	4,768,000	7,939,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	21.46	21.46	21.46	21.46

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Technology Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Technology Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program, is to make use of recent technology advances to increase the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's efficiency and productivity.

#### **Summary**

Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The Technology Budget Control Level was reorganized internally to structure the budget around the problem being solved, rather than the internal customer, in order to gain synergies and economies of scale. About \$1.3 million in programmatic increases is proposed, including rate reform work on a new drainage billing system that will support more nuanced drainage rates and more frequently updated data.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Technology	3,597,338	3,544,000	3,810,000	3,971,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.76	12.76	12.76	12.76

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Wastewater Conveyance Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Wastewater Conveyance Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by wastewater revenues, is to improve the effectiveness of the City's wastewater system.

#### **Summary**

The Wastewater Conveyance Budget Control Level is a combination of the former Sewer Rehabilitation BCL and General Wastewater BCL. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. This BCL is associated with the capacity improvements and sewer rehabilitation business areas. About \$1.5 million in programmatic decreases is proposed. Among the highlights:

- -- The Other Agency Opportunity WW project is reduced for 2007 and 2008 because candidate projects have not been identified for this time period.
- -- Major construction on the Lakewood Raincatcher Pilot project is expected to be completed in 2007.
- -- The Sanitary Sewer Overflow Capacity program addresses capacity constraints in the sewer system that can result in sewer backups and overflows.
- -- The Sewage System Modeling project constructs a system-wide network model of the sewer system to aid in understanding the entire system and meet water resource challenges effectively and efficiently.
- -- The No Dig Pipe & Maintenance Rehabilitation program reduces the risk to critical pipes by lining them at low cost to extend their useful life.
- -- The Point Sewer Pipe Rehabilitation Crews program is reduced to a level that can be staffed and operated more easily.
- -- The Point Sewer Pipe Rehabilitation Contract program is reduced so that SPU can further analyze risks and cost effectiveness and establish priorities before proceeding with additional projects.
- -- The Wastewater Rehabilitation Evaluation program is increased to more effectively analyze the risks and alternatives associated with failing pipes. The program uses new inspection techniques and analytical tools to reduce life cycle costs of owning and operating the wastewater system.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Wastewater Conveyance	9,108,045	8,973,000	8,841,000	7,971,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	22.25	22.25	22.25	22.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Engineering Services**

## **Administration Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Engineering Services Administration Budget Control Level is to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to Seattle Public Utilities, and, more specifically, to the Engineering Services Fund.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Administration	3,488,860	2,903,384	2,841,958	2,877,085
General and Administrative Credit	-3,245,689	-2,701,020	-3,080,179	-3,155,924
Total	243,171	202,364	-238,220	-278,840
Full-time Equivalents Total *	22.10	22.10	22.10	22.10

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Administration: Administration Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Engineering Services Administration program is to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department, and, more specifically, to the Engineering Services Fund.

## **Program Summary**

Decrease \$176,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$114,000 for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$62,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Administration	3,488,860	2,903,384	2,841,958	2,877,085
Full-time Equivalents Total*	22.10	22.10	22.10	22.10

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Administration: General and Administrative Credit Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Engineering Services General and Administrative Credit program is to eliminate double-budgeting related to implementation of capital projects.

## **Program Summary**

Decrease \$314,000 to reflect SPU's forecast of General and Administrative credit amounts.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs reduce the budget by \$65,000 for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$379,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
General and Administrative Credit	-3.245.689	-2.701.020	-3.080.179	-3.155.924

## **General Expense Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Engineering Services General Expense Budget Control Level is to provide appropriation to pay the Engineering Services Fund's general expenses.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008	
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed	
Other General Expenses	271,403	225,858	265,573	280,853	
Taxes	0	0	2,000	2,000	
Total	271,403	225,858	267,573	282,853	

## **General Expense: Other General Expenses Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Engineering Services Other General Expenses program is to provide appropriation for payment of the Fund's share of City central costs and other general expenses.

#### **Program Summary**

Decrease \$188,000 to reflect SPU's allocation of City central costs to Engineering Services.

This program saw a space rent increase of \$190,000. Other citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, increase the budget by \$38,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$40,000.

All amounts are shown in SPU's new, reorganized structure. Amounts for 2005 are estimates.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Other General Expenses	271,403	225,858	265,573	280,853

## **General Expense: Taxes**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Engineering Services Taxes program is to provide appropriation for payment of city taxes.

## **Program Summary**

Increase \$2,000 to reflect small amounts the Engineering Services Fund pays for City and State taxes.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Taxes	0	0	2,000	2,000

## **Other Operating Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Other Operating Budget Control Level is to fund the Engineering Services Fund's operating expenses for Engineering Services and Utility Systems Management programs.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Engineering Services	7,022,789	5,844,274	7,773,654	7,774,927
Utility Systems Management	0	0	126,766	130,064
Total	7,022,789	5,844,274	7,900,419	7,904,991
Full-time Equivalents Total *	50.52	50.52	50.52	50.52

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Other Operating: Engineering Services Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Engineering Services Engineering Services program is to provide engineering support and construction inspection services to other City departments and non-City agencies.

#### **Program Summary**

Provide \$66,000 for hardware and software to service the Virtual Base Station Network, a regional network of GPS ground stations and satellites.

Increase \$1.7 million to reflect SPU's projection of demand for engineering services work.

This program saw a space rent increase of \$9,000. Other citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, increase the budget by \$204,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.9 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Engineering Services	7,022,789	5,844,274	7,773,654	7,774,927
Full-time Equivalents Total*	50.52	50.52	50.52	50.52

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Other Operating: Utility Systems Management Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Engineering Services Utility Systems Management program is to assure that each SPU utility system and associated assets are properly planned, developed, operated and maintained and that asset management principles and practices are applied to achieve established customer and environmental service levels at the lowest life cycle cost.

## **Program Summary**

Increase \$127,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Utility Systems Management	0	0	126,766	130,064

## **Solid Waste Utility**

## **Administration Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Administration Budget Control Level is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and, more specifically, for the Solid Waste Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Administration	3,589,549	3,945,744	3,579,996	3,646,689
General and Administrative Credit	-1,157,673	-1,272,550	-1,120,000	-1,149,000
Total	2,431,876	2,673,194	2,459,996	2,497,689
Full-time Equivalents Total *	31.01	31.01	31.01	31.01

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Administration: Administration Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Administration program is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and, more specifically, for the Solid Waste Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department.

## **Program Summary**

Decrease \$508,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$143,000 for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$366,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Administration	3,589,549	3,945,744	3,579,996	3,646,689
Full-time Equivalents Total*	31.01	31.01	31.01	31.01

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **Administration: General and Administrative Credit Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility General and Administrative Credit program is to eliminate double-budgeting related to implementation of capital projects and equipment depreciation.

## **Program Summary**

Increase \$183,000 to reflect SPU's estimate of General and Administrative credit amounts.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs reduce the budget by \$31,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$153,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
General and Administrative Credit	-1 157 673	-1 272 550	-1 120 000	-1 149 000

## <u>Customer Service Budget Control Level</u>

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Customer Service Budget Control Level is to provide exceptional customer service in the direct delivery of essential programs and services that anticipate and fully respond to customer expectations.

#### **Summary**

Provide \$1 million and 4.5 FTEs for Clean Cities programs, including 48-hour graffiti removal, a new agreement on litter control with Parks and increased enforcement of illegal dumping laws. Position adds include 2.0 FTE Painters, 1.0 FTE Utility Service Representative and 0.5 FTE Public Education Program Specialist associated with the 48-hour graffiti policy, as well as 1.0 FTE Painter associated with graffiti removal on roadway structures.

Provide a net \$124,000 increase and 1.0 FTE Senior Planning and Development Specialist for the recycling education and outreach program.

Provide \$90,000 of General Subfund for SPU's Graffiti Rangers to purchase traffic control services and use of special cranes when cleaning road and bridge structures that require it.

Decrease \$491,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$407,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.2 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Customer Service	11,505,445	12,647,145	13,818,229	14,105,569
Full-time Equivalents Total*	83.90	83.90	89.40	89.40

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **General Expense Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility General Expense Budget Control Level is to provide appropriation to pay the Solid Waste Utility's general expenses.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Debt Service	7,390,114	8,123,445	8,743,965	9,856,258
Other General Expenses	62,033,293	68,188,936	67,559,062	69,516,333
Taxes	19,055,848	20,946,784	19,665,367	20,494,445
Total	88,479,255	97,259,165	95,968,394	99,867,036

## General Expense: Debt Service Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Debt Service program is to appropriate funds for debt service on Solid Waste Utility bonds.

## **Program Summary**

Increase \$621,000 to reflect SPU's estimate of 2007 debt service costs.

All amounts are shown in SPU's new, reorganized structure. Amounts for 2005 are estimates.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Debt Service	7,390,114	8,123,445	8,743,965	9,856,258

# **General Expense: Other General Expenses Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Other General Expenses program is to provide appropriation for payments to contractors who collect the City's solid waste, the Solid Waste Fund's share of City central costs, claims, and other general expenses.

#### **Program Summary**

This program saw a space rent increase of \$901,000. Other citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, increase the budget by \$931,000. However, due to SPU's lower estimate for these and other Solid Waste contract expenses, this amount is reduced by \$2.5 million for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$630,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Other General Expenses	62,033,293	68,188,936	67,559,062	69,516,333

## **General Expense: Taxes**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Taxes program is to appropriate funds for payment of city and state taxes.

#### **Program Summary**

Decrease \$1.3 million to reflect SPU's lower estimate of taxes based on proposed 2007 rates as well as a tax accounting treatment that no longer shows state refuse and sales tax on budget or income statements, but rather treats them as a pass through.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Taxes	19,055,848	20,946,784	19,665,367	20,494,445

## **New Facilities Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility New Facilities Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by solid waste revenues, is to design and construct new facilities to enhance solid waste operations.

#### **Summary**

Provide an additional \$6.6 million for several projects. About \$5.7 million reflects increased capital costs for the Facilities Master Plan after the decision to purchase rather than lease land for the intermodal facility, as well as higher construction inflation. (Note -- intermodal facility costs are subject to a proviso.) Most of the remainder is for new projects that perform landfill closure and development work at the South Park landfill and that relocate the household hazardous waste disposal station.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
New Facilities	4,857,888	8,561,000	14,354,000	43,371,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	9.19	9.19	9.19	9.19

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Other Operating Budget Control Level**

## **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Other Operating Budget Control Level is to fund the Solid Waste Utility's operating expenses for Engineering Services, Field Operations, Science, Sustainability & Watersheds and Utility Systems Management programs.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Engineering Services	113,650	124,928	83,583	86,207
Field Operations	8,352,808	9,181,668	9,938,098	10,090,192
Science, Sustainability & Watershed	543,152	597,050	724,831	732,222
Utility Systems Management	1,276,422	1,403,083	2,525,558	2,385,718
Total	10,286,033	11,306,729	13,272,070	13,294,339
Full-time Equivalents Total *	72.93	72.93	75.93	75.93

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## Other Operating: Engineering Services Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Engineering Services program is to provide engineering design and support services, construction inspection, and project management services to Solid Waste Fund capital improvement projects, and to solid waste facility managers.

## **Program Summary**

Transfers related to SPU's reorganization, other citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs result in a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$41,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Engineering Services	113,650	124,928	83,583	86,207
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Other Operating: Field Operations Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Field Operations program is to operate and maintain the City's solid waste transfer stations and hazardous materials disposal facilities, and to monitor and maintain the City's closed landfills so the public's health is protected and opportunities are provided for reuse and recycling.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$457,000 and 2.0 FTE Senior Construction and Maintenance Equipment Operator for additional staffing at the recycling and disposal stations to reflect recent tonnage and workload increases.

Provide \$52,000 for additional landfill closure costs at Kent, Midway and Genesee landfills.

Decrease \$40,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$288,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$756,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Field Operations	8,352,808	9,181,668	9,938,098	10,090,192
Full-time Equivalents Total*	54.02	54.02	56.02	56.02

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Other Operating: Science, Sustainability & Watershed Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Science, Sustainability & Watersheds program is to ensure SPU's investments, operations, services and programs are scientifically sound, promote environmental sustainability and provide stewardship of watersheds and aquatic resources.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$7,000 for the Solid Waste Fund share of Climate Protection efforts to implement recommendations from a greenhouse gas inventory study.

Increase \$101,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$20,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$128,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Science, Sustainability & Watershed	543,152	597,050	724,831	732,222
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.43	3.43	3.43	3.43

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Other Operating: Utility Systems Management Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility's Utility Systems Management program is to ensure that each SPU utility system and associated assets are properly planned, developed, operated and maintained and that asset management principles and practices are applied to achieve established customer and environmental service levels at the lowest life cycle cost.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$343,000 for consulting and legal costs associated with upcoming solid waste contract negotiations.

Provide \$215,000 for consumer surveys and research to determine appropriate service levels.

Provide \$41,000 for ongoing support and maintenance of the solid waste data integration project.

Provide \$46,000 and 1.0 FTE Senior Economist to convert economic analysis currently done by consultants into a full-time position and meet increased demand for economic analysis.

Increase \$429,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$49,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.1 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Utility Systems Management	1,276,422	1,403,083	2,525,558	2,385,718
Full-time Equivalents Total*	14.69	14.69	15.69	15.69

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### Rehabilitation and Heavy Equipment Budget Control Level

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Rehabilitation and Heavy Equipment Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by solid waste revenues, is to implement projects to repair and rehabilitate the City's solid waste transfer stations and improve management of the City's closed landfills, and replace heavy equipment used at the transfer stations, household hazardous waste sites, and the landfills.

### **Summary**

Provide an additional \$243,000 for several projects, including a new disaster debris management plan and improvements to historic city landfill sites.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Rehabilitation and Heavy Equipment	1,117,865	1,970,000	1,824,000	1,851,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level, a Solid Waste Capital Improvement Program, is to implement the Solid Waste Utility's share of capital improvement projects that receive funding from multiple SPU funds and will benefit the Solid Waste Fund.

### Summary

Provide an additional \$718,000 for several projects, including work upgrading the operations control center, new facility improvement projects, and a major department-wide security initiative.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Shared Cost Projects	464,737	819,000	876,000	226,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Technology Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Technology Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program, is to make use of recent technology advances to increase the Solid Waste Utility's efficiency and productivity.

### **Summary**

The Technology Budget Control Level was reorganized internally to structure the budget around the problem being solved, rather than the internal customer, in order to gain synergies and economies of scale. About \$388,000 in programmatic increases is proposed, including work on solid waste data integration.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Technology	677,528	1,194,000	1,569,000	1,226,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.92	5.92	5.92	5.92

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Water Utility**

# **Administration Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Administration Budget Control Level is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and, more specifically, for the Water Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Administration	11,413,099	11,649,288	11,079,881	11,293,647
General and Administrative Credit	-8,092,724	-8,260,200	-8,466,000	-8,678,000
Total	3,320,374	3,389,088	2,613,881	2,615,647
Full-time Equivalents Total *	89.50	89.50	90.50	90.50

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### Administration: Administration Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Administration program is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and, more specifically, for the Water Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department.

### **Program Summary**

Decrease \$990,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Add 1.0 FTE Senior Personnel Specialist for increased hiring and recruitment, contingency staffing, and labor relations.

In other FTE-neutral changes:

- -- Reclassify a vacant Management Systems Analyst position to an Executive 2 to serve as the new Communications Director; and
- -- Divide a full-time Senior Economist and a full-time Accounting Technician II position into four half-time positions to better reflect their status.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$420,000 for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$569,000.

All amounts are shown in SPU's new, reorganized structure. Amounts for 2005 are estimates.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Administration	11,413,099	11,649,288	11,079,881	11,293,647
Full-time Equivalents Total*	89.50	89.50	90.50	90.50

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Administration: General and Administrative Credit Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility General and Administrative Credit program is to eliminate double-budgeting related to implementation of capital projects and equipment depreciation.

### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Adopted Budget.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
General and Administrative Credit	-8,092,724	-8,260,200	-8,466,000	-8,678,000

## **Customer Service Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Customer Service Budget Control Level is to provide exceptional customer service in the direct delivery of essential programs and services that anticipate and fully respond to customer expectations.

### **Summary**

Decrease \$549,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$323,000 for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$226,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed	
Customer Service	9,477,397	9,673,528	9,447,207	9,747,223	
Full-time Equivalents Total*	87.57	87.57	87.57	87.57	

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### <u>Distribution Budget Control Level</u>

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Distribution Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to repair and upgrade the City's water lines, pump stations, and other facilities.

### **Summary**

The Distribution Budget Control Level was formerly part of the larger Infrastructure BCL. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Water Fund Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area for this BCL is transmission and distribution. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$9.5 million net decrease to this BCL. An additional \$12.5 million in programmatic decreases is proposed. Among the highlights:

- -- The largest single decrease, approximately \$5 million, is the elimination of a project to replace a large section of the 42-inch pipeline between Volunteer and Maple Leaf reservoirs, which after asset management review appears to be unnecessary within the next decade.
- -- Another \$5 million of funding for previously anticipated work on water mains and pressure improvements has been eliminated as asset management review has not confirmed the need for it.
- -- Add 8.0 FTE Water Pipe Worker to expand the Water Fund's apprenticeship program.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Distribution	20,404,020	24,016,000	26,658,000	16,156,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	69.33	69.33	77.33	77.33

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# **General Expense Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility General Expense Budget Control Level is to appropriate funds to pay the Water Utility's general expenses.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006 2007	2008	
	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Debt Service	60,773,798	62,031,486	59,291,000	63,591,000
Other General Expenses	8,545,927	8,722,781	13,728,085	14,069,496
Taxes	20,432,168	20,855,003	22,629,470	23,815,078
Total	89,751,892	91,609,270	95,648,555	101,475,574
Full-time Equivalents Total *	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# General Expense: Debt Service Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Debt Service program is to appropriate funds for debt service on Water Utility bonds.

### **Program Summary**

Decrease by \$2.7 million to reflect SPU's estimate of 2007 debt service.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Debt Service	60.773.798	62.031.486	59,291,000	63,591,000

# **General Expense: Other General Expenses Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Other General Expenses program is to appropriate funds for the Water Fund's share of City central costs, claims, and other general expenses.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$158,000 for renewal and replacement of infrastructure at the Cedar and Tolt river water treatment facilities.

Increase \$4.5 million for transfers related to SPU's reorganization. In this case, contract payments for Tolt and Cedar operations moved from Utility Systems Management to General Expense.

This program saw a space rent increase of \$2.7 million. Other citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, reduce the budget by \$2.3 million for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$5 million.

All amounts are shown in SPU's new, reorganized structure. Amounts for 2005 are estimates.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Other General Expenses	8,545,927	8,722,781	13,728,085	14,069,496
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### **General Expense: Taxes**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Taxes program is to appropriate funds for payment of City and state taxes.

#### **Program Summary**

Provide \$1.8 million to reflect SPU's estimate of 2007 taxes.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Taxes	20.432.168	20.855.003	22,629,470	23.815.078

## **Habitat Conservation Program Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Habitat Conservation Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to manage projects directly related to the Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan.

### **Summary**

The Habitat Conservation Program Budget Control Level is unchanged in SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Water Fund Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area for this BCL is major watersheds. About \$1 million in programmatic decreases is proposed due to delays in the implementation of some programs, including Downstream Fish Habitat.

Major projects funded in 2007 include \$5.4 million for Cedar Sockeye Hatchery, \$2.5 million for Downstream Fish Habitat, \$955,000 for Stream & Riparian Restoration, and \$940,000 for Watershed Road Improvement/Decommissioning.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Habitat Conservation Program	4,590,395	5,403,000	11,565,000	8,820,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	14.98	14.98	14.98	14.98

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### **Other Operating Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Other Operating Budget Control Level is to fund the Water Utility's operating expenses for Engineering Services, Field Operations, Science, Sustainability & Watershed and Utility Systems Management programs.

Program Expenditures	2005	2006	2007	2008
-	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Engineering Services	2,513,953	2,565,978	3,142,178	3,188,654
Field Operations	15,029,218	15,340,241	16,927,569	17,556,748
Science, Sustainability & Watershed	9,543,605	9,741,106	10,151,075	10,368,648
Utility Systems Management	10,490,130	10,707,219	8,731,428	8,846,715
Total	37,576,906	38,354,544	38,952,250	39,960,765
Full-time Equivalents Total *	298.47	301.47	305.63	305.63

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Directr actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Other Operating: Engineering Services Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Engineering Services program is to provide engineering design and support services, construction inspection, and project management services to Water Utility's capital improvement projects and to the managers of water facilities.

### **Program Summary**

Increase \$487,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

This program saw a space rent increase of \$5,000. Other citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs, increase the budget by \$84,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$576,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Engineering Services	2,513,953	2,565,978	3,142,178	3,188,654
Full-time Equivalents Total*	29.58	29.58	29.58	29.58

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Other Operating: Field Operations Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Field Operations program is to operate and maintain the infrastructure that provides the public with an adequate, reliable, and safe supply of high-quality drinking water.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$105,000 to improve readiness at the Seattle Wells, used for emergency water production.

Provide \$210,000 for operations and maintenance of recently completed capital projects.

Increase \$736,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization and higher labor costs.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$537,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.6 million.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Field Operations	15,029,218	15,340,241	16,927,569	17,556,748
Full-time Equivalents Total*	134.22	137.22	137.22	137.22

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Other Operating: Science, Sustainability & Watershed Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Science, Sustainability & Watersheds program is to ensure SPU's investments, operations, services and programs are scientifically sound, promote environmental sustainability, and provide stewardship of watersheds and aquatic resources.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$263,000 and 1.16 FTE for additional staff at the Cedar River Watershed Education Center to meet demand for programs. FTE addition includes conversion of part-time Public Education Program Specialist to full time and addition of 1.0 Education Program Assistant.

Provide \$175,000 for this program's share of Cedar River habitat conservation work.

Provide \$40,000 for the Water Fund share of Climate Protection efforts to implement recommendations from a greenhouse gas inventory study.

Provide \$105,000 for additional one-time water quality monitoring work.

Provide \$210,000 and 1.0 FTE Watershed Resources Technician and 1.0 FTE Security Programs Specialist for watershed security upgrades.

Provide \$158,000 for assessments, training and equipment to protect the Cedar and Tolt watersheds from wildfires.

Provide 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2 for implementation work on the Muckleshoot agreement at the Cedar River watershed.

Decrease \$875,000 for transfers related to SPU's reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$333,000 for a net increase from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$410,000.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Science, Sustainability & Watershed	9,543,605	9,741,106	10,151,075	10,368,648
Full-time Equivalents Total*	71.07	71.07	75.23	75.23

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

# Other Operating: Utility Systems Management Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility's Utility Systems Management program is to assure that each SPU utility system and associated assets are properly planned, developed, operated and maintained and that asset management principles and practices are applied to achieve established customer and environmental service levels at the lowest life cycle cost.

### **Program Summary**

Provide \$88,000 for this program's share of Cedar River habitat conservation work.

Provide \$420,000 for asset management work on the operating budget.

Provide \$158,000 for SCADA-related equipment upgrades.

Provide \$263,000 for installation and maintenance of security system improvements.

Provide \$63,000 for security-related water quality testing and threat assessment.

Decrease \$3.3 million for transfers related to SPU's reorganization. This amount includes moving contract payments for Tolt and Cedar operations from Utility Systems Management to General Expense.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs, and changes in inflation assumptions for other costs increase the budget by \$353,000 for a net reduction from the 2006 Adopted Budget to the 2007 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2 million.

All amounts are shown in SPU's new, reorganized structure. Amounts for 2005 are estimates.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Utility Systems Management	10,490,130	10,707,219	8,731,428	8,846,715
Full-time Equivalents Total*	63.60	63.60	63.60	63.60

2005

2006

2005

2000

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## **Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level, which is a Water Capital Improvement Program, is to implement the Water Utility's share of capital improvement projects that receive funding from multiple SPU funds.

### **Summary**

Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Water Fund Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level includes several business areas -- security and emergency response, fleets, facilities, major interagency projects, and SCADA. Re-org-related shifting resulted in a \$5.6 million net increase to this BCL. An additional \$10 million in programmatic increases is proposed. Among the highlights:

Provide \$2.1 million in funding and add 5.0 FTEs for utility relocation due to the Alaskan Way Tunnel and Seawall project. New positions include two Strategic Advisor 2, Utilities (0.5 FTE each), four Senior Civil Engineers (0.5 FTE each), one Associate Civil Engineers (0.5 FTE), one Senior Management Systems Analyst (0.5 FTE), one Assistant Management Systems Analyst (0.5 FTE), and one Senior Financial Analyst (0.5 FTE).

Provide \$4.6 million for several new facility improvement projects.

Provide \$1.8 million for a major department-wide SCADA initiative.

Provide \$2.2 million for a major department-wide security initiative.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Shared Cost Projects	15,648,803	18,419,000	19,052,000	15,756,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	51.09	51.09	56.09	57.09

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### **Technology Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Technology Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program, is to make use of recent technology advances to increase the Water Utility's efficiency and productivity.

### **Summary**

Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Water Fund Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The Technology Budget Control Level was reorganized internally to structure the budget around the problem being solved, rather than the internal customer in order to gain synergies and economies of scale. About \$1.2 million in programmatic increases is proposed, including enhancements to the project management tracking system.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Technology	3,563,227	4,194,000	5,721,000	6,087,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	22.20	22.20	22.20	22.20

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### **Transmission Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Transmission Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to repair and upgrade the City's large transmission pipelines that bring untreated water to the treatment facilities, and convey water from the treatment facilities to Seattle and its suburban wholesale customers' distribution systems.

### **Summary**

The Transmission Budget Control Level was formerly the Other Agencies BCL, and contains parts of the former Infrastructure BCL. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Water Fund Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area for this BCL is transmission and distribution. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$1.2 million net increase to this BCL. A \$902,000 decrease in programmatic effort is proposed, primarily by reducing budget for water system dewatering improvements and transmission pipeline rehabilitation to reflect the specific work identified to date.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Transmission	1,338,122	1,575,000	1,574,000	1,066,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.16	5.16	5.16	5.16

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

•

### Water Quality & Treatment Budget Control Level

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Water Quality & Treatment Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to design, construct, and repair water treatment facilities and remaining open-water reservoirs.

### **Summary**

The Water Quality and Treatment Budget Control Level was formerly the Water Quality BCL. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Water Fund Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area for this BCL is also called water quality and treatment. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$2 million net decrease to this BCL. An additional \$1.7 million programmatic decrease is proposed.

Major projects funded in 2007 include \$18.5 million for Reservoir Covering - Beacon and \$6.7 million for Reservoir Covering - Myrtle.

All amounts are shown in SPU's new, reorganized structure. Amounts for 2005 are estimates.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Water Quality & Treatment	10,034,639	11,811,000	26,680,000	16,296,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.49	13.49	13.49	13.49

•••

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

### **Water Resources Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Water Resources Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to repair and upgrade water transmission pipelines and promote residential and commercial water conservation.

### **Summary**

The Water Resources Budget Control Level was formerly the Water Supply BCL. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Water Fund Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area for this BCL is also called water resources. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$2.6 million net increase to this BCL. No additional substantive changes are proposed.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Water Resources	6,050,009	7,121,000	9,966,000	8,155,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.17	12.17	12.17	12.17

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

•••

## Watershed Stewardship Budget Control Level

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Watershed Stewardship Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to implement projects associated with the natural land, forestry, and fishery resources within the Tolt, Cedar, and Lake Youngs watersheds.

### Summary

The Watershed Stewardship Budget Control Level was formerly the Environmental Stewardship BCL and also contains expiring projects from the former Bonneville Power Agreement BCL. Numerous budget adjustments have been made as part of SPU's reorganization, which restructured the entire Water Fund Capital Improvement Program to better align budget control levels to SPU business areas. The business area for this BCL is major watersheds. This shifting of projects resulted in a \$2.5 million net increase to this BCL. An additional \$3.8 million in programmatic increases is proposed. Among the highlights:

- -- Provide \$626,000 for the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe settlement agreement.
- -- Provide an additional \$1.1 million for a culvert replacement project for Rock Creek that has now been fully defined and is approaching construction.

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
Watershed Stewardship	3,586,166	4,221,000	8,751,000	3,972,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.25	8.25	8.25	8.25

<sup>\*</sup> FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

## 2007 - 2008 Estimated Revenues for the Drainage and Wastewater Fund

Summit Code	Source	2005 Actuals	2006 Adopted	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
437010	Operating Grants	509,439	231,958	410,000	410,000
443450	Public Toilet Service Fees	690,160	711,000	710,700	710,700
443510	Wastewater Utility Services	142,759,292	145,108,860	159,437,467	159,169,025
443610	Drainage Utility Services	31,360,996	35,441,875	39,950,242	47,515,889
443691	Side Sewer Permit Fees	913,764	700,081	913,764	913,764
443694	Drainage Permit Fees	510,888	399,919	510,888	510,888
461110	Interest and Investment Earnings	1,899,294	1,323,891	1,544,285	1,913,042
469990	General Subfund Transfer In Restore	0	0	200,000	200,000
	Our Waters				
469990	Other Miscellaneous Revenues	245,962	17,311	146,625	167,709
481200	Use of Bond Proceeds	32,419,432	31,990,604	34,165,582	38,529,309
577010	Capital Grants and Contributions	1,541,100	1,915,750	2,721,247	2,938,006
577010	Cumulative Reserve Subfund Transfer	0	100,000	103,000	0
	In Citywide Source Control				
705000	SCL Reimbursement	1,050,501	1,427,495	1,304,617	1,337,232
Tota	l Revenues	213,900,828	219,368,744	242,118,417	254,315,565
379100	Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital	631,628	(546,439)	8,409,106	19,737,798
Tota	l Resources	214,532,456	218,822,306	250,527,523	274,053,363

# 2007 - 2008 Estimated Revenues for the Engineering Services Fund

Summit Code	Source	2005 Actuals	2006 Adopted	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
443210	Other Eng Services - Outside the City	126,737	0	66,000	76,000
541850	GIS CGDB Corporate Support	398,115	523,873	601,656	614,384
541850	Other Eng Services Corporate GIS	159,678	0	0	0
543210	GIS CGDB Support - General Fund	510,529	523,686	535,194	546,516
543210	GIS Maps & Publications	264,876	256,238	301,616	289,034
543210	Parks & Other City Depts.	119,119	572,461	144,672	183,390
543210	SCL Fund	921,824	674,998	1,343,071	955,824
543210	SDOT Fund	5,732,343	2,888,767	4,196,455	4,502,940
543210	Surcharge From SPU Funds	856,768	1,004,509	1,083,923	1,078,115
543210	Various Engineering Services - General	455,955	469,939	473,731	477,421
	Fund				
Tota	l Revenues	9,545,944	6,914,471	8,746,318	8,723,624
379100	Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital	(2,008,580)	(641,975)	(816,546)	(814,620)
Tota	l Resources	7,537,364	6,272,496	7,929,772	7,909,004

#### 2007 - 2008 Estimated Revenues for the Solid Waste Fund

Summit		2005	2006	2007	2008
Code	Source	Actuals	Adopted	Proposed	Proposed
408000	Other Nonoperating Revenue	158,607	1,000	283,079	290,156
416456	Landfill Closure Fee	212,364	427,267	260,479	260,479
416457	Transfer Fee - In City	1,209,218	657,279	841,894	841,894
416458	Transfer Fee - Out City	194,154	96,521	742,500	742,500
434010	Grants	313,581	100,000	400,000	400,000
443710	Commercial Services	36,918,254	39,582,387	41,623,957	44,063,766
443710	Residential Services	53,604,214	56,819,209	57,768,568	61,874,484
443741	Transfer Station Disposal Charges	10,740,916	10,795,948	12,686,060	14,336,519
443745	Commercial Disposal Charges	933,632	1,318,610	963,534	977,747
443875	HHW Reimbursement	2,141,926	2,318,106	2,350,044	2,408,795
461110	Interest Earnings	249,733	250,126	385,961	154,824
469990	Other Operating Revenue	144,086	91,451	215,377	220,761
481200	LOC/Bond Proceeds	4,000,000	21,300,000	0	42,194,000
516456	Landfill Closure Fee	3,792,829	3,950,710	4,331,163	4,308,681
516457	Transfer Fee - In City	2,571,714	2,619,408	3,080,423	3,079,276
543710	General Subfund - Operating Transfer In	944,325	893,910	1,028,495	1,025,870
705000	City Light for Customer Service	1,061,458	1,427,495	1,323,993	1,357,092
805000	General Subfund - Transfer In – Graffiti*	287,000	517,000	90,000	90,000
Tota	l Revenues	119,478,013	143,166,428	128,375,528	178,626,844
379100	Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital	342,613	(6,736,195)	15,766,161	(2,188,211)
Tota	l Resources	119,820,626	136,430,233	144,141,689	176,438,633

<sup>\*</sup>In prior years, per ordinance, approximately \$290,000 in tonnage taxes was specifically earmarked for graffiti work. The revised tonnage tax ordinance passed by Council in 2006 eliminated this earmark, though the amounts continue to support graffiti work via other tonnage tax line items. Additional amounts in 2006, 2007 and 2008 reflect specific, general-fund-supported scope changes on graffiti work that were approved after solid waste rates and tonnage taxes were finalized. These amounts will be folded into tonnage tax receipts during future rate cycles.

### 2007 - 2008 Estimated Revenues for the Water Fund

Summit Code	Source	2005 Actuals	2006 Adopted	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
224300	Bond Issue Proceeds/Existing Bonds	48,593,190	0	0	0
224300	Bond Issue Proceeds/Future Bonds	0	67,888,000	74,389,084	43,562,692
437010	Operating Grants	320,928	0	0	0
443410	Retail Water Sales	95,381,931	95,096,112	99,478,978	105,033,897
443420	Water Service for Fire Protection	4,076,959	4,105,862	5,476,927	5,782,759
443420	Wholesale Water Credits	(1,144,824)	0	0	0
443420	Wholesale Water Sales	39,669,418	39,289,605	41,794,000	43,216,000
443450	Facilities Charges	747,224	570,400	945,000	945,000
443450	Tap Fees	5,172,675	0	4,439,424	4,494,917
443480	Miscellaneous Water Ser. Charges	1,603,436	1,641,940	1,767,744	1,807,810
443979	Other Operating Revenues	82,923	0	0	0
459930	NSF Check Charges	19,507	30,000	30,750	31,519
461110	Investment Interest	2,927,422	1,673,414	2,414,409	938,042
461900	Other Interest	(435,608)	0	0	0
462500	RentalsNon-City	322,286	219,556	338,601	347,066
469100	Salvage	0	10,000	10,396	10,526
469990	Other Miscellaneous Revenue	157,299	130,302	0	0
479010	Contributions in Aid of Construction	4,772,832	6,819,580	3,546,450	3,419,825
485120	Timber Sales	16,451	0	0	0
543970	Call Center payments for City Light	1,082,335	1,467,842	1,137,128	1,165,556
543970	Inventory Purchased by SDOT	344,485	314,202	361,925	370,973
587000	Operating Transfer In - Revenue Stabilization Subfund	(625,000)	2,370,000	650,000	1,150,000
587000	Operating Transfer In - Revenue Stabilization Subfund - BPA Account	3,675,703	2,192,000	1,157,746	868,142
Total	Revenues	206,761,571	223,818,815	237,938,562	213,144,723
379100	Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital	(1,419,621)	(4,032,384)	18,690,331	16,962,486
Total	Resources	205,341,950	219,786,430	256,628,893	230,107,209

# **Drainage & Wastewater Fund**

	2005 Actuals	2006 Revised	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
<b>Total Cash at End of Previous Year</b>	17,249,804	19,912,657	21,800,973	16,762,359
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	213,900,828	222,588,556	242,118,417	254,315,565
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	214,532,456	227,213,618	250,527,523	274,053,363
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	(3,294,481)	(6,513,378)	(3,370,492)	(19,896,858)
<b>Ending Total Cash Balance</b>	19,912,657	21,800,973	16,762,359	16,921,418
Less: Reserves against Cash Balances				
Bond Reserve Account	5,386,059	5,601,502	5,601,502	5,825,562
Bond Parity Fund	1,814,849	1,779,849	1,743,349	1,705,349
Construction Bond Fund Cash	2,884,115	2,884,115	0	0
Construction Loan Fund Cash	830,511	830,511	830,511	830,511
Vendor Deposits	244,997	244,997	244,997	244,997
<b>Total Reserves against Cash Balances</b>	11,160,531	11,340,973	8,420,359	8,606,419
<b>Ending Operating Cash</b>	8,752,126	10,460,000	8,342,000	8,315,000

# **Engineering Services Fund**

	2005 Actuals	2006 Revised	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
Beginning Balance	(5,177,333)	(4,019,578)	(3,393,712)	(2,577,166)
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	(850,825)	0	0	0
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	9,545,944	10,631,529	8,746,318	8,723,624
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	7,537,364	10,005,663	7,929,772	7,909,004
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	(4,019,578)	(3,393,712)	(2,577,166)	(1,762,546)
Less: Reserves against Fund Balance	0	0	0	0
Ending Unreserved Fund Balance	(4.019.578)	(3,393,712)	(2,577,166)	(1.762.546)

## **Solid Waste Fund**

	2005 Actuals	2006 Revised	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
Total Cash at End of Previous Year	7,422,993	8,380,458	26,533,051	5,903,393
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	119,478,013	164,801,153	128,375,528	178,626,844
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	119,820,626	141,783,900	144,141,689	176,438,633
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	(1,300,078)	4,864,660	4,863,497	1,347,329
<b>Ending Total Cash Balance</b>	8,380,458	26,533,051	5,903,393	6,744,275
Less: Reserves against Cash Balances				
Construction Fund	0	19,876,920	0	0
<b>Total Reserves against Cash Balances</b>	0	19,876,920	0	0
<b>Ending Operating Cash</b>	8,380,458	6,656,131	5,903,393	6,744,275

## **Water Fund**

	2005 Actuals	2006 Revised	2007 Proposed	2008 Proposed
Total Cash at End of Previous Year	36,652,924	40,749,594	31,560,093	31,902,097
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	206,761,571	222,997,772	237,938,562	213,144,723
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures Accounting and Technical Adjustments	205,341,950 (2,677,049)	245,177,401 (12,990,128)	256,628,893 (19,032,335)	230,107,209 (10,252,646)
<b>Ending Total Cash Balance</b>	40,749,594	31,560,093	31,902,097	25,192,257
Less: Reserves against Cash Balances				
Construction Fund	16,322,389	13,595,000	15,367,000	10,334,000
Bond Parity Fund	236,938	183,313	127,063	68,063
Revenue Stabilization Subfund	11,430,199	10,830,199	10,180,199	9,030,199
BPA Account	3,675,703	1,734,586	576,840	0
Vendor deposits	204,996	204,996	204,996	204,996
<b>Total Reserves against Cash Balances</b>	31,870,224	26,548,093	26,456,097	19,637,257
<b>Ending Operating Cash</b>	8,879,370	5,012,000	5,446,000	5,555,000