

# Office of Economic Development

## Steve Johnson, Interim Director

### Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-8090

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

On the Web at: <http://www.seattle.gov/EconomicDevelopment/>

### Department Description

The mission of the Office of Economic Development (OED) is to help create a vibrant economy by promoting access to economic opportunities for all of Seattle's diverse communities. OED supports economic development that is financially, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The core services OED provides capitalize on Seattle's established economic activity, particularly in the areas of manufacturing and maritime industries, film and music, healthcare, and clean technology. To accomplish this mission, the Office is re-organized into programs designed to:

- Support Seattle businesses as they navigate government services;
  - Provide technical assistance to businesses through OED staff and community partner organizations;
  - Retain and expand businesses by identifying financial assistance including access to both equity and debt financing;
  - Convene a broad range of the business community to help inform and set the City's economic agenda;
  - Build the management capacity of businesses to be better positioned for growth and expand product markets;
- and
- Invest in the development of a skilled workforce to meet the needs of industry and employers in a changing economy.

### Proposed Policy and Program Changes

In 2009, OED engaged in an intensive strategic planning review of the services provided by the Office in relation to other City departments and local economic development entities. As a result of this process, the Office is restructured in the 2010 Proposed Budget to focus on three program areas: Business Services, Economic Development Leadership, and Finance and Operations. The Department's budget is augmented to address funding gaps in personnel and service allocations that support the labor demands and outcomes associated with the OED reorganization.

## Economic Development

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
<b>Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level</b>					
Business Development		1,797,054	1,417,602	1,452,057	0
Business Services		0	0	0	5,082,051
Community Development		1,743,965	1,129,987	1,171,416	0
Economic Development Leadership		0	0	0	568,769
Finance and Operations		1,468,553	1,096,211	845,767	707,936
Work Force Development		3,254,108	2,588,504	2,507,746	0
<b>Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level</b>	<b>X1D00</b>	<b>8,263,680</b>	<b>6,232,304</b>	<b>5,976,987</b>	<b>6,358,757</b>
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>8,263,680</b>	<b>6,232,304</b>	<b>5,976,987</b>	<b>6,358,757</b>
<b>Department Full-time Equivalents Total*</b>		<b>24.60</b>	<b>19.50</b>	<b>19.50</b>	<b>20.00</b>
<i>* 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.</i>					

<b>Resources</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
General Subfund	8,263,680	6,232,304	5,976,987	6,358,757
<b>Department Total</b>	<b>8,263,680</b>	<b>6,232,304</b>	<b>5,976,987</b>	<b>6,358,757</b>

# Economic Development

## Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level is to provide vital services to individual businesses and economic development leadership to support a strong local economy, thriving neighborhood business districts, and broadly-shared prosperity.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Business Development	1,797,054	1,417,602	1,452,057	0
Business Services	0	0	0	5,082,051
Community Development	1,743,965	1,129,987	1,171,416	0
Economic Development Leadership	0	0	0	568,769
Finance and Operations	1,468,553	1,096,211	845,767	707,936
Work Force Development	3,254,108	2,588,504	2,507,746	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,263,680</b>	<b>6,232,304</b>	<b>5,976,987</b>	<b>6,358,757</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	24.60	19.50	19.50	20.00

*\*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 Economic Development: Business Development

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Business Development Program is to develop, manage, and support initiatives building on Seattle's economic foundations to maintain Seattle's competitiveness, promote business growth, and connect residents to good jobs. Business development activities are focused on the creation and implementation of strategies to promote growth in Seattle's key industry sectors and to support the development and sustainability of the City's small businesses. The Business Development Program works closely with industry leaders and other City departments to maintain Seattle's positive business climate, to encourage growth of a diverse and vibrant local economy, and to help businesses understand and navigate processes, regulations, and policies.

### Program Summary

A departmental reorganization affects the Business Development Program and results in the following budget actions:

Transfer out \$1.43 million and 6.50 FTE to the Business Services Program.

Transfer out \$19,000 to the Economic Development Leadership Program.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Business Development	1,797,054	1,417,602	1,452,057	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.50	6.50	6.50	0.00

*\* 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.*

# Economic Development

## Office of Economic Development: Business Services

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Business Services Program is to provide direct support services to businesses and to support a healthy business environment that empowers businesses to develop, grow and succeed. The three key service areas include providing assistance navigating government services, facilitating access to capital and building management expertise, and investing in workforce development services focused on building skills that benefit individual job-seekers and support employers in key industry sectors.

### Program Summary

A departmental reorganization creates the Business Services Program and results in the following budget actions:

Transfer in \$4.98 million and 12.5 FTE from the Community Development, Business Development and Work Force Development Programs.

Increase budget by \$131,000 to restore funding gaps in personnel and service allocations that support the labor demands and outcomes associated with the reorganization.

Increase budget by \$14,000 and increase an Administrative Specialist II position, which functions as the Film Program Coordinator, from 0.5 FTE to 1.0 FTE. Reclassify this position to a Planning & Development Specialist I to reflect changes in the functions and responsibilities associated with this position.

Increase budget by \$19,000 and reclassify the following positions to reflect changes in the functions and responsibilities associated with these positions: 1.0 FTE Community Development Specialist Senior to a Strategic Advisor 2, and 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II to Planning & Development Specialist I.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$65,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$5.08 million.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Business Services	0	0	0	5,082,051
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.00

*\* 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.*

# Economic Development

## Office of Economic Development: Community Development

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Community Development Program is to provide operating, grant, loan and project management support to neighborhood business districts and community-based development organizations, as well as to special projects, so Seattle has thriving neighborhoods and broadly shared prosperity.

### Program Summary

A departmental reorganization affects the Community Development Program and results in the following budget actions:

Transfer \$128,000 and 1.0 FTE to the Economic Development Leadership Program.

Transfer \$1.04 million and 5.0 FTE to the Business Services Program.

The Office of Policy and Management (OPM) is proposed to take a role supporting broader coordination on place-based community development initiatives across City departments. No additional budget is added to the OPM budget to assume this function.

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Community Development	1,743,965	1,129,987	1,171,416	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.60	6.00	6.00	0.00

*\* 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.*

# Economic Development

## Office of Economic Development: Economic Development Leadership

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Economic Development Leadership Program is to play a leadership role in the creation of the City of Seattle's economic agenda through analysis of timely opportunities and development of targeted areas of focus for OED and relevant City and community partners. This program supports OED in serving as the convener of a broad range of the business community, reflecting the knowledge and networks needed to make informed decisions on economic policies and strengthen alignment of city, regional, state, and federal economic development activities. The functions related to the executive management of the office have been shifted from the Management and Operations Program to this program.

### Program Summary

A departmental reorganization creates the Economic Development Leadership Program and results in the following budget actions:

Transfer in \$439,000 and 3.0 FTE from the Finance and Operations Program.

Transfer in \$128,000 and 1.0 FTE from the Community Development Program.

Transfer in \$19,000 from the Business Development Program.

Increase budget by \$4,000 to restore funding gaps in personnel and service allocations that support the labor demands and outcomes associated with the reorganization.

Of the transferred funds, allocate \$14,000 to fund the reclassification of 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II to an Executive Assistant to reflect changes in the position's functions and responsibilities.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$21,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$569,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Economic Development Leadership	0	0	0	568,769
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00

*\* 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.*

# Economic Development

## Office of Economic Development: Finance and Operations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Finance and Operations Program is to provide leadership and financial, administrative, and human resources to effectively accomplish OED's mission and goals. This program has been restructured in the 2010 Proposed Budget from the Management and Operations Program to the Finance and Operations Program. The functions related to the executive management of the office have been shifted to the Economic Development Leadership Program.

### Program Summary

A departmental reorganization affects the Finance and Operations Program and results in the following budget actions:

Transfer out \$439,000 and 3.0 FTE to the Economic Development Leadership Program.

Increase budget by \$317,000 to restore funding gaps in personnel and service allocations that support the labor demands and outcomes associated with the reorganization.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$16,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$138,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Finance and Operations	1,468,553	1,096,211	845,767	707,936
Full-time Equivalents Total*	10.50	6.00	6.00	3.00

*\* 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.*

# Economic Development

## Office of Economic Development: Work Force Development

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Work Force Development Program is to provide work force development services to businesses, community organizations, residents, the Mayor, the City Council, and other public decision makers, so employers meet their need for qualified workers, and all residents, particularly those who are disadvantaged, secure and retain family-wage jobs. The work of this program remains a priority for the Office, however, OED believes that better services will be provided to businesses and job seekers in Seattle if it is aligned within the goals of the Business Services program.

### Program Summary

A departmental reorganization affecting the Work Force Development Program results in transferring out \$2.51 million and 1.0 FTE to the Business Services Program.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Work Force Development	3,254,108	2,588,504	2,507,746	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00

*\* 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 Housing

## Adrienne Quinn, Director

### Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-0721

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

On the Web at: <http://seattle.gov/housing/>

### Department Description

The mission of the Office of Housing (OH) is to invest in and promote the development and preservation of housing so that all Seattle residents have access to safe, decent, and affordable housing. To accomplish this mission, OH has four programs, reflected in the budget as the Multi-Family Production and Preservation Program, Homeownership and Sustainability Program, Community Development Program, and the Administration and Management Program.

The Multi-Family Production and Preservation Program invests in the community by making long-term, low-interest loans to developers to develop or preserve affordable multi-family rental housing. OH monitors the housing portfolio to ensure the units remain affordable and serve the intended residents, and the buildings remain in good condition.

The Homeownership and Sustainability Program provides funding, including loans and grants, to low-income and low-to-moderate income Seattle residents. These include loans to first-time home buyers, home repair loans to address health and safety and code repairs, and grants to make low-income housing more energy efficient.

The Community Development Program provides strategic planning, program development, and disposition of vacant land for redevelopment purposes to increase housing opportunities for Seattle residents.

The Administration and Management Program provides centralized leadership, coordination, technology, contracting, and financial management services to OH programs and capital projects.

### Proposed Policy and Program Changes

The City's current Housing Levy began in 2002 and expires at the end of 2009. A renewal of the Housing Levy totaling \$145 million for 2010 - 2016 is on the ballot in the City's November 2009 general election. Although the outcome of the election will not be known until after the 2010 Budget is proposed, funding is adjusted in the 2010 Proposed Budget to be consistent with the 2009 Housing Levy finance plans approved by the City Council In Ordinance 123013. Of note, the 2010 Proposed Budget does not appropriate the full amount of Levy funds designated for administration in 2010; instead, Levy funds in the amount of \$164,000 will be appropriated in future years to fund inflationary increases in administrative expenses associated with the Levy. If approved by voters, the 2009 Housing Levy is expected to produce or preserve 1,850 affordable homes and assist 3,420 households.

The 2010 Proposed Budget for the Housing Operating Fund (16600) reduces one position, reclassifies two positions, and reduces other administrative expenses to assist in balancing the General Subfund.

The 2010 Proposed Budget transfer funds from the Low Income Housing Fund (16400) to the Housing Operating Fund to better align expenses incurred by the Weatherization program staff.

## Housing

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
<b>Low-Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level</b>					
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400		6,671,781	8,208,090	8,467,360	6,635,836
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400		23,934,278	32,729,437	28,455,463	33,591,236
<b>Low-Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level</b>	<b>XZ-R1</b>	<b>30,606,060</b>	<b>40,937,527</b>	<b>36,922,823</b>	<b>40,227,072</b>
<b>Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level</b>					
Administration and Management - 16600		1,953,862	1,688,418	1,741,702	1,748,487
Community Development - 16600		478,284	517,694	539,909	505,967
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600		744,575	743,972	757,477	1,163,273
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600		1,304,922	1,675,865	1,470,101	1,440,681
<b>Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level</b>	<b>XZ600</b>	<b>4,481,642</b>	<b>4,625,949</b>	<b>4,509,189</b>	<b>4,858,408</b>
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>35,087,702</b>	<b>45,563,476</b>	<b>41,432,012</b>	<b>45,085,480</b>
<b>Department Full-time Equivalents Total*</b>		<b>41.50</b>	<b>41.00</b>	<b>41.00</b>	<b>40.50</b>
<i>* 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.</i>					
		<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
<b>Resources</b>					
General Subfund		3,073,140	2,988,043	1,455,955	871,577
Other		32,014,562	42,575,433	39,976,057	44,213,903
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>35,087,702</b>	<b>45,563,476</b>	<b>41,432,012</b>	<b>45,085,480</b>

## Low-Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Low-Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level is to fund multi-family housing production, and to support homeownership and sustainability.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400	6,671,781	8,208,090	8,467,360	6,635,836
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400	23,934,278	32,729,437	28,455,463	33,591,236
<b>Total</b>	<b>30,606,060</b>	<b>40,937,527</b>	<b>36,922,823</b>	<b>40,227,072</b>

## **Low-Income Housing Fund 16400: Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400**

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Homeownership and Sustainability -16400 Program is to provide three types of loans and grants to low-income Seattle residents: loans for first-time home buyers, home repair loans to address health and safety and code repairs, and grants to make low-income housing more energy efficient.

### Program Summary

Decrease budget by approximately \$96,000 for single-family homebuyer activities, should the 2009 Housing Levy be approved by voters in 2009. This funding level is consistent with the finance plan approved by the City Council in Ordinance 123013.

Decrease budget by approximately \$1.03 million in state weatherization grant funding to correct the 2010 Endorsed budget. The two-year grant was fully appropriated in the 2009 Adopted budget and no additional appropriation is required in 2010.

Increase budget by \$10,000 to account for an increase in local weatherization grant funding from Seattle City Light.

Transfer out \$715,000 to the Operating Fund (16600) to reflect a technical adjustment to better align operating expenses incurred by the Weatherization program staff.

These changes result in a net program decrease from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.83 million.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400	6,671,781	8,208,090	8,467,360	6,635,836

## Low-Income Housing Fund 16400: Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400 Program is to invest in the community by making long-term, low-interest loans to developers to develop or preserve affordable multi-family rental housing. OH monitors the affordable housing portfolio to ensure the units remain affordable, serve the intended residents, and the buildings remain in good condition.

### Program Summary

Increase budget by approximately \$5.13 million for multi-family housing activities, should the 2009 Housing Levy be approved by voters in 2009. This funding level is consistent with the finance plan approved by the City Council in Ordinance 123013.

Increase budget by \$11,000 to reflect the updated estimate of the federal HOME award.

These changes result in a net program increase of \$5.14 million from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget.

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400	23,934,278	32,729,437	28,455,463	33,591,236

## Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level is to fund the Department's administration activities.

### Program Expenditures

	2008	2009	2010	2010
	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Administration and Management - 16600	1,953,862	1,688,418	1,741,702	1,748,487
Community Development - 16600	478,284	517,694	539,909	505,967
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600	744,575	743,972	757,477	1,163,273
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600	1,304,922	1,675,865	1,470,101	1,440,681
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,481,642</b>	<b>4,625,949</b>	<b>4,509,189</b>	<b>4,858,408</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	41.50	41.00	41.00	40.50

*\*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 Housing Operating Fund 16600: Administration and Management - 16600

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Administration and Management - 16600 Program is to provide centralized leadership, coordination, technology, contracting, and financial management support services to OH programs and capital projects to facilitate the production of affordable housing for Seattle residents.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$59,000 for communications and other administrative expenses to assist with balancing the General Fund budget.

Transfer in \$203,000 from the Low Income Housing Fund (16400) to better align operating expenses incurred by the Weatherization program staff.

Reduce budget by approximately \$22,000 for administration, should the 2009 Housing Levy be approved by voters. This funding level is consistent with the finance plan approved by the City Council in Ordinance 123013. Of note, of the \$1.89 million anticipated to be collected in 2010 for administration from the 2009 Housing Levy, \$1.73 million is appropriated in the 2010 Proposed Budget and \$164,000 will be appropriated in future years to fund inflationary increases in administrative expenses.

Reduce budget by \$60,000 due to an internal realignment of expenses within this budget control level.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$55,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$7,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Administration and Management - 16600	1,953,862	1,688,418	1,741,702	1,748,487
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.50	13.50	13.50	13.50

*\* 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 Housing Operating Fund 16600: Community Development - 16600

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Community Development -16600 Program is to provide strategic planning, program development, and vacant land redevelopment services to increase housing opportunities for Seattle residents.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$9,000 for consulting, training and travel budgets to assist with balancing the General Fund budget.

Reduce budget by \$15,000 and reclassify 1.0 FTE Sr. Community Development Specialist to a Community Development Specialist.

Reduce budget by \$7,000 for administration, should the 2009 Housing Levy be approved by voters. This funding level is consistent with the finance plan approved by the City Council in ordinance 123013. Of note, of the \$1.89 million anticipated to be collected in 2010 for administration from the 2009 Housing Levy, \$1.73 million is appropriated in the 2010 Proposed Budget and \$164,000 will be appropriated in future years to fund inflationary increases in administrative expenses.

Increase budget by \$17,000 due to an internal realignment of expenses within this budget control level.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$20,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$34,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Community Development - 16600	478,284	517,694	539,909	505,967
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00

*\* 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 Housing Operating Fund 16600: Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600

### Purpose Statement

The Homeownership and Sustainability -16600 Program provides three types of loans and grants to low-income Seattle residents: loans for first-time home-buyers, home repair loans to address health and safety and code repairs, and grants to make low-income housing more energy efficient.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$1,000 for training and travel to assist with balancing the General Fund budget.

Reduce budget by \$39,000 and reduce a Development Finance Specialist I position from 1.0 FTE to 0.5 FTE.

Transfer in \$499,000 from the Low Income Housing Fund (16400) to better align operating expenses incurred by the Weatherization program staff.

Reduce budget by \$10,000 for administration, should the 2009 Housing Levy be approved by voters in 2009. This funding level is consistent with the finance plan approved by the City Council in ordinance 123013. Of note, of the \$1.89 million anticipated to be collected in 2010 for administration from the 2009 Housing Levy, \$1.73 million is appropriated in the 2010 Proposed Budget and \$164,000 will be appropriated in future years to fund inflationary increases in administrative expenses.

Reduce budget by \$9,000 due to an internal realignment of expenses within this budget control level.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$35,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$406,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600	744,575	743,972	757,477	1,163,273
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.50	12.50	12.50	12.00

*\* 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 Housing Operating Fund 16600: Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600

### Purpose Statement

The Multi-Family Production and Preservation -16600 Program invests in the community by making long-term, low-interest loans to developers to develop or preserve affordable multi-family rental housing. OH monitors the affordable housing portfolio to ensure the units remain affordable and serve the intended residents, and the buildings remain in good condition.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$25,000 for salaries, training and travel expenses to assist with balancing the General Fund budget.

Reduce budget by \$15,000 and reclassify 1.0 FTE Sr. Community Development Specialist to a Community Development Specialist.

Transfer in \$13,000 from the Low Income Housing Fund (16400) to better align operating expenses incurred by the Weatherization program staff.

Increase budget by \$52,000 due to an internal realignment of expenses within this budget control level.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$54,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$29,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600	1,304,922	1,675,865	1,470,101	1,440,681
Full-time Equivalents Total*	11.00	11.00	11.00	11.00

*\* 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.*

# Housing

## 2010 Estimated Revenues for the Housing Operating Fund

Summit Code	Source	2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
433010	Federal Grants - Weatherization	0	0	0	531,720
434010	State Grants - Weatherization	0	0	0	182,896
439090	Grants (Sound Families, UWKC, Fort Lawton)	393,895	0	0	0
462900	Other Rent and use charges	0	0	0	27,000
469990	MacArthur Foundation Grant	0	282,500	0	17,500
541490	City Light Administration	615,893	631,588	631,588	654,731
541490	Contingent Bonus Program Administration	0	0	0	150,000
541490	HOME Administration	377,213	414,265	414,265	461,551
541490	Interest Earnings	602,432	30,000	30,000	26,300
541490	Levy Administration	798,678	746,917	1,769,325	1,730,212
541490	Prior Year Savings	198,312	88,000	88,056	109,957
541490	Program Income	113,912	50,000	50,000	94,964
541490	TDR Administration	0	114,000	70,000	0
587001	General Subfund Support	1,670,109	2,268,679	1,455,955	871,577
<b>Total Revenues</b>		<b>4,770,444</b>	<b>4,625,949</b>	<b>4,509,189</b>	<b>4,858,408</b>

# Housing

## 2010 Estimated Revenues for the Low-Income Housing Fund

Summit Code	Source	2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
411100	Property Tax Levy	11,724,862	11,856,344	13,791,978	18,820,000
431190	Federal Grants - Weatherization (ARRA)	0	0	0	0
433010	Federal Grants - Weatherization	1,379,483	2,270,000	2,338,100	1,623,484
434010	State Grants - Weatherization	504,507	1,000,000	1,030,000	0
439090	Contingent Bonus Program/TDR Authority	632,054	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
439090	United Way of King County Bridge Loan Program	0	3,000,000	0	0
461110	Investment Interest Earnings	2,593,856	2,552,000	2,868,200	2,868,200
469930	Program Income - Miscellaneous (Including Bridge Loans)	8,373,591	9,520,000	7,270,000	7,270,000
471010	Federal Grants - HOME Program	5,508,395	4,292,653	4,142,653	4,153,961
541490	Local Grants - Weatherization	704,378	1,438,730	1,481,891	1,491,427
541490	REACH Interest Earnings	0	288,436	0	0
587001	General Subfund Support	2,074,312	719,364	0	0
<b>Total Revenues</b>		<b>33,495,438</b>	<b>40,937,527</b>	<b>36,922,822</b>	<b>40,227,072</b>



# Neighborhood Matching Subfund

## Department Description

The purpose of the Neighborhood Matching Subfund (NMF) is to provide resources for Seattle's communities to preserve and enhance the City's diverse neighborhoods, and to empower people to make positive contributions to their communities.

The NMF was established in 1988 to support partnerships between the City of Seattle and neighborhood organizations to produce neighborhood-initiated planning, organizing, and improvement projects. The City provides a cash match to the community's contribution of volunteer labor, donated materials, and professional services or cash. Applications are accepted from neighborhood-based organizations of residents or businesses, community-based organizations that advocate for the interests of people of color, and ad-hoc groups of neighbors that form a committee for the purpose of a specific project.

Since 1997, the NMF has been divided into five categories, which include Large Projects (awards between \$15,000 and \$100,000); Small and Simple Projects (awards of \$15,000 or less); Tree Fund (trees provided to neighborhood groups to plant along residential planting strips); Neighborhood Outreach (one-time awards up to \$750 to help neighborhood-based organizations with membership expansion or leadership development); and Management and Project Development (consultation and technical assistance to neighborhood groups, coordination of the application and award process, and monitoring of funded projects). The NMF is housed in, and primarily staffed by, the Department of Neighborhoods. Staff are also located in, and funded by, the Department of Parks and Recreation and the Seattle Department of Transportation.

## Proposed Policy and Program Changes

The 2010 Proposed Budget reduces staffing levels in the Neighborhood Matching Fund to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund. The NMF program is undergoing a variety of process improvements and program changes to streamline administrative functions, improve customer service, and create staffing efficiencies, all of which help mitigate impacts of this staffing reduction.

The 2010 Proposed Budget does not reduce funding for NMF projects.

In 2010, NMF unreserved fund balance is used to cover operating expenditures. The use of fund balance reduces the amount of General Subfund support to NMF and assists in balancing the General Fund budget.

## Neighborhood Matching Subfund

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
<b>Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level</b>					
Large Projects Fund		1,555,439	1,295,563	1,332,643	1,332,643
Management and Project Development		1,334,737	1,128,186	1,170,558	881,243
Neighborhood Outreach Fund		29,667	14,372	14,788	14,788
Small and Simple Projects Fund		1,295,522	1,342,314	1,381,241	1,381,241
Tree Fund		46,185	49,259	50,687	50,687
<b>Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level</b>	<b>2IN00</b>	<b>4,261,550</b>	<b>3,829,693</b>	<b>3,949,917</b>	<b>3,660,602</b>
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>4,261,550</b>	<b>3,829,693</b>	<b>3,949,917</b>	<b>3,660,602</b>
		<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Resources</b>		<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
General Subfund		3,665,857	3,314,344	3,611,570	3,322,255
Other		595,693	515,349	338,347	338,347
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>4,261,550</b>	<b>3,829,693</b>	<b>3,949,917</b>	<b>3,660,602</b>

# Neighborhood Matching Subfund

## Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level is to support local grassroots actions within neighborhoods. The Neighborhood Matching Fund provides funding to match community contributions of volunteer labor, donated professional services or materials, or cash, to implement neighborhood-based self-help projects.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Large Projects Fund	1,555,439	1,295,563	1,332,643	1,332,643
Management and Project Development	1,334,737	1,128,186	1,170,558	881,243
Neighborhood Outreach Fund	29,667	14,372	14,788	14,788
Small and Simple Projects Fund	1,295,522	1,342,314	1,381,241	1,381,241
Tree Fund	46,185	49,259	50,687	50,687
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,261,550</b>	<b>3,829,693</b>	<b>3,949,917</b>	<b>3,660,602</b>

## Neighborhood Matching Fund: Large Projects Fund

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Large Projects Fund Program is to provide technical assistance and funding to neighborhood organizations initiating local improvement projects that require 12-18 months to complete and more than \$15,000 in Neighborhood Matching Funds.

### Program Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Large Projects Fund	1,555,439	1,295,563	1,332,643	1,332,643

# Neighborhood Matching Subfund

## Neighborhood Matching Fund: Management and Project Development

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Management and Project Development Program is to administer the Neighborhood Matching Fund by providing marketing and outreach to applicant groups; consulting and technical assistance for project development; administrative support coordinating and conducting the application, review, and award processes; and management and monitoring of funded projects to support high quality and successful completion of projects.

### Program Summary

Decrease budget by \$31,000 in consultant funds to assist in balancing the overall General Fund budget.

Decrease budget by \$227,000, abrogate 1.5 FTE Planning & Development Specialist II positions, decrease 0.2 FTE Finance Analyst, Assistant, and decrease 0.2 FTE Planning and Development Specialist, Senior. These changes address administrative goals to streamline the NMF process to meet customer service expectations and address budget reduction targets. The corresponding position reductions are displayed in the Department of Neighborhoods Budget.

Reclassify the existing Manager 2 position overseeing the NMF and P-Patch Programs to a Strategic Advisor 2 position, and have it report directly to the Department Director. This change has a zero net impact on the NMF budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$31,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$289,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Management and Project Development	1,334,737	1,128,186	1,170,558	881,243

## Neighborhood Matching Fund: Neighborhood Outreach Fund

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood Outreach Fund Program is to provide one-time awards of up to \$750 to assist neighborhood-based organizations in recruiting members, or in providing technical assistance or leadership training for their membership. Awards are available to neighborhood organizations with annual operating budgets under \$20,000.

### Program Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Neighborhood Outreach Fund	29,667	14,372	14,788	14,788

# Neighborhood Matching Subfund

## Neighborhood Matching Fund: Small and Simple Projects Fund

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Small and Simple Projects Fund Program is to provide technical assistance and funding for local improvement projects initiated by neighborhood organizations that can be completed in six months or less and require \$15,000 or less in funding.

### Program Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Small and Simple Projects Fund	1,295,522	1,342,314	1,381,241	1,381,241

## Neighborhood Matching Fund: Tree Fund

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Tree Fund Program is to provide trees to neighborhood groups to plant along residential planting strips in exchange for ongoing care and maintenance. Increasing the number of street trees in the city is a central goal of the Urban Forest Management Plan, and supports climate protection.

### Program Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Tree Fund	46,185	49,259	50,687	50,687

## Neighborhood Matching Subfund

### 2010 Estimated Revenues for the Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Summit Code	Source	2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
587001	OPER TR IN-FR GENERAL FUND	3,665,857	3,314,344	3,611,570	3,322,255
	<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>3,665,857</b>	<b>3,314,344</b>	<b>3,611,570</b>	<b>3,322,255</b>
379100	Use of Fund Balance	595,693	515,349	338,347	338,347
	<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>4,261,550</b>	<b>3,829,693</b>	<b>3,949,917</b>	<b>3,660,602</b>

## Neighborhood Matching Subfund

### Neighborhood Matching Subfund

	2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2009 Revised	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>5,491,726</b>	<b>5,361,194</b>	<b>4,896,033</b>	<b>4,845,845</b>	<b>4,380,683</b>
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	0	0	0	0	0
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	3,665,857	3,314,344	3,202,344	3,611,570	3,322,255
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	4,261,550	3,829,693	3,717,693	3,949,917	3,660,602
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>4,896,033</b>	<b>4,845,845</b>	<b>4,380,683</b>	<b>4,507,498</b>	<b>4,042,336</b>
Continuing Appropriations	4,315,131	4,645,846	4,060,435	4,507,498	4,042,336
<b>Total Reserves</b>	<b>4,315,131</b>	<b>4,645,846</b>	<b>4,060,435</b>	<b>4,507,498</b>	<b>4,042,336</b>
<b>Ending Unreserved Fund Balance</b>	<b>580,902</b>	<b>199,999</b>	<b>320,248</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>



# Department of Neighborhoods

## Stella Chao, Director

### Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-0464

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

On the Web at: <http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/>

### Department Description

The Department of Neighborhoods (DON) works to bring government closer to the residents of Seattle by engaging them in civic participation, helping them become empowered to make positive contributions to their communities, and involving more of Seattle's residents, including communities of color and immigrants, in civic discussions, processes, and opportunities. DON has six budget control levels (BCLs):

- 1) The Director's Office provides executive leadership, communications, and operational support for the entire Department. The Director's Office also includes Historic Preservation, which provides technical assistance, outreach, and education to the general public, owners of historic properties, government agencies, and elected officials to identify, protect, rehabilitate, and re-use historic properties.
- 2) The Community Building Division includes the P-Patch, Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF), Neighborhood District Coordinators, and Major Institutions and Schools. It also provides assistance on neighborhood planning coordination and implementation.
- 3) The Customer Service and Operations Division includes: Neighborhood Payment and Information Services; Finance, Budget, and Accounting; Human Resources; Facilities and Office Management; and Information Technology functions.
- 4) The Customer Service Bureau provides local residents with access to City services and information, and also provides opportunities to solve problems and resolve complaints.
- 5) The Office for Education (OFE) builds linkages between the City of Seattle and the Seattle Public School District. It administers the Families and Education Levy, provides policy direction to help children succeed in school, strengthens school-community connections, and increases access to high-quality early learning and out-of-school time programs.
- 6) The Youth Violence Prevention BCL includes funding for a variety of youth violence prevention initiatives including active outreach, counseling, referrals to job training, and individual and group programming. The Office for Education oversees this initiative.

### Proposed Policy and Program Changes

DON's 2010 Proposed Budget includes a variety of cost reductions that represent streamlining efficiency measures, sharing work with other departments, and reducing budget to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund budget.

The Department reduces information technology staff in response to a decreased need for direct IT support within its offices. To mitigate impacts of this reduction, the Department of Executive Administration increases support services provided to DON beginning in 2009.

## Neighborhoods

Staff in the Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration program is reduced as part of the Department's effort to streamline the NMF process for the community. The process improvements create administrative efficiencies that help offset the impacts of staff reductions. Corresponding funding reductions are displayed in the Neighborhood Matching Subfund budget.

In 2010, staff and funding levels for historic preservation activities are reduced due to a reduction in private development projects. This adjustment results in a slowdown of City-initiated historic preservation activity, but not in activities requiring compliance with local, state, or federal procedures.

The 2010 Proposed Budget transfers the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI) funds from Finance General to the Department of Neighborhoods. This transfer also moves the SYVPI Program Manager from the Office of Policy and Management to the DON.

In 2010, the City will follow through on three neighborhood plan updates related to communities with new light rail stations, but will also combine and restructure some of its other neighborhood planning efforts. This represents a slight restructuring of Neighborhood Planning work, and therefore a full-time position is reduced to part-time and another technical position is abrogated. The remaining work will be distributed to other departments that have existing neighborhood planning staff. Lastly, all contract work for translation and outreach for the neighborhood planning work is transferred to DON from the Department of Planning and Development in order to create efficiencies with DON's existing translation and outreach staff and work program.

Staff for youth civic engagement work and the South Park Action Agenda is added to support focused neighborhood and community work in these areas. Transferring the South Park Action position into DON, and funding the youth position with Neighborhood Matching Fund resources, help better align this important community work within the Department.

Other budget changes include a small reduction of staff hours at Neighborhood Payment Information Service Centers, a decrease in information publications, a reduction in Office for Education consultant resources, reclassification of positions to better align them with assigned work, and small reductions in administrative budgets.

## Neighborhoods

Appropriations	Summit Code	2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
<b>Community Building Budget Control Level</b>					
Involving All Neighbors		49,858	0	0	0
Major Institutions and Schools		250,357	217,350	226,905	220,137
Neighborhood District Coordinators		1,868,120	2,256,394	2,317,072	2,258,485
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration		13,848	75,000	77,325	0
P-Patch		693,591	679,645	705,674	666,490
<b>Community Building Budget Control Level</b>	<b>I3300</b>	<b>2,875,774</b>	<b>3,228,389</b>	<b>3,326,975</b>	<b>3,145,112</b>
<b>Customer Service and Operations Budget Control Level</b>					
Internal Operations/Administrative Services		1,842,928	1,575,864	1,623,385	1,477,126
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services		1,719,410	1,834,473	1,905,335	1,803,483
<b>Customer Service and Operations Budget Control Level</b>	<b>I3200</b>	<b>3,562,338</b>	<b>3,410,338</b>	<b>3,528,720</b>	<b>3,280,609</b>
<b>Customer Service Bureau Budget Control Level</b>	<b>I3800</b>	<b>619,137</b>	<b>698,450</b>	<b>731,437</b>	<b>686,631</b>
<b>Director's Office Budget Control Level</b>					
Communications		149,364	118,113	122,456	117,795
Executive Leadership		293,498	300,774	312,078	298,180
Historic Preservation		818,066	997,534	1,030,602	827,619
<b>Director's Office Budget Control Level</b>	<b>I3100</b>	<b>1,260,928</b>	<b>1,416,422</b>	<b>1,465,137</b>	<b>1,243,594</b>
<b>Office for Education Budget Control Level</b>	<b>I3700</b>	<b>272,597</b>	<b>237,857</b>	<b>244,894</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Youth Violence Prevention Budget Control Level</b>	<b>I4100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,305,007</b>
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>8,590,774</b>	<b>8,991,455</b>	<b>9,297,163</b>	<b>11,660,953</b>
<b>Department Full-time Equivalents Total*</b>		<b>87.00</b>	<b>88.00</b>	<b>88.00</b>	<b>85.10</b>
<i>* 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.</i>					
		2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
<b>Resources</b>					
General Subfund		8,590,774	8,991,455	9,297,163	11,660,953
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>8,590,774</b>	<b>8,991,455</b>	<b>9,297,163</b>	<b>11,660,953</b>

## Community Building Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Community Building Budget Control Level is to deliver technical assistance, support services, and programs in neighborhoods to strengthen local communities, engage residents in neighborhood improvement, leverage resources, and complete neighborhood-initiated projects.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Involving All Neighbors	49,858	0	0	0
Major Institutions and Schools	250,357	217,350	226,905	220,137
Neighborhood District Coordinators	1,868,120	2,256,394	2,317,072	2,258,485
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration	13,848	75,000	77,325	0
P-Patch	693,591	679,645	705,674	666,490
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,875,774</b>	<b>3,228,389</b>	<b>3,326,975</b>	<b>3,145,112</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	36.00	37.50	36.50	34.60

*\*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.*

## Community Building: Involving All Neighbors

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Involving All Neighbors Program is to promote the inclusion and participation of people with disabilities in neighborhood activities.

### Program Summary

This program was eliminated in the 2009 Adopted and 2010 Endorsed Budget.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Involving All Neighbors	49,858	0	0	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00

*\* 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.*

## Community Building: Major Institutions and Schools

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Major Institutions and Schools Program is to coordinate community involvement in the development, adoption, and implementation of Major Institution Master Plans, and to facilitate community involvement in school re-use and development.

### Program Summary

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$6,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$6,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Major Institutions and Schools	250,357	217,350	226,905	220,137
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.00	2.50	1.50	1.50

*\* 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.*

## Community Building: Neighborhood District Coordinators

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood District Coordinators Program is to provide a range of technical assistance and support services for citizens and neighborhood groups to develop a sense of partnership among neighborhood residents, businesses, and City government.

### Program Summary

Decrease budget by \$90,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Planning and Development Specialist II responsible for Neighborhood Planning database administration. This reduction reflects a transfer of these activities to individual departments involved in neighborhood planning activities.

Add 0.5 FTE Planning and Development Specialist I for administering civic engagement activities for high school age youth. This change is funded by Neighborhood Matching Fund resources and therefore has no net effect on the overall General Subfund.

Increase budget by \$90,000 and 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisory 1 to reflect a transfer of the South Park Action Agenda work from the Mayor's Office to the Department of Neighborhoods to better align this work with existing DON work.

Decrease budget by \$37,000 and 0.5 FTE Planning and Development Specialist II to reflect reduced funding for 2009 Status Report work on neighborhood planning activities.

Increase budget by \$92,000 in consulting resources to reflect a transfer of administration of contracts for outreach and translation services from the Department of Planning and Development to DON.

Decrease budget by \$18,000 to reduce translation services due to efficiencies of consolidating translation and outreach work for neighborhood planning within DON.

Decrease budget by \$9,000 to reduce enhancement funds for Neighborhood District Councils to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$87,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$59,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Neighborhood District Coordinators	1,868,120	2,256,394	2,317,072	2,258,485
Full-time Equivalents Total*	17.50	19.50	19.50	19.50

*\* 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.*

## Community Building: Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF) Administration Program is to manage the NMF, work with other City departments and agencies involved in NMF projects, and support diverse neighborhood groups engaged in local improvement efforts to leverage private resources, assist neighborhood organizations to become more self-reliant, build effective partnerships between City government and neighborhoods, and complete neighborhood-initiated improvements. Costs for NMF administration are included in the NMF budget, although position authority is displayed here for Department of Neighborhoods staff who administer the NMF program.

### Program Summary

Abrogate 1.5 FTE Planning & Development Specialist II positions, decrease 0.2 FTE Finance Analyst, Assistant and decrease 0.2 FTE Planning and Development Specialist, Senior. These changes address administrative goals to streamline the NMF process to meet customer service expectations and address budget reduction targets. The corresponding budget reductions are displayed in the Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF) Budget.

Reclassify the existing Manager 2 position overseeing the NMF and P-Patch Programs to a Strategic Advisor 2 position, and have it report directly to the Department Director. This change has a zero net impact on the NMF budget.

Transfer \$77,000 in sustainment funding to the Youth Violence Prevention Budget Control Level to consolidate all SYVPI funding.

These changes result in a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$77,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration	13,848	75,000	77,325	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.00	8.50	8.50	6.60

*\* 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.*

## Community Building: P-Patch

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the P-Patch Program is to provide community gardens, gardening space, and related support to Seattle residents while preserving open space for productive purposes, particularly in high-density communities. The goals of the program are to increase self-reliance among gardeners, and for P-Patches to be focal points for community involvement.

### Program Summary

Decrease budget by \$15,000 and reclassify a Planning and Development Specialist II position to a Community Garden Coordinator position to better align the position with assigned work. This change will not result in decreased services to P-Patches and does not impact DON's staffing or program needs.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$24,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$39,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
P-Patch	693,591	679,645	705,674	666,490
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00

*\* 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 Service and Operations Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Customer Service and Operations Budget Control Level is to provide information, referral services, and coordination of City services to community members, and to provide financial, human resources, facilities, office management, and information technology services to the Department's employees to serve customers efficiently and effectively.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Internal Operations/Administrative Services	1,842,928	1,575,864	1,623,385	1,477,126
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services	1,719,410	1,834,473	1,905,335	1,803,483
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,562,338</b>	<b>3,410,338</b>	<b>3,528,720</b>	<b>3,280,609</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	29.00	28.50	29.50	27.50

*\*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 Service and Operations: Internal Operations/Administrative Services**

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Internal Operations/Administrative Services Program is to manage financial, human resources, facility, administrative, and information technology services to enable department employees to serve customers efficiently and effectively.

### Program Summary

Decrease budget by \$27,000 to reflect a transfer of space rental costs to the Families and Education Levy Fund.

Decrease budget by \$150,000, abrogate 1.0 FTE Information Technology Systems Analyst and reduce 0.5 FTE Information Technology Professional C to streamline IT services across Department facilities and assist in balancing the overall General Subfund budget.

Decrease budget by \$10,000 in administrative expenses to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes increase the budget by \$41,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$146,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Internal Operations/Administrative Services	1,842,928	1,575,864	1,623,385	1,477,126
Full-time Equivalents Total*	11.00	10.50	11.50	10.00

*\* 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 Service and Operations: Neighborhood Payment and Information Services

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood Payment and Information Services Program is to accept payment for public services and to provide information and referral services so that customers can access City services where they live and work, and do business with the City more easily.

### Program Summary

Decrease budget by \$39,000 and abrogate 0.5 FTE Customer Service Representative to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund budget.

Decrease budget by \$16,000 in operating expenses to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$47,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$102,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services	1,719,410	1,834,473	1,905,335	1,803,483
Full-time Equivalents Total*	18.00	18.00	18.00	17.50

*\* 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 Service Bureau Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Customer Service Bureau is to assist Seattle residents in accessing services, to resolve complaints, and to provide appropriate and timely responses from City government.

**Summary**

Decrease budget by \$25,000 to reduce spending on the Citizen Information Guide and one-panel brochures to save costs by combining publishing and distribution with Seattle City Light Reading.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$20,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$45,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Customer Service Bureau	619,137	698,450	731,437	686,631
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25

*\* 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.*

## Director's Office Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Director's Office Budget Control Level is to provide executive leadership, communications, and operational support for the entire department. The Director's Office also includes Historic Preservation, which provides technical assistance, outreach, and education to the general public, owners of historic properties, government agencies, and elected officials to identify, protect, rehabilitate, and re-use historic properties.

### Program Expenditures

	2008	2009	2010	2010
	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Communications	149,364	118,113	122,456	117,795
Executive Leadership	293,498	300,774	312,078	298,180
Historic Preservation	818,066	997,534	1,030,602	827,619
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,260,928</b>	<b>1,416,422</b>	<b>1,465,137</b>	<b>1,243,594</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	10.25	10.25	10.25	9.25

*\*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.*

## Director's Office: Communications

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Communications Program is to provide printed and electronic information on programs and services offered by the Department, as well as to publicize other opportunities to increase civic participation.

### Program Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$5,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$5,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Communications	149,364	118,113	122,456	117,795
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

*\* 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.*

## Director's Office: Executive Leadership

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Executive Leadership Program is to provide leadership in fulfilling the Department's mission, and to facilitate the Department's communication and interaction with other City departments, external agencies, elected officials, and the public.

### Program Summary

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$14,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$14,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Executive Leadership	293,498	300,774	312,078	298,180
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

*\* 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.*

## Director's Office: Historic Preservation

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Historic Preservation Program is to provide technical assistance, outreach, and education to the general public, owners of historic properties, government agencies, and elected officials to identify, protect, rehabilitate, and re-use historic properties.

### Program Summary

Decrease budget by \$63,000 to reflect a reduction of consultant resources needed for Downtown Historic Survey and Inventory work, due in part to a slowing of private development projects.

Decrease budget by \$111,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Senior Community Development Specialist handling the Downtown Historic Survey and Inventory work based on the corresponding reduction in funding for the project.

Use American Recovery and Reinvestment (ARRA) funds to partially offset the costs of a 0.5 FTE Community Development Specialist responsible for federal section 106 compliance on historic buildings. This has no net effect on the General Subfund budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar changes decrease the budget by \$29,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$203,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Historic Preservation	818,066	997,534	1,030,602	827,619
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.25	7.25	7.25	6.25

*\* 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 for Education Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Office for Education (OFE) Budget Control Level is to build linkages and a strong relationship between the City of Seattle and the Seattle Public School District, administer the Families and Education Levy, provide policy direction to help children succeed in school, strengthen school-community connections, and help achieve the vision of every Seattle child having access to high-quality early care and out-of-school-time programs.

### Summary

Decrease budget by \$244,000 in consultant resources to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund. This change zeros out this Budget Control Level in 2010. Any future costs will be funded by the Families and Education Levy.

Increase budget by 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II that was added during the Q2 2009 supplemental process. Additional funding was not provided so this increase has no budget impact.

These changes result in a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$244,000.

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Office for Education	272,597	237,857	244,894	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.50	5.50	5.50	6.50

*\* 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.*

## Youth Violence Prevention Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Youth Violence Prevention Budget Control Level is to reduce juvenile violent crimes. The initiative provides a wide range of services for young people including active outreach, skills development, case management and individual and group programming.

### Summary

Increase budget by \$3.1 million to reflect the transfer of the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI) from Finance General to this program. This change will provide centralized management of the initiative to ensure overall alignment of programs and to efficiently track outcomes

Increase budget by \$151,000 and add 1.0 Strategic Advisor 3 to reflect the transfer of the Youth Violence Prevention Initiative Director from the Office of Policy and Management to this program. Although functions of the initiative will continue to be carried out through multiple departments, the overall program administration will be managed by DON.

Increase budget by \$77,325 to reflect a transfer of sustainment funding from the Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration Budget Control Level to consolidate all SYVPI funding.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Youth Violence Prevention	0	0	0	3,305,007
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00

*\* 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.*



# **Pike Place Market Levy**

## **Carol Binder, Executive Director**

### **Contact Information**

Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority

PDA Information Line: (206) 682-7453

On the Web at: <http://www.pikeplacemarket.org>

### **Department Description**

The Pike Place Market Levy, approved by voters in November 2008, collects up to \$73 million in additional property taxes over six years for major repairs, infrastructure, and accessibility upgrades to buildings owned by the Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority (PDA). The PDA is a nonprofit, public corporation chartered by the City of Seattle. As part of its mission, the PDA is required to preserve, rehabilitate, and protect the Market's buildings.

The PDA manages the renovation project. The City receives Levy proceeds in the Pike Place Market Renovation Fund established through Ordinance 122737 and provides cash to finance the project according to the PDA's construction schedule, including issuing limited-tax obligation bonds as cash flow requires. The City collects \$12.5 million per year in Levy proceeds through 2014.

### **Proposed Policy and Program Changes**

In the 2009 Adopted Budget, the City planned to borrow \$18 million to meet the PDA's projected cash flow needs for Phase I of the levy-funded renovation project. Based on the PDA's revised cash flow projections, the City was able to reduce its borrowing to \$12 million in 2009. The City intends to issue another \$4.8 million of debt in 2010. Debt service on these bonds is paid from Levy proceeds. Due to favorable interest rates and a reduced principal amount, debt service payments in the 2010 Proposed budget are significantly less than in the 2010 Endorsed Budget.

Although the overall borrowing requirement has been reduced, Phase I of the PDA project is on schedule and the PDA intends to spend \$815,000 more in the biennium as design on Phase II of the project has been accelerated.

## Pike Place Market Levy

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
<b>Pike Place Market Renovation Budget Control Level</b>					
Bond Proceeds		0	18,000,000	0	0
Levy Proceeds		0	6,979,000	8,431,000	9,246,000
<b>Pike Place Market Renovation Budget Control Level</b>	<b>PKLVYBC L-01</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24,979,000</b>	<b>8,431,000</b>	<b>9,246,000</b>
<b>Pike Place Market Renovation Debt Service Budget Control Level</b>	<b>PKLVYBC L-02</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>417,150</b>	<b>4,223,257</b>	<b>2,574,692</b>
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>25,396,150</b>	<b>12,654,257</b>	<b>11,820,692</b>
		<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Resources</b>		<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Other		0	25,396,150	12,654,257	11,820,692
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>25,396,150</b>	<b>12,654,257</b>	<b>11,820,692</b>

# Pike Place Market Levy

## Pike Place Market Renovation Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Pike Place Market Renovation Budget Control Level is to provide appropriation authority for the City's disbursement of funds to the Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority (PDA) in compliance with the "Agreement regarding Levy Proceeds by and between the City of Seattle and the Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority" related to renovation and improvements to the Pike Place Market.

### Program Expenditures

	2008	2009	2010	2010
	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Bond Proceeds	0	18,000,000	0	0
Levy Proceeds	0	6,979,000	8,431,000	9,246,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24,979,000</b>	<b>8,431,000</b>	<b>9,246,000</b>

## Pike Place Market Renovation: Bond Proceeds

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Bond Proceeds Program is to allow spending of bond proceeds and bond interest earnings to be tracked separately from other revenues in the Pike Place Market Renovation Fund.

### Program Summary

The City received \$12 million in proceeds from the 2009 Limited Tax General Obligation (LTGO) Bond issue for the Pike Place Market renovation. The City intends to issue an additional \$4.8 million in 4-year LTGO Bonds in early 2010 using appropriation authority carried over from 2009. Bond proceeds are used to reimburse levy-related expenses incurred by the PDA in the renovation of Pike Place Market.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Bond Proceeds	0	18,000,000	0	0

## Pike Place Market Renovation: Levy Proceeds

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Levy Proceeds Program is to allow spending of levy proceeds and levy interest earnings to be tracked separately from bond proceeds in the Pike Place Market Renovation Fund.

### Program Summary

Levy proceeds are used to cover the PDA's levy-related Pike Place Market renovation expenses.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Levy Proceeds	0	6,979,000	8,431,000	9,246,000

# Pike Place Market Levy

## Pike Place Market Renovation Debt Service Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Pike Place Market Renovation Debt Service Budget Control Level is to provide appropriation authority for the City's payment of debt service for debt issued in support of the Pike Place Market Renovation funded by levy proceeds.

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Pike Place Market Renovation Debt Service Program	0	417,150	4,223,257	2,574,692

## Pike Place Market Levy

### 2010 Estimated Revenues for the Pike Place Levy

Summit Code	Source	2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
411100	Property Tax	0	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
461100	Interest Earnings	0	306,000	176,000	55,000
481100	General Obligation Bond Proceeds	0	18,000,000	0	4,800,000
	<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30,806,000</b>	<b>12,676,000</b>	<b>17,355,000</b>
379100	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	0	(5,409,850)	(21,743)	(5,534,308)
	<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25,396,150</b>	<b>12,654,257</b>	<b>11,820,692</b>

## Pike Place Market Levy

### Pike Place Levy

	2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2009 Revised	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,409,850</b>	<b>(777,150)</b>
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	0	0	0	0	0
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	0	30,806,000	24,619,000	12,676,000	17,355,000
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	0	25,396,150	25,396,150	12,654,257	11,820,692
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,409,850</b>	<b>(777,150)</b>	<b>5,431,593</b>	<b>4,757,158</b>
Reserve for Pike Place Market Renovations		5,409,850		5,431,593	4,757,158
<b>Total Reserves</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,409,850</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,431,593</b>	<b>4,757,158</b>
<b>Ending Unreserved Fund Balance</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(777,150)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

# Department of Planning and Development

## Diane Sugimura, Director

### Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-8600

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

On the Web at: <http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/>

### Department Description

The Department of Planning and Development (DPD) is responsible for both regulatory and long-range planning functions. On the regulatory side, DPD is responsible for developing policies and codes related to public safety, environmental protection, land use, construction, and rental housing, including:

- Environmentally Critical Areas Ordinance (ECA);
- Housing and Building Maintenance Code;
- Just Cause Eviction Ordinance;
- Seattle Building Code;
- Seattle Condominium and Cooperative Conversion Ordinances;
- Seattle Electrical Code;
- Seattle Energy Code;
- Seattle Land Use Code;
- Seattle Mechanical Code;
- Seattle Noise Ordinance;
- Seattle Shoreline Master Program;
- Seattle Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance;
- Seattle Tree Protection Ordinance;
- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA); and
- Stormwater, Grading, and Drainage Control Ordinance.

DPD reviews land use and construction-related permits, annually approving more than 28,000 permits and performing approximately 117,000 on-site inspections. The work includes public notice and involvement for Master Use Permits (MUPs); shoreline review; design review; approval of permits for construction, mechanical systems, site development, elevators, electrical installation, boilers, furnaces, refrigeration, signs and billboards; annual inspections of boilers and elevators; and home seismic retrofits.

DPD enforces compliance with community standards for housing, zoning, shorelines, tenant relocation assistance, just cause eviction, vacant buildings, noise, and development-related violation complaints, responding to more than 5,300 complaints annually.

Long-range physical planning functions are also included in the DPD's mission. These planning functions include monitoring and updating the City's Comprehensive Plan, evaluating regional growth management policy, developing sub-area and functional plans, implementing the Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood plans, fostering urban design excellence throughout the city and particularly in Seattle's public spaces, encouraging sustainable development via the City Green Building Team, and staffing the Planning and Design Commissions.

DPD services are funded by a variety of fees and from General Subfund resources. DPD must demonstrate that its fees are set to recover no more than the cost of related services. To provide this accountability, DPD uses cost accounting to measure the full cost of its programs. Each program is allocated a share of departmental administration and other overhead costs to report the full cost and calculate the revenue requirements of the program.

# Planning and Development

## Proposed Policy and Program Changes

The Department of Planning and Development's 2010 Proposed Budget maintains funding for City priorities while responding to fiscal challenges. The 2009 Adopted and 2010 Endorsed Budget anticipated a slowing in regional development. However, the actual recession both regionally and nationally has been deeper, particularly in construction-related activity. As a result, based on an analysis of anticipated fee revenues and permit activity, the 2010 Proposed Budget contains significant reductions in DPD.

The 2010 Proposed Budget limits funding for overtime, the use of consultants, and training, and abrogates almost all term and contingent positions that were added to address peak construction volumes in recent years. In addition, the 2010 Proposed Budget abrogates or unfunds several regular positions. Unfunded positions will not be funded or filled until development activity returns to levels that are more normal by historical standards and generates revenue to fund the positions.

The 2010 Proposed Budget reduces planning resources to help balance DPD's General Fund and fee-supported budgets. Fewer resources will be available for consultant support for center city planning, the Shoreline Master Program, and green building outreach and consulting support. DPD will redistribute work among remaining Staff to ensure that the Department continues to provide support for specific projects and leadership in urban planning and sustainable development.

Resources have been reallocated to support updates to the City's Comprehensive Plan that are required once every seven years and must be completed by 2011.

The 2010 Proposed Budget continues the City's commitment to working with communities to update Neighborhood Plans to reflect the changes and opportunities presented by major transportation investments, including Link Light Rail which began operating in 2009.

Resources are added to partially fund an environmental impact statement (EIS) on alternatives for South Lake Union that envision a vital and dynamic pedestrian-oriented community combining new housing, jobs, and infrastructure. This part of Seattle is anticipated to experience significant growth when the development environment improves.

As a result of the Citywide vehicle review intended to make the City's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient, and as a result of the positions reduced departmentwide, nine vehicles are removed from DPD's fleet, resulting in savings of \$29,000 in the 2010 Proposed Budget.

## Planning and Development

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
<b>Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level</b>					
Annual Certification & Inspection Overhead Allocations		962,564	1,155,272	1,188,848	1,008,523
Annual Certification and Inspection		2,564,256	2,629,533	2,825,551	2,472,566
<b>Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U24A0</b>	<b>3,526,821</b>	<b>3,784,805</b>	<b>4,014,399</b>	<b>3,481,088</b>
<b>Code Compliance Budget Control Level</b>					
Code Compliance		3,288,594	3,849,269	3,977,574	3,734,539
Code Compliance Overhead Allocations		992,448	1,161,229	1,196,412	1,141,755
<b>Code Compliance Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2400</b>	<b>4,281,043</b>	<b>5,010,498</b>	<b>5,173,985</b>	<b>4,876,294</b>
<b>Construction Inspections Budget Control Level</b>					
Building Inspections Program		3,719,218	5,436,211	5,621,814	3,475,621
Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations		3,581,827	4,615,621	4,743,691	3,975,754
Construction Inspections Unallocated CBA		0	0	0	1,798,947
Electrical Inspections		3,298,745	3,600,568	3,730,182	3,527,130
Signs and Billboards		201,000	160,143	166,481	252,275
Site Review and Inspection		2,352,187	2,844,947	2,952,413	2,448,564
<b>Construction Inspections Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U23A0</b>	<b>13,152,977</b>	<b>16,657,490</b>	<b>17,214,581</b>	<b>15,478,292</b>
<b>Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level</b>					
Applicant Services Center		7,458,735	8,216,793	8,520,374	6,299,051
Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations		3,787,404	3,110,576	3,233,286	3,096,514
Construction Permit Services Unallocated CBA		0	0	0	3,150,000
Construction Plans Administration		6,400,824	8,351,819	8,636,134	4,761,626
Operations Division Management		1,565,040	3,088,423	3,187,359	1,824,856
Public Resource Center		1,607,118	1,643,556	1,635,446	1,615,111
<b>Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2300</b>	<b>20,819,121</b>	<b>24,411,168</b>	<b>25,212,599</b>	<b>20,747,158</b>

## Planning and Development

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
<b>Department Leadership Budget Control Level</b>					
Community Relations		363,840	504,786	523,426	428,938
Department Leadership Overhead Allocations		(12,501,755)	(13,880,215)	(14,319,874)	(12,452,208)
Director's Office		711,587	801,803	828,533	699,104
Finance and Accounting Services		5,107,676	5,702,421	5,876,048	5,587,921
Human Resources		714,526	672,706	697,943	504,207
Information Technology Services		5,604,125	6,198,499	6,393,924	5,232,037
<b>Department Leadership Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Land Use Services Budget Control Level</b>					
Land Use Services		4,709,001	5,159,712	5,355,071	3,886,512
Land Use Services Overhead Allocations		1,739,082	2,170,757	2,240,539	1,641,294
Land Use Services Unallocated CBA		0	0	0	500,000
<b>Land Use Services Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2200</b>	<b>6,448,083</b>	<b>7,330,469</b>	<b>7,595,610</b>	<b>6,027,805</b>
<b>Planning Budget Control Level</b>					
Design Commission		303,294	286,285	296,542	273,743
Planning Commission		342,204	407,678	423,070	407,296
Planning Overhead Allocations		1,438,429	1,667,581	1,720,215	1,588,368
Planning Services		5,367,949	4,892,854	5,067,514	4,691,209
<b>Planning Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2900</b>	<b>7,451,876</b>	<b>7,254,398</b>	<b>7,507,341</b>	<b>6,960,617</b>
<b>Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2800</b>	<b>2,008,954</b>	<b>2,965,449</b>	<b>3,054,038</b>	<b>3,036,445</b>
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>57,688,874</b>	<b>67,414,276</b>	<b>69,772,553</b>	<b>60,607,700</b>
<b>Department Full-time Equivalents Total*</b>		<b>441.00</b>	<b>437.00</b>	<b>436.00</b>	<b>407.00</b>

*\* 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.*

<b>Resources</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
General Subfund	10,159,178	10,179,507	10,740,517	10,040,985
Other	47,529,696	57,234,768	59,032,036	50,566,715
<b>Department Total</b>	<b>57,688,874</b>	<b>67,414,276</b>	<b>69,772,553</b>	<b>60,607,700</b>

# Planning and Development

## Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level is to provide inspections of mechanical equipment at installation and on an annual or biennial cycle in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner. These services are provided so mechanical equipment is substantially maintained to applicable codes, legal requirements, and policies, and operated safely. The program also certifies that installers and mechanics are qualified, by validation of work experience and testing of code knowledge, to operate and maintain mechanical equipment. In addition, this budget control level includes a proportionate share of associated departmental administration and other overhead costs.

### Program Expenditures

	2008	2009	2010	2010
	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Annual Certification & Inspection Overhead Allocations	962,564	1,155,272	1,188,848	1,008,523
Annual Certification and Inspection	2,564,256	2,629,533	2,825,551	2,472,566
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,526,821</b>	<b>3,784,805</b>	<b>4,014,399</b>	<b>3,481,088</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	24.54	23.54	24.54	24.54

*\*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.*

## Annual Certification and Inspection: Annual Certification & Inspection Overhead Allocations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Annual Certification and Inspection Overhead Allocations Program is to represent the share of departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to the Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$180,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on the proposed staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Annual Certification & Inspection Overhead Allocations	962,564	1,155,272	1,188,848	1,008,523

# Planning and Development

## Annual Certification and Inspection: Annual Certification and Inspection Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Annual Certification and Inspection Program is to provide inspections of mechanical equipment at installation and on an annual or biennial cycle in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner. These services are provided so mechanical equipment is substantially maintained to applicable codes, legal requirements, and policies, and operated safely. The program also certifies that installers and mechanics are qualified, by validation of work experience and testing of code knowledge, to operate and maintain mechanical equipment.

## Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$3,000 and remove one sedan from the DPD vehicle fleet as a result of the Citywide vehicle review intended to make the City's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$350,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$353,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Annual Certification and Inspection	2,564,256	2,629,533	2,825,551	2,472,566
Full-time Equivalents Total*	24.54	23.54	24.54	24.54

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Code Compliance Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Code Compliance Budget Control Level is to see that properties and buildings are used and maintained in conformance with code standards, and deterioration of structures and properties is reduced. Additionally, this budget control level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs.

### Program Expenditures

	2008	2009	2010	2010
	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Code Compliance	3,288,594	3,849,269	3,977,574	3,734,539
Code Compliance Overhead Allocations	992,448	1,161,229	1,196,412	1,141,755
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,281,043</b>	<b>5,010,498</b>	<b>5,173,985</b>	<b>4,876,294</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	32.38	32.88	32.88	31.88

*\*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.*

## Code Compliance: Code Compliance

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Code Compliance Program is to see that properties and buildings are used, maintained, and developed in conformance with code standards, to facilitate enforcement actions against violators through the legal system, and to reduce the deterioration of structures and properties so that Seattle's housing stock lasts longer.

### Program Summary

Reduce General Fund allocation by \$149,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Housing and Zoning Inspector, Sr., position. This adjustment includes a reduction of \$50,000 in resources for consulting resources, printing, and other soft costs.

Reduce budget authority by \$7,000 and remove two sedans from the DPD vehicle fleet as a result of the Citywide vehicle review intended to make the City's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient, and as a result of the positions being reduced departmentwide.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$87,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$243,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Code Compliance	3,288,594	3,849,269	3,977,574	3,734,539
Full-time Equivalents Total*	32.38	32.88	32.88	31.88

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Code Compliance: Code Compliance Overhead Allocations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Code Compliance Overhead Allocations Program is to represent a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs to report the full cost of the related programs.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$55,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on the proposed staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Code Compliance Overhead Allocations	992,448	1,161,229	1,196,412	1,141,755

# Planning and Development

## Construction Inspections Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Construction Inspections Budget Control Level is to provide timely on-site inspections of property under development to support substantial compliance with applicable City codes, ordinances, and approved plans. Additionally, this budget control level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Building Inspections Program	3,719,218	5,436,211	5,621,814	3,475,621
Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations	3,581,827	4,615,621	4,743,691	3,975,754
Construction Inspections Unallocated CBA	0	0	0	1,798,947
Electrical Inspections	3,298,745	3,600,568	3,730,182	3,527,130
Signs and Billboards	201,000	160,143	166,481	252,275
Site Review and Inspection	2,352,187	2,844,947	2,952,413	2,448,564
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,152,977</b>	<b>16,657,490</b>	<b>17,214,581</b>	<b>15,478,292</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	91.10	96.10	96.10	88.10

*\*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.*

## Construction Inspections: Building Inspections Program

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Building Inspections Program is to provide timely on-site inspections of property under development at predetermined stages of construction; work closely with project architects, engineers, developers, contractors, and other City of Seattle departments to approve projects as substantially complying with applicable City codes, ordinances, and approved plans; and to issue final approvals for occupancy.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$423,000 to reflect reductions in four positions supporting the Building Inspections program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2010 Proposed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes are as follows:

- Abrogate 2.0 FTE Building Inspector, Sr. (Expert) positions. These term positions were originally added to handle peak construction volumes;
- Abrogate 2.0 FTE contingent Building Inspector, Sr. (Expert) positions.

Reduce budget authority by \$11,000 and remove three sedans from the DPD vehicle fleet as a result of the Citywide vehicle review intended to make the City's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient, and as a result of the positions being reduced departmentwide.

Transfer \$1.6 million to the Construction Inspections Unallocated Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) program. Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget proposing the use of contingent budget authority. Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$1.6 million in contingent budget authority for construction inspection could be proposed. The 2010 Proposed Budget intends to access none of this authority, however, so the full balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$112,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.15 million.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Building Inspections Program	3,719,218	5,436,211	5,621,814	3,475,621
Full-time Equivalents Total*	34.96	34.96	34.96	30.96

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Inspections: Construction Inspections Overhead

### Allocations

#### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations Program is to represent the proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to this budget control level, in order to report the full cost and calculate the revenue requirements of the budget control level and programs.

#### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$768,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on the proposed staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations	3,581,827	4,615,621	4,743,691	3,975,754
Full-time Equivalents Total*	9.25	9.25	9.25	9.25

*\* 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.*

## Construction Inspections: Construction Inspections Unallocated CBA

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Construction Inspections Unallocated CBA Program is to display the amount of Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) that has not been accessed within the Construction Inspections BCL for construction inspections and electrical inspections with plan review. In contrast, CBA that is accessed is appropriated in the programs in which it will be spent. More information about CBA and its planned use in this budget may be found at the conclusion of the DPD chapter.

#### Program Summary

This program is established in the 2010 Proposed Budget. In 2010, a total of \$1.8 million in contingent authority in the Construction Inspections BCL will not be accessed, including \$1.6 million for construction inspections in the Building Inspections program, and \$199,000 for electrical inspections with plan review from the Electrical Inspections program. The unallocated authority has been transferred into this program to facilitate oversight and monitoring.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Construction Inspections Unallocated CBA	0	0	0	1,798,947

# Planning and Development

## Construction Inspections: Electrical Inspections

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Electrical Inspections Program is to provide review of proposed electrical installations and on-site inspection of properties under development in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner. These services are provided to ensure the electrical installations substantially comply with applicable codes, legal requirements, and approved plans.

### Program Summary

Transfer \$199,000 in budget authority to the Construction Inspections Unallocated Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) program. Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget proposing the use of contingent budget authority. Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$620,000 in contingent budget authority for electrical inspection with plan review could be proposed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2010 Proposed Budget intends to access \$421,000 of this authority, and the remaining balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$4,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$203,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Electrical Inspections	3,298,745	3,600,568	3,730,182	3,527,130
Full-time Equivalents Total*	25.18	26.18	26.18	26.18

*\* 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.*

## Construction Inspections: Signs and Billboards

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Signs and Billboards Program is to provide review of proposed sign installations and on-site inspection of properties under development in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner. These services are provided to ensure sign installations comply with applicable codes, legal requirements, and approved plans.

### Program Summary

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and other technical changes increase the budget by \$86,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$86,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Signs and Billboards	201,000	160,143	166,481	252,275
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Inspections: Site Review and Inspection

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Site Review and Inspection Program is to ensure construction projects comply with grading, drainage, side sewer, and environmentally critical area codes; City of Seattle engineering standard details; and best management practices for erosion control methods to ensure that ground-related impacts of development are mitigated on-site and that sewer and drainage installations on private property are properly installed.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$568,000 to reflect reductions in six positions supporting the Site Review and Inspection program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2010 Proposed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes are as follows:

- Abrogate 1.0 FTE Civil Engineering Specialist, Sr. position. This term position was originally added to handle peak construction volumes;
- Abrogate 3.0 FTE Site Development Inspector positions;
- Retain position authority but unfund 2.0 FTE regular positions, a 1.0 FTE Civil Engineering Associate and 1.0 FTE Civil Engineering Specialist, Sr.

Reduce budget authority by \$11,000 and remove three sedans from the DPD vehicle fleet as a result of the Citywide vehicle review intended to make the City's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and other technical changes increase the budget by \$75,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$504,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Site Review and Inspection	2,352,187	2,844,947	2,952,413	2,448,564
Full-time Equivalents Total*	20.09	24.09	24.09	20.09

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level is to facilitate the review of development plans and processing of permits so that applicants can plan, alter, construct, occupy, and maintain Seattle's buildings and property. Additionally, this budget control level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Applicant Services Center	7,458,735	8,216,793	8,520,374	6,299,051
Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations	3,787,404	3,110,576	3,233,286	3,096,514
Construction Permit Services Unallocated CBA	0	0	0	3,150,000
Construction Plans Administration	6,400,824	8,351,819	8,636,134	4,761,626
Operations Division Management	1,565,040	3,088,423	3,187,359	1,824,856
Public Resource Center	1,607,118	1,643,556	1,635,446	1,615,111
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,819,121</b>	<b>24,411,168</b>	<b>25,212,599</b>	<b>20,747,158</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	139.08	135.58	134.58	120.58

*\*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.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services: Applicant Services Center

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Applicant Services Center Program is to provide early technical and process assistance to applicants during building design and permit application; screen, accept and process all land use and construction permit applications; and review and issue simple development plans in a fair, reasonable and consistent manner to ensure substantial compliance with applicable codes and legal requirements.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$1.69 million to reflect reductions in 19 positions supporting the Applicant Services Center program, including \$80,000 in savings for overtime, training, travel, and other costs. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2010 Proposed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes are as follows:

- Abrogate five term positions originally added to handle peak construction volumes, including 2.0 FTE Land Use Planner II, 2.0 FTE Permit Specialist II, and 1.0 FTE Permit Technician;
- Abrogate 2.0 FTE contingent Permit Specialist II positions;
- Retain position authority but unfund 12 regular positions, including 2.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II, 4.0 FTE Permit Process Leader, 1.0 FTE Permit Specialist, 4.0 FTE Permit Technician positions, and 1.0 FTE Land Use Planner II.

Transfer \$124,000 in budget authority and 1.0 FTE Manager 2 position from the Applicant Services program to the Planning Services program to align the organizational structure with work being performed.

Transfer \$500,000 to the Construction Permit Services Unallocated Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) program. Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget proposing the use of contingent budget authority. Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$500,000 in contingent budget authority for construction plan review could be proposed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2010 Proposed Budget intends to access none of this authority, however, so the full balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and other technical changes increase the budget by \$91,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.22 million.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Applicant Services Center	7,458,735	8,216,793	8,520,374	6,299,051
Full-time Equivalents Total*	66.95	65.95	65.95	57.95

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services: Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations Program is to represent the proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs to report the full cost of the related programs.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$137,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on the proposed staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations	3,787,404	3,110,576	3,233,286	3,096,514

## Construction Permit Services: Construction Permit Services Unallocated CBA

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Construction Permit Services Unallocated CBA Program is to display the amount of Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) in the Construction Permit Services BCL that has not been accessed for construction plan review and peer review contracts. In contrast, CBA that is accessed is appropriated in the programs in which it will be spent. More information about CBA and its planned use in this budget may be found at the conclusion of the DPD chapter.

### Program Summary

This program is established in the 2010 Proposed Budget. In 2010, a total of \$3.15 million in contingent authority in the Construction Permit Services BCL will not be accessed, including \$500,000 for construction plan review from the Applicant Services program, and \$1.9 million for construction plan review and \$750,000 for peer review contracts from the Construction Plans Administration program. The unallocated authority has been transferred into this program to facilitate oversight and monitoring.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Construction Permit Services Unallocated CBA	0	0	0	3,150,000

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services: Construction Plans Administration

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Construction Plans Administration Program is to review development plans and documents for permit applicants in a fair, reasonable, and predictable manner; ensure that the plans substantially comply with applicable codes and legal requirements; develop and revise technical code regulations at the local, state, and national levels; and provide appropriate support for preparation, mitigation, response, and recovery services for disasters.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$1.10 million to reflect reductions in eight positions supporting the Construction Plans Administration Program, including \$255,000 in savings for consulting services and other costs including overtime, training, and travel. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2010 Proposed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes are as follows:

- Abrogate 1.0 FTE Permit Process Leader position and 5.0 FTE Structural Plans Engineer, Sr., positions. These term positions were originally added to handle peak construction volumes;
- Retain position authority but unfund 2.0 FTE regular positions, a 1.0 FTE Code Development Analyst and 1.0 FTE Code Development Analyst, Sr.

Reclassify a Manager 2 position to a Strategic Advisor 2 position. This position provides policy leadership to a small team responsible for technical code development including emergency management.

Transfer \$1.9 million to the Construction Permit Services Unallocated Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) program. Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget proposing the use of contingent budget authority. Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$1.9 million in contingent budget authority for construction plan review could be proposed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2010 Proposed Budget intends to access none of this authority, however, so the full balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

Transfer \$750,000 to the Construction Permit Services Unallocated Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) program. Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget proposing the use of contingent budget authority. Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$1.5 million in contingent budget authority for peer review contracts could be proposed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2010 Proposed Budget intends to access \$750,000 of this authority, and the remaining balance of \$750,000 is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$126,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$3.87 million.

## Planning and Development

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Construction Plans Administration	6,400,824	8,351,819	8,636,134	4,761,626
Full-time Equivalents Total*	58.27	55.77	55.77	49.77

*\* 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.*

### **Construction Permit Services: Operations Division Management Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Operations Division Management Program is to oversee the functions of four budget control levels: Annual Certification/Inspection, Construction Permit Services, Construction Inspections, and Land Use Services.

### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget by \$417,000 to reflect the unfunding of five positions supporting the Operations Division program, including 2.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II, 2.0 FTE Management Systems Analyst, Sr., and 1.0 FTE Public Relations Specialist. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2010 Proposed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload.

Reduce budget authority by \$1.69 million to reflect reductions in costs to balance DPD's budget, including reductions in the use of consultants, overtime, printing, office supplies and furnishings, training, and travel.

Reclassify a Manager 3 position to a Strategic Advisor 2 position. This position provides policy leadership for the Green Permitting and the Sustainable Business Practices programs.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes increase the budget by \$744,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.36 million.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Operations Division Management	1,565,040	3,088,423	3,187,359	1,824,856

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services: Public Resource Center

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Public Resource Center Program is to provide the general public and City staff convenient access to complete, accurate information about department regulations and current applications; to provide applicants with a first point of contact; and to preserve, maintain, and provide access to records for department staff and the public.

### Program Summary

Reduce General Fund budget authority by \$30,000 and reduce fee-supported budget authority by \$95,000 to reflect reductions in consulting and other costs to help balance DPD's budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes increase the budget by \$104,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$20,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Public Resource Center	1,607,118	1,643,556	1,635,446	1,615,111
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.86	13.86	12.86	12.86

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Department Leadership Budget Control Level is to develop and implement business strategies to improve the performance of the organization; ensure that managers and staff have the information, tools, and training needed for managing and making decisions; set fees that reflect the cost of services; and maintain a community relations program.

### Program Expenditures

	2008	2009	2010	2010
	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Community Relations	363,840	504,786	523,426	428,938
Department Leadership Overhead Allocations	-12,501,755	-13,880,215	-14,319,874	-12,452,208
Director's Office	711,587	801,803	828,533	699,104
Finance and Accounting Services	5,107,676	5,702,421	5,876,048	5,587,921
Human Resources	714,526	672,706	697,943	504,207
Information Technology Services	5,604,125	6,198,499	6,393,924	5,232,037
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	54.02	54.02	53.02	50.02

*\*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 Leadership: Community Relations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Community Relations Program is to provide the general public, stakeholder groups, community leaders, City staff, and news media with complete and accurate information, including informative materials and presentations, to explain the Department's responsibilities, processes, and actions; to ensure the Department's services are clearly understood by applicants and the general public; and to respond to public concerns related to the Department's responsibilities.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$44,000 to reflect a reduction in funding for consulting services and supplies.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$50,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$94,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Community Relations	363,840	504,786	523,426	428,938
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.65	3.65	3.65	3.65

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership: Department Leadership Overhead Allocations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Department Leadership Overhead Allocations Program is to distribute the proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to the Department's other budget control levels, in order to report the full cost and calculate the revenue requirements of the related programs.

### Program Summary

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes remove \$1.87 million from the total overhead costs that will be allocated to other Department programs. As a result, the value of total overhead costs that are allocated decreases from \$14.32 million in the 2010 Endorsed Budget to \$12.45 million in the 2010 Proposed Budget.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Department Leadership Overhead Allocations	-12,501,755	-13,880,215	-14,319,874	-12,452,208

## Department Leadership: Director's Office

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Director's Office Program is to ensure department management develops and implements business strategies to continually improve the performance of the organization, and to ensure effective working relationships with other City personnel and agencies, the general public, and the development and planning communities.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$86,000 to reflect savings in costs and professional services.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$43,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$129,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Director's Office	711,587	801,803	828,533	699,104
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.58	6.58	6.58	6.58

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership: Finance and Accounting Services

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Finance and Accounting Services Program is to provide financial and accounting services to department management, and develop and maintain financial systems based on program and funding study principles, so that people, tools, and resources are managed effectively with a changing workload and revenue stream.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$60,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Accounting Technician II position to assist in balancing DPD's budget.

Reduce budget authority by \$71,000 to reflect reductions in costs and the use of consultants.

Reduce budget authority by \$75,000 as a result of changes in the administration of credit card payments. The City will pass on a processing charge to customers who choose to use credit cards for their own convenience when a cash payment option is also available.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$83,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$288,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Finance and Accounting Services	5,107,676	5,702,421	5,876,048	5,587,921
Full-time Equivalents Total*	14.74	14.74	13.74	12.74

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership: Human Resources

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Human Resources Program is to ensure the work environment is safe, and that a competent, talented, and skilled workforce is recruited through a fair and open process, is compensated fairly for work performed, is well trained for jobs, is responsible and accountable for performance, and reflects and values the diversity of the community.

### Program Summary

Transfer \$128,000 in budget authority and 1.0 FTE vacant Manager 2 position to the Planning Services program.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$66,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$194,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Human Resources	714,526	672,706	697,943	504,207
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.28	6.28	6.28	5.28

*\* 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 Leadership: Information Technology Services

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Information Technology Services Program is to provide information technology solutions, services, and expertise to the department and other City staff, so that department management and staff have the technology tools and support necessary to meet business objectives.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$85,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Information Systems Analyst position to assist in balancing DPD's budget.

Reduce budget authority by \$125,000 to reflect reductions in the use of consultants.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$952,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.16 million.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Information Technology Services	5,604,125	6,198,499	6,393,924	5,232,037
Full-time Equivalents Total*	22.77	22.77	22.77	21.77

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Land Use Services Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Land Use Services Budget Control Level is to provide land use permitting services to project applicants, City of Seattle departments, public agencies, and residents. These services are intended to allow development proposals to be reviewed in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner, and substantially comply with applicable codes, legal requirements, policies, and community design standards. Additionally, this budget control level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs.

### Program Expenditures

	2008	2009	2010	2010
	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Land Use Services	4,709,001	5,159,712	5,355,071	3,886,512
Land Use Services Overhead Allocations	1,739,082	2,170,757	2,240,539	1,641,294
Land Use Services Unallocated CBA	0	0	0	500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,448,083</b>	<b>7,330,469</b>	<b>7,595,610</b>	<b>6,027,805</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	46.35	44.85	44.85	40.85

*\*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.*

## Land Use Services: Land Use Services

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Land Use Services Program is to provide land use permitting services to project applicants, City of Seattle departments, public agencies, and residents. Land Use Services staff provide permit process information and regulatory expertise to inform pre-application construction project design. Land Use Services staff also review proposed construction plans as part of a developer's permit application. Staff then facilitate the process to elicit public input on those construction projects before the permit may be granted. These services are intended to ensure that development proposals are reviewed in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner, and to ensure that the plans substantially comply with applicable codes, legal requirements, policies, and community design standards.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$551,000 to reflect reductions in six positions supporting the Land Use Services program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, The 2010 Proposed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes are as follows:

- Abrogate 1.0 FTE Land Use Planner II. This position was originally added to handle peak construction volumes;
- Abrogate 3.0 FTE contingent positions, including 1.0 FTE Land Use Planner II and 2.0 FTE Land Use Planner III;
- Retain position authority but unfund two regular positions including 0.5 FTE Arborist and 1.0 FTE Permit Technician Sr.

Transfer \$500,000 to the Land Use Services Unallocated Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) program. Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget proposing the use of contingent budget authority. Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$500,000 in contingent budget authority for land use could be proposed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2010 Proposed Budget intends to access none of this authority, however, so the full balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$418,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.47 million.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2010</b>
	<b>Actuals</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Land Use Services	4,709,001	5,159,712	5,355,071	3,886,512
Full-time Equivalents Total*	46.35	44.85	44.85	40.85

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Land Use Services: Land Use Services Overhead Allocations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Land Use Services Overhead Allocations Program is to represent a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to the Land Use Services Budget Control Level, to report the full cost of the related programs.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$599,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on the proposed staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Land Use Services Overhead Allocations	1,739,082	2,170,757	2,240,539	1,641,294

## Land Use Services: Land Use Services Unallocated CBA

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Land Use Services Unallocated CBA Program is to display the amount of Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) in the Land Use Services BCL that has not been accessed. In contrast, CBA that is accessed is appropriated in the programs in which it will be spent. More information about CBA and its planned use in this budget may be found at the conclusion of the DPD chapter.

### Program Summary

This program is established in the 2010 Proposed Budget. In 2010, a total of \$500,000 in contingent authority in the Land Use Services BCL will not be accessed. The unallocated authority has been transferred into this program to facilitate oversight and monitoring.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Land Use Services Unallocated CBA	0	0	0	500,000

# Planning and Development

## Planning Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Planning Budget Control Level is to manage growth and development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and to inform and guide decisions for shaping and preserving Seattle so that it is a vital urban environment. Planning staff does this work by stewarding the Comprehensive Plan and supporting its core values of community, environmental stewardship, social equity and economic opportunity. Staff conduct research and make use of the best urban design strategies when preparing plans for areas of the City that are impacted by growth or major public investments. Additionally, the Planning Budget Control Level includes the staff of the Design Commission and Planning Commission. Lastly, this budget control level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Design Commission	303,294	286,285	296,542	273,743
Planning Commission	342,204	407,678	423,070	407,296
Planning Overhead Allocations	1,438,429	1,667,581	1,720,215	1,588,368
Planning Services	5,367,949	4,892,854	5,067,514	4,691,209
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,451,876</b>	<b>7,254,398</b>	<b>7,507,341</b>	<b>6,960,617</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	40.31	36.81	36.81	37.81

*\*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.*

## Planning: Design Commission

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Design Commission is to promote civic design excellence in City projects and promote interdepartmental/interagency coordination. The Seattle Design Commission advises the Mayor, the City Council, and City departments on the design of capital improvements and other projects that shape Seattle's public realm.

### Program Summary

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$23,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$23,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Design Commission	303,294	286,285	296,542	273,743
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Planning: Planning Commission

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Planning Commission Program is to provide informed citizen advice and assistance to the Mayor, the City Council, and City departments in developing planning policies and carrying out major planning efforts; to seek public comment and participation as a part of this process; and to steward the ongoing development and implementation of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

### Program Summary

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$16,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$16,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Planning Commission	342,204	407,678	423,070	407,296
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.26	3.26	3.26	3.26

*\* 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.*

## Planning: Planning Overhead Allocations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Planning Overhead Allocations Program is to represent a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to the Planning Budget Control Level, to report the full cost of the related programs.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$132,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on the proposed staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Planning Overhead Allocations	1,438,429	1,667,581	1,720,215	1,588,368

# Planning and Development

## Planning: Planning Services

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Planning Services Program is to advocate for policies, plans and regulations that steward and advance Seattle's Comprehensive Plan and growth management strategy; that protect and enliven Seattle's established and emerging neighborhoods; that support job creation and housing choices; that promote design excellence in Seattle's public realm; and that advance green buildings, neighborhoods, and infrastructure towards healthier communities, energy independence, and climate protection.

### Program Summary

Reduce General Fund budget authority by \$125,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Land Use Planner III to help balance the General Fund budget. Remaining Planning Services staff will be allocated across projects to ensure that the City's priorities are addressed.

Reduce General Fund budget authority by \$119,000 through reductions in the use of consultants, printing, training, and travel.

Reduce General Fund budget authority by \$60,000 and reduce fee-supported budget authority by \$52,000 to reflect reductions in consulting and other support for center city design and planning.

Reduce General Fund budget authority by \$50,000 to reflect reductions in consultant support for the Shoreline Master Program.

The 2010 Proposed Budget continues the City's commitment to working with communities to revise Neighborhood Plans to reflect the changes and opportunities presented by major transportation investments, including Light Rail. In 2010, the City will follow through on the three neighborhood plan updates that are underway in Southeast Seattle in station areas along the Sound Transit Light Rail alignment. This budget also proposes resources for the City to work with neighbors to update three additional Neighborhood Plans. The focus of this effort will be on the parts of the three neighborhoods that are within a quarter mile radius of Light Rail stations and on transportation and land use elements of the Neighborhood Plans. With contributions from community organizations, non-profits, or the private sector, the City would expand the scope of the project to include a larger radius and more plan elements. To implement this neighborhood planning work:

- Transfer \$128,000 in budget authority and 1.0 FTE vacant Manager 2 position from the Human Resources program to the Planning Services program, and reclassify the position as a Strategic Advisor 2. This position will provide key leadership for the City's follow through on the three plan updates begun in 2009 and will be funded by the General Fund;
- Reassign 0.65 FTE of the 1.0 FTE Land Use Planner III position working on the status report process, which was completed in 2009, to support neighborhood planning. The other 0.35 FTE will be allocated to support 2011 Comprehensive Plan updates;
- Add \$30,000 in General Fund resources for consultant services related to design and plan alternatives for Neighborhood Plan updates;
- Transfer \$92,500 in General Fund resources for consulting to the Department of Neighborhoods, reflecting the actual administration of contracts for translation and outreach.

Reallocate a total of 0.75 FTE within the Planning Services program to support updates to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. Major updates are required once every seven years by Washington state's Growth Management Act, with the next update required to be completed in 2011. The 2011 update will also add new elements related to parks and recreation and container port facilities.

## Planning and Development

Transfer in \$124,000 and 1.0 FTE Manager 2 from the Applicant Services program to the Planning Services program, and reclassify the position as a Strategic Advisor 2 to coordinate Citywide design and planning for the Seattle waterfront. The Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement will have material impacts and present significant opportunities for the downtown and neighboring communities. The position will provide Citywide urban design leadership for this major set of construction projects, and will be funded by resources from the Seattle Department of Transportation capital budget.

Reduce \$30,000 in General Fund resources and \$330,000 in other resources for a total reduction of \$360,000 in consultant funding available to the Green Building Team. The Green Building Team supports sustainable building practices and energy conservation in public and private development projects. The team will continue to focus on the highest priority projects.

Add \$175,000 in one-time General Fund budget authority to help support the costs of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that will evaluate alternative zoning and development scenarios for South Lake Union. Draft development alternatives have been identified that will support new jobs, open spaces, and housing served by retail and personal services in a transit friendly environment. This funding represents just over half of the projected costs of the EIS. The remainder is anticipated to be funded by private contributions.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes increase the budget by \$26,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$376,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2008 Actuals</b>	<b>2009 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Endorsed</b>	<b>2010 Proposed</b>
Planning Services	5,367,949	4,892,854	5,067,514	4,691,209
Full-time Equivalents Total*	35.05	31.55	31.55	32.55

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level is to allow the department to plan and implement continuous improvements to its business processes, including related staff training and equipment purchases; and to see that the Department's major technology investments are maintained, upgraded, or replaced when necessary.

### Summary

Reclassify a Manager 2 position to a Strategic Advisor 1 position. This position supports the Sustainment Program, which evaluates DPD's internal business processes and recommends improvements; and the Interdepartmental Coordination Permitting (IDP) Program, which evaluates and recommends continuous process improvements among DPD's partners (Transportation, City Light, Public Utilities) in various permitting processes.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs due to inflation, health care, furloughs, and similar technical changes decrease the budget by \$18,000 for a net reduction from the 2010 Endorsed Budget to the 2010 Proposed Budget of approximately \$18,000.

	2008	2009	2010	2010
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Process Improvements and Technology	2,008,954	2,965,449	3,054,038	3,036,445
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.22	13.22	13.22	13.22

*\* 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.*

# Planning and Development

## 2010 Estimated Revenues for the Planning and Development Fund

Summit Code	Source	2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
422111	Building Development	24,721,794	27,947,741	28,722,815	19,869,257
422115	Land Use	5,995,652	6,509,309	6,509,309	4,998,214
422130	Electrical	5,806,523	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,102,880
422150	Boiler	1,008,206	1,031,821	1,031,821	1,142,410
422160	Elevator	2,530,598	2,295,779	2,295,779	2,707,467
437010	Grant Revenues	490,331	414,872	214,872	319,898
443694	Site Review & Development	1,732,993	2,479,179	2,479,179	1,259,423
461110	Interest	1,282,796	500,000	500,000	250,000
469990	Contingent Revenues - Unaccessed	0	4,083,640	4,083,640	5,448,979
469990	Other Revenues	1,233,746	1,355,708	1,355,708	1,411,623
587001	General Subfund Support	10,159,178	10,179,507	10,740,517	10,040,985
587116	Cumulative Reserve Fund-REET I - TRAO	205,000	250,000	238,000	113,000
587116	Cumulative Reserve Fund-Unrestricted - Design Commission	368,739	361,246	374,251	374,000
587116	Cumulative Reserve Fund-Unrestricted - TRAO	80,000	83,000	86,000	74,000
587900	Green Building Team - SPU & SCL	482,600	636,525	659,440	587,780
587900	SPU MOA for Side Sewer & Drainage	1,418,364	1,630,343	1,630,343	1,630,343
<b>Total Revenues</b>		<b>57,516,520</b>	<b>64,758,670</b>	<b>65,921,674</b>	<b>54,330,259</b>
379100	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	172,354	2,655,603	3,850,876	6,277,441
<b>Total Resources</b>		<b>57,688,874</b>	<b>67,414,273</b>	<b>69,772,550</b>	<b>60,607,700</b>

# Planning and Development

## 2010 DPD Contingent Budget Authority

Council Resolution No. 30357 established contingent authority in the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) for budget and positions. The contingent authority is intended to allow prompt response to unanticipated changes in demand for services. When actual and estimated fee revenues exceed forecasted amounts, DPD may propose to access its contingent budget authority.

DPD's contingent budget authority is displayed fully in Budget Control Levels (BCLs) in the City's Proposed Budget. The authority is associated with various categories of work, such as Construction Plan Review, and triggered by unanticipated levels of various fee revenues, such as Building Development fees. Although all of DPD's contingent authority is displayed in the BCLs in this budget document, not all of it is proposed to be accessed in 2010. Table 1, below, details total contingent budget authority, as well as amounts proposed to be accessed in 2010. The remaining authority will not be accessed without approval, which would be based on an analysis of revenue deviations from the budget forecast, as described in Table 2 below. Beginning with the 2010 Proposed Budget, the unaccessed contingent authority is displayed in each BCL in a separate program created for this purpose.

**Table 1: Total and Accessed Contingent Budget Authority, 2010 Endorsed and 2010 Proposed**

BCL	Contingent Authority Category	Revenue Source	2010 Endorsed Authority	2010 Endorsed Accessed	2010 Proposed Authority	2010 Proposed Accessed
Const Insp	Const Inspection	Bldg Dvlpmt	1,600,000	233,577	1,600,000	-
Const Insp	Elec Insp w/Plan Review	Electrical	620,000	421,053	620,000	421,053
Cons Permit Svcs	Cons Plan Review	Bldg Dvlpmt	2,400,000	245,367	2,400,000	-
Cons Permit Svcs	Peer Review Contracts	Bldg Dvlpmt	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	750,000
Land Use	Land Use	Land Use	500,000	136,364	500,000	-
<b>Total Contingent Budget Authority</b>			<b>6,620,000</b>	<b>2,536,361</b>	<b>6,620,000</b>	<b>1,171,053</b>

**Table 2: Schedule of Contingent Budget Authority**

Land Use		
Unanticipated Revenue	Contingent Budget	Contingent FTE
(200,000) to (100,000)	(160,000)	-1.3
(99,999) to 99,999	-	0.0
100,000 to 199,999	160,000	1.3
200,000 to 299,999	320,000	2.6
300,000 to 399,999	480,000	4.0
400,000 to 499,999	640,000	4.0
500,000 and above	880,000	4.0

## Planning and Development

<b>Construction Plan Review</b>		
Unanticipated Revenue	Contingent Budget	Contingent FTE
(400,000) or less	(288,000)	-2.5
(399,999) to (200,000)	(144,000)	-1.2
(199,999) to 199,999	–	0.0
200,000 to 399,999	144,000	1.2
400,000 to 599,999	288,000	2.5
600,000 to 799,999	432,000	3.7
800,000 to 999,999	576,000	5.0
1,000,000 to 1,199,999	720,000	5.0
1,200,000 to 1,399,999	864,000	5.0
1,400,000 to 1,599,999	1,008,000	5.0
1,600,000 to 1,799,999	1,152,000	5.0
1,800,000 to 1,999,999	1,296,000	5.0
2,000,000 and above	1,565,000	5.0

<b>Construction Inspection</b>		
Unanticipated Revenue	Contingent Budget	Contingent FTE
(400,000) or less	(201,600)	-1.7
(399,999) to (200,000)	(100,800)	-0.1
(199,999) to 199,999	–	0.0
200,000 to 399,999	100,800	0.9
400,000 to 599,999	201,600	1.7
600,000 to 799,999	302,400	2.6
800,000 to 999,999	403,200	3.5
1,000,000 to 1,199,999	504,000	4.0
1,200,000 to 1,399,999	604,800	4.0
1,400,000 to 1,599,999	705,600	4.0
1,600,000 to 1,799,999	806,400	4.0
1,800,000 to 1,999,999	907,200	4.0
2,000,000 and above	1,096,000	4.0

<b>Electrical Inspection with Plan Review</b>		
Unanticipated Revenue	Contingent Budget	Contingent FTE
(100,000) or less	(50,400)	-0.4
(99,999) to 99,999	–	0.0
100,000 to 199,999	50,400	0.4
200,000 to 299,999	100,800	0.9
300,000 to 399,999	151,200	1.3
400,000 to 499,999	201,600	1.7
500,000 to 599,999	285,000	2.0
600,000 and above	405,000	3.0

## Planning and Development

<b>Peer Review Contracts</b>		
<b>Unanticipated Revenue</b>	<b>Contingent Budget</b>	<b>Contingent FTE</b>
200,000 to 499,999	500,000	0.0
500,000 to 999,999	1,000,000	0.0
1,000,000 and above	1,500,000	0.0

## Planning and Development

### Planning and Development Fund

	2008 Actuals	2009 Adopted	2009 Revised	2010 Endorsed	2010 Proposed
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>19,102,197</b>	<b>17,765,012</b>	<b>18,929,843</b>	<b>15,109,406</b>	<b>13,373,538</b>
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	0	0	0	0	0
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	57,516,520	64,758,670	48,876,318	65,921,674	54,330,259
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	57,688,874	67,414,276	54,432,623	69,772,553	60,607,700
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>18,929,843</b>	<b>15,109,406</b>	<b>13,373,538</b>	<b>11,258,528</b>	<b>7,096,097</b>
Continuing Appropriations	871,232				
Designation - Core Staffing	5,953,150	5,568,242	3,497,289	4,484,638	1,893,731
Designation - Process Improvement & Technology	1,701,515	1,772,716	67,772	2,359,156	17,528
<b>Total Reserves</b>	<b>8,525,897</b>	<b>7,340,958</b>	<b>3,565,061</b>	<b>6,843,794</b>	<b>1,911,259</b>
<b>Ending Unreserved Fund Balance</b>	<b>10,403,946</b>	<b>7,768,448</b>	<b>9,808,477</b>	<b>4,414,734</b>	<b>5,184,838</b>