

**City Council Statements of Legislative Intent (SLIs) Approved by the Seattle City Council  
for the 2005 Adopted and 2006 Endorsed Budget and 2005-2010 Capital Improvement Program**

<b>SLI #</b>	<b>Primary Responsible Committee/SLI Statement Title</b>	<b>Report Due Date</b>
<b>Budget</b>		
1	Fire: Restore Engine 21 to a four-person crew	September, 2005
<b>Finance and Budget</b>		
2	Span of Control Study	June, 2005
3	Vacancy Rate Assumptions	September, 2005
4	Funding for Casa Latina	June 1, 2005
5	Asset Preservation Program Plan	July 30, 2005
6	Funding for Non-Profit Owned Community Facilities	Not applicable
7	Fire, Police: Law Enforcement Officers' and Fire Fighters' Retirement System Contributions	by June 2005
<b>Government Affairs and Labor</b>		
8	Seattle Public Library: Annual Report to City Council on Library Operating Plan	January 31, 2005 and every year thereafter
9	Report on Seattle Public Library's Administrative Budget Reduction	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter 2005
10	Bookmobile: Best Practices Study	May 1, 2005
<b>Housing, Human Services and Health</b>		
11	Human Services: Tuberculosis Control	May 2005, September 2005
12	Human Services: Healthy Communities Initiative	March 2005, July 2005
13	Analysis of options for providing hygiene and homeless services in Downtown Seattle	January 1, 2005
14	Police: Elder Abuse Investigations	February, March and July 2005
15	Annual Reporting of City Domestic Violence Budgets	March 31, 2005
16	Forfeiture of Firearms by Domestic Violence Offenders	March 31, 2005
17	Reporting of Domestic Violence Warrants Information	July 1, 2005
18, 40	Requesting SPD (with SDOT's assistance) to develop recommendations and a work program for curbing abuses of disabled parking privileges in Seattle, including consideration of using volunteers.	March 30, 2005
<b>Parks, Neighborhoods and Education</b>		
19	Department of Neighborhoods – Report to Council	Briefing due 3/30/05 Report due 6/30/05
20	Neighborhood Planning Implementation – status report and proposed approaches to keep track of implementation	Quarterly 2005, 4/30/05
21	Seattle Center Long Term Sustainability: Analysis of Policy Options and Business Plan	Monthly Briefings, April 15, June 1, 2005
22	Seattle Center: Restructure & rename budget control levels to more closely align with actual operations	April, 2005

SLI #	Primary Responsible Committee/SLI Statement Title	Report Due Date
23	Aquarium – Pier 59 Piling Replacement Project Spending Plan	January 2005, Quarterly Reports
24	Pier 62/63 Design Concepts and Master Plan Amendments	April 1, 2005
25	Late Night Recreation Program Design Changes Evaluation	September 1, 2005
26	Parks Department Enterprise Division Policy Framework	April 1, 2005
27	Volunteer Park Conservatory Donations and Funding Plan	April 15, 2005
28	Parks Department Major Maintenance Strategic Plan	April 1, 2005, and September 1, 2005
29	Strategic Business Plan for Parks and Recreation Department	April 1, 2005, and March 1, 2006
<b>Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts</b>		
30	Arts Office Annual Analyses of Admissions Tax Spending	August 16, 2005 and June 15, 2006
31	Arts Office Analysis of Increasing in 2006 the Percent for Art Appropriation Amount for Eligible Construction Projects.	May 17, 2005 and July 8, 2005
32	General Subfund Revenues, Police: Special Events Recovery	by March 2005
33	Goals and Measures of buy-bust program as part of Seattle Police Department Anti-Crime Teams (ACT) budget	August 1, 2005
34	Status report regarding community agencies performance in assisting individuals with suspended drivers licenses and in recovering delinquent fines owed to Seattle	May and Sept 2005 and 2006
<b>Transportation</b>		
35	Rainier Valley Community Development Fund: Annual Report to the Seattle City Council	February 1, 2005 and August 1, 2005, and every year thereafter
36	Mercer Corridor Project TCIP – Monitor spending related to environmental review process.	1Q Report – 3/17/05; 2Q Report – 6/9/05; 3Q Report – 9/8/05; 4Q Report – 12/1/05
37	SDOT Long Term Budget Sustainability – SDOT Financial Policy Limit on Debt	May 1, 2005
38	Enhancing Parking Enforcement Effectiveness	February 1 and June 1 2005; Additional analysis may be reported subsequent to 6/1/05
39	Work Program for Implementing and Enforcing a Four Hour Limit on Disabled Parking in parts of the City.	February 1, 2005
18, 40	Requesting SPD (with SDOT's assistance) to develop recommendations and a work program for curbing abuses of disabled parking privileges in Seattle, including consideration of using volunteers.	March 30, 2005
41	Extending Pay Parking Hours to Evenings and Sundays	July 1, 2005

<b>SLI #</b>	<b>Primary Responsible Committee/SLI Statement Title</b>	<b>Report Due Date</b>
42	Establishing Funding for the Replacement of Parking Enforcement Officers' Handheld Ticketing Devices as a Priority Use of Any Excess Parking Fee Revenues Expected in 2006 and Requesting Information from SPD to Implement this Priority	Prior to or with Mayor's 2006 budget submittal to Council
<b>Urban Development and Planning</b>		
43	North Helpline Food Bank and Emergency Services	June, 2005
44	DPD – Funding for Priority Projects	Quarterly 2005 and 2006
45	Office of Economic Development – Report to Council	March 31 and April 30, 2005
<b>Utilities &amp; Technology</b>		
46	Web-based Access to City Lien and Utility Bill Data	June 30, 2005
47	Recommendations for Use and Users of Community Notification System	June 30, 2005
48	Seattle Public Utility Assistance to Seniors, Disabled, and Low-Income Customers	March 31, 2005
49	Evaluation of criteria for debt-financing for certain CIP activities	January 31, 2005
<b>Other (Briefings/Consultations should be offered to all Councilmembers)</b>		
50	KeyArena Negotiations with Seattle Sonics	Periodic, as necessary

## 2005-06 Statements of Legislative Intent

### Budget

#### 1. Fire: Restore Engine 21 to a four-person crew

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In approving the Proposed Budget for the Fire Department, it is the Council's intent that next year's 2006 Proposed Budget for the Fire Department add sufficient positions and funding to restore Engine 21 to a four-person crew.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Budget

**Date Due to Council:** September 2005

### Finance and Budget

#### 2. Span of Control Study

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The City Council requests the City Auditor to conduct a follow-up to the 1996 and 1997 span of control studies to determine the current ratio of staff to supervisors ("span of control" studies). The Auditor may determine the appropriate methodology (e.g., conducting a random review of 400 supervisors/managers throughout City departments to determine their span of control), but at a minimum should include the following priority departments for review: the Department of Parks and Recreation, Human Services Department, and departments with large numbers of management positions. The resulting report should include: 1) the current overall ratio of staff to managers, 2) comparison to other similar jurisdictions, 3) recommendations for steps, if appropriate, to increase the span of control, and 4) projected savings that could result from such recommendations. The Report will be used by City Council and DOF in reviewing the proposed 2006 budget.

**Responsible Council Committees:** Finance and Budget

**Date Due to Council:** June 2005

#### 3. Vacancy Rate Assumptions

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** Beginning with the 2006 Adopted Budget, the City Council intends to assume vacancy rates for each large department (departments with over 30 regular positions). The Council intends to assume the rates provided in the full SLI, and requests the Executive to assume such rates in review of the 2006 endorsed budget and submission of the endorsed budget to Council for adoption in 2005. The Executive may assume higher rates, if determined appropriate by the Department of Finance, based on a review of historical effective vacancy rates. If the Executive assumes a lower rate, an explanation will be provided.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Finance and Budget

**Date Due to Council:** September 2005, with Proposed 2006 Budget.

#### 4. Funding for CASA Latina

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The City Council endorses the appropriation of \$250,000 for the CASA Latina Project in Finance General in 2006. However, Council does not intend to authorize expenditure of the appropriation for the Casa Latina Project, unless and until the Executive, working with CASA Latina, submits the following for review and approval:

1. Final development and operating budgets of the facility;
2. Agreement with CASA Latina that establishes the condition under which City funding will be provided, including the public benefits;

3. Submittal of a Business Plan demonstrating how CASA Latina will raise funds from fees, individuals, foundations, organizations, and other public agencies to meet its capital campaign goals; and
4. Implementation of a public outreach plan and an assurance that community members support the project.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Finance and Budget

**Date Due to Council:** June 1, 2005

## 5. Asset Preservation Program Plan

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** It is Council's intent that the Fleet and Facilities Department (FFD) implement asset management strategies that will maintain the full functionality of the City's assets and prevent their premature deterioration. To help ensure that is the case, the City Council requests that FFD provide the Council with a report on its asset preservation program that includes descriptions of the department's property management strategy and process for prioritizing expenditures on major maintenance. FFD's Asset Preservation report should describe:

1. Current efforts to preserve FFD's facilities and assets;
2. Criteria used to select facility investments that demonstrate best business practices in facility management and ensures that investments are both cost-effective and incorporate the principles of cost-benefit analysis;
3. Efforts to include input from customer departments and other stakeholders in the process of prioritizing facility investments to ensure that facility-need based projects are balanced with customer-based requests.

The report should contain a description of the department's inventory and condition assessment practices for properties under the management and control of FFD. It should also describe the factors utilized by the department in assessing and prioritizing projects for funding. The report will be presented to Council for review by July 30, 2005. Council anticipates that following this presentation and review legislation will be approved to release the asset management reserves now held in Finance General. It is expected that along with the report, Council will be presented with a set of policies for the Asset Preservation Subaccount and overall FFD program to consider for adoption via Resolution.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Finance and Budget

**Date Due to Council:** July 30, 2005

## 6. Funding for Non-Profit Owned Community Facilities

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In the Mayor's proposed 2005 - 2006 budget, the 2006 budget provides \$1 million for the Colman School African American Heritage Museum, \$1 million for the Wing Luke Asian Museum and \$619,000 for the Asian Counseling and Referral Service (ACRS) Multi-Service Center. In addition, \$381,000 of CDBG funding is provided in 2005 for the ACRS project (see accompanying budget proviso for this funding). The Council intends to authorize the appropriation of the 2006 funds as part of the adoption of the Mayor's 2006 budget. However, Council does not intend to authorize such appropriations unless and until the Executive submits the following to the Council for review and approval: i) Finalized construction and operating budgets for each of the projects; ii) legal agreements between the City and each of the non-profit owners of the projects that establishes the conditions under which City funding will be provided, including the public benefits and considerations to be provided to the City; iii) a timeline for deliverables and release of City funds for each of these projects; and iv) funding plan for the project that includes formal commitments made by other public and private funders.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Finance and Budget

**Date Due to Council:** Not applicable

## 7. Fire, Police: Law Enforcement Officers' and Fire Fighters' Retirement System Contributions

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In approving the budgets for the Fire and Police Departments, it is the Council's intent that the Finance Department develop a method for anticipating changes in the required City contributions to the Law Enforcement Officers' & Fire Fighters' Retirement System (LEOFF). The Council recognizes that these contributions are determined by the State Legislature and typically announced after the Mayor proposes the annual City budget and that no method for anticipating changes in the required contributions will be perfect. The Finance Department shall describe its proposed method to the Council no later than June 2005.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Finance & Budget

**Date Due to Council:** Report on proposed method by June 2005

## Government Affairs and Labor

### 8. Seattle Public Library: Annual Report to City Council on Library Operating Plan

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Seattle City Council directs the Seattle Public Library (SPL) to provide the Seattle City Council with a copy of SPL's annual Operating Budget, beginning in January 2005 and following each year thereafter. SPL staff should also provide an explanation of any changes that the SPL Board has made compared to the previous year's Operating Budget. In addition, SPL should report any large mid-year budget shifts or the receipt of grants to the City Council's Government Affairs and Labor Committee (or its successor) and then account for those changes in the subsequent proposed budget to the City Council.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Government Affairs and Labor

**Date Due to Council:** January 31, 2005 and every year thereafter

### 9. Report on Seattle Public Library's Administrative Budget Reduction

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Seattle City Council directs the Seattle Public Library (SPL) to report back on how SPL will implement a \$645,000 budget reduction related to administrative changes. SPL has not yet worked out the details associated with this reduction. As this is a significant reduction that may involve a reorganization, Council wishes to understand how it will be undertaken.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Government Affairs and Labor

**Date Due to Council:** 1st Quarter, 2005

### 10. Bookmobile: Best Practices Study

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** It is the City Council's intent to provide funding to restore Seattle Public Library's bookmobile services. However, the funding provided in 2005 is based on SPL's current service delivery model and should be considered a "transition budget" until SPL has had an opportunity to complete a best practices study. The City Council requests the City Librarian to undertake a study to determine the most effective and efficient means for providing mobile services to populations who are unable to access the City's branch or Central libraries. The study should include the following:

- An evaluation of SPL's current mobile operations and populations served (and not served).
- A review of best practices at peer institutions, including cost, service levels, and populations served/not served, staffing, criteria for service, etc.
- Proposed guidelines/policies/best practices for SPL's mobile services, including frequency of service, type of service (e.g., mail vs. bookmobile), and criteria for populations that should be served.
- A comprehensive plan for serving Seattle residents who are unable to access SPL's branch or Central Libraries.

- A proposal for operating the bookmobile more efficiently without compromising service to those who depend on it.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Government Affairs and Labor Committee

**Date Due to Council:** May 1, 2005

### **Housing, Human Services and Health**

#### **11. Human Services: Tuberculosis Control**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In approving the budget for Public Health Services in the Human Services Department, it is the Council's intent to not fund Tuberculosis Control after 2005 absent a compelling argument that this service is an enhanced service requiring City funding rather than part of the basic King County Public Health mission. A compelling argument would include at least (1) a comparison of the services the City-funded tuberculosis control program provides to homeless people in Seattle, the tuberculosis control services provided by the King County Department of Public Health to homeless people and others at high risk for tuberculosis in the rest of the County, and the services Seattle residents receive as part of the County-funded program; (2) a description of the effectiveness of the major elements of the City-funded program and the program in the rest of the County in preventing the spread of tuberculosis, focusing in particular on the outcomes of the City-funded program that are not outcomes of the County-funded program; (3) a description of the tuberculosis control services Seattle residents would receive without the City-funded program, accompanied by an explanation of why this level of service would reflect best public health practice and a comparison of this level of service to the levels in the rest of the County; and (4) an endorsement of the argument by the King County Board of Health. The Human Services Department shall report to the Council no later than the end of May 2005 whether it intends to make such an argument and if so what its progress has been in obtaining the necessary information. If the 2006 Proposed Budget includes funding for Tuberculosis Control, the argument should be presented to the Council no later than when the budget is proposed. If as a result of this process the funds currently proposed for Tuberculosis Control in the 2005-2006 Proposed Budget are not used for Tuberculosis Control in 2006, it is the Council's intent that they be used for other public health services.

**Responsible Council Committee:** Housing, Human Services & Health

**Dates Due to Council:** Progress report from Human Services by May 2005. Demonstration that program is an enhanced rather than critical program by September 2005.

#### **12. Human Services: Healthy Communities Initiative**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In approving the budget for Public Health Services in the Human Services Department, it is the Council's intent that Human Services develop a plan to guide the City's expenditures for enhanced public health services. The plan should include:

- A review of the history of the City's expenditures for enhanced public health services for at least the last ten years;
- A policy framework that defines the appropriate role of the City in supplementing the County's primary role in public health, consistently with City and County Charters and with the appropriate regional role of a city;
- A clear statement of the goals of the City's Public Health Services, specified as desired progress in concrete outcomes;
- An estimate of the amount of progress towards each goal the City can expect to achieve for a given level of expenditures;
- An estimate of the effects of demographic, economic and other external factors on these goals; and

- A plan for monitoring progress towards the goals and the effectiveness of the City expenditures in achieving them and adjusting the expenditures as necessary.

Human Services shall report to the Council no later than March 2005 on the process it will use to develop this plan, including the forms of community outreach the planning process will involve; and shall present a draft plan for the Council's review no later than July 2005.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing, Human Services & Health

**Date Due to Council:** Human Services report on planning process by March 2005. Human Services draft plan by July 2005.

### 13. Analysis of options for providing hygiene and homeless services in Downtown Seattle

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** It is the intent of the City Council to provide funding of \$3.2 million in 2005 and 2006 for the provision of urgently needed/priority homeless services in Downtown Seattle. The Council intends to proceed with funding a city-owned facility bounded by 4th, 5th, Yesler and Washington ("proposed site") unless, by February 28, 2005, Council passes legislation that identifies a viable alternative site or sites. If Council takes no action to identify an alternative site or sites by that date, Council will adopt by February 28, 2005 an ordinance releasing funds restricted by the associated budget proviso (green sheet 42-2-D-1) for construction of the facility at the proposed site. To determine whether there are feasible alternatives to the proposed site, Council will work expeditiously with the Human Services Department (HSD) to review alternative options for the provision of homeless services primarily for single adult men. Feasible alternatives considered shall be at least equivalent or better in terms of costs (capital and operating) and timing of provision of services as compared to the facility at the proposed site. The review of alternative options shall be presented to the Housing, Human Services and Health Committee by January 31, 2005. In order to avoid any delay, Council intends for design work on the facility at the proposed site to proceed while a review of alternative sites is undertaken. Funding in the amount of \$130,000 contained in the 3rd and 4th quarter supplemental budget ordinance and \$150,000 in the proposed 2005 budget for Fleets and Facilities will be appropriated for the design work and will not be restricted by a budget proviso. A budget proviso (Green Sheet # 42-2-D-1) precludes \$1.75 million in 2005 funding from being expended on construction of a new hygiene and homeless services center unless authorized by future ordinance. The Council and HSD shall form a joint staff working group by November 29th, 2004, to conduct an analysis of alternatives to the proposed site. This analysis of alternatives will focus on the feasibility of providing hygiene and homeless services to single adults with an emphasis on single men in Downtown Seattle at a site or sites different than the proposed site. In completing this analysis, the Council and HSD shall solicit input and best advice from interested stakeholders, community groups, homeless service providers, homeless advocates, the business community, and the Committee to End Homelessness (or its successor group). This analysis shall evaluate the following: the types of homeless services that are needed/desired which shall be consistent with our community's 10 year plan to end homelessness and available needs data, including consideration of the new/expanded hygiene and day center services that will be available in 2005; population to be served by proposed services; assessment of potential options for the provision of desired services, including expansion of existing facilities owned by non-profit providers and/or inclusion of desired services within a future, planned non-profit housing or services facility; and potential funding sources, including federal, state, private sources, available for construction and/or operation of a facility or facilities. The types of homeless services that will be evaluated include but are not limited to: hygiene services, day center services, meal services, centralized intake, assessment and referral services, supportive services, and shelter. The staff working group shall complete their review and provide recommendations to the Housing, Human Services and Health Committee by January 31, 2005. The Executive shall provide information to the Council regarding the cost and schedule impacts, if any, to the Fire Station 10 Replacement Project that result specifically from selecting an alternative site for the hygiene and homeless services facility. If Council pursues an alternative site or sites, the increased costs, if any, to the Fire Station 10 Replacement Project associated with this decision will be taken into

consideration and addressed. A report back on the findings from this analysis shall be submitted to the Housing, Human Services and Health Committee no later than January 31, 2005.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing, Human Services and Health Committee

**Date Due to Council:** January 31, 2005

#### 14. Police: Elder Abuse Investigations

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In approving the budget for Police Gender & Age Crimes Investigations, it is the Council's intent that the Police Department protects elderly and vulnerable adults from financial exploitation and physical abuse and neglect. The Council directs that the Police Department review the workload and the current methods for investigating cases of financial, physical and neglect crimes against the elderly and vulnerable adults and develop a plan for strengthening the system. The plan would include methods for improving coordination and communication between police units and would employ the best practices of law enforcement departments in other cities. The Police Department shall report back to the Council with the plan by March 31, 2005. The Police Department shall periodically report on its performance in elder abuse investigations. These reports should include but are not limited to the number of elder abuse cases, the number of cases referred for investigation, the size of any backlog in investigations and the outcomes of the investigations. If possible they should include the number of repeat offenses against the same victims.

**Responsible Council Committee:** Housing, Human Services and Health Committee

**Date Due to Council:** Written performance reports in February and July of 2005. Written plan by March 2005.

#### 15. Annual Reporting of City Domestic Violence Budgets

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In adopting the 2005 Budget and endorsing the 2006 Budget, the City Council expresses its appreciation for the collaboration of City Departments in the City Auditor's assessment of City domestic violence resources. The Council intends that a standard protocol be developed for consistently reporting annual domestic violence budgets, so as to permit monitoring of the City's commitment over time. The protocol should:

- Determine when annual reports will be issued each year.
- Define what is considered a domestic violence related expense, such as certain aspects of elder abuse;
- Provide for annual reports that:
  1. Permit apples-to-apples comparisons, without respect to departmental organization; if a budget category, item or function is moved within a department, or between departments, it should continue to be reported consistently in the annual report of domestic violence budgets.
  2. Distinguish budgets for dedicated domestic violence programs or contracts from those for which domestic violence is not the primary component; for instance, report domestic violence related aspects of units such as the Police SWAT teams, or patrol separately from those of the Sex and Age Crimes Unit (as well as identify any activities of the Sex and Age Crimes Unit that are not domestic violence related).
  3. Clearly distinguish, in new categories that remain separate, any ongoing expenses that are newly identified as domestic violence related, that had not been counted in previous reports.
  4. Separately identify General Subfund resources.
  5. Identify resources dedicated solely to the *prevention* of domestic violence and, separately, those primarily dedicated to *responding* to domestic violence.

A staff team with representatives from the City Auditor, the Seattle Police Department, Municipal Court, City Attorney's Office, the Human Services Department, the Department of Finance and Council Central Staff shall draft the protocol for reporting domestic violence budgets, to be included in the proposed

Domestic Violence Strategic Plan in March. City Council Central Staff will be responsible for convening the staff team.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing, Human Services and Health

**Date Due to Council:** March 31, 2005. A report on the protocol shall be submitted to the responsible Committees, and the protocol shall be included in the proposed Domestic Violence Strategic Plan.

#### 16. Forfeiture of Firearms by Domestic Violence Offenders

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In adopting the 2005 Budget and endorsing the 2006 Budget, it is the intent of the City Council that the Seattle Police Department, City Attorney's Office, and Municipal Court shall report to the City Council, with the presentation of the Domestic Violence Strategic Plan, on the City's coordinated effort to remove firearms from perpetrators of domestic violence. The report shall include a description of the measures being undertaken by each department, as well as meaningful data on the number and proportion of weapons removed from those who are arrested, charged and/or convicted of a domestic violence offense. In addition, the Police Department should establish, and the report should address, the measures in place to permit "sworn generalists" to seize firearms at the scene of domestic violence calls.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing, Human Services and Health

**Date Due to Council:** No later than March 31, 2005

#### 17. Reporting of Domestic Violence Warrants Information

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In adopting the 2005 Budget and endorsing the 2006 Budget, it is the intent of the City Council that the Seattle Police Department (SPD) continue to track and report on domestic violence arrest warrants and fugitive apprehension. SPD shall prepare a report to the City Council, by July 1, 2005, that includes the following information:

1. Comparison of the number of misdemeanor warrants issued in the 2004 to the number issued in 2001, the last full year of DVFAT operation.
2. The number of misdemeanor and, separately, felony warrants for each year, including 2001.
3. Backlogged warrants should be reported in a meaningful way, dividing between those that are considered active, workable warrants, and those that are not, and reporting the number of individuals with multiple warrants, as well as the total number of warrants.
4. The number of bookings compared to number of warrants.

Data should be presented in comparable format, e.g., full year data, compared to full year data.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing, Human Services and Health

**Date Due to Council:** No later than July 1, 2005.

#### 18. Requesting SPD (with SDOT's assistance) to develop recommendations and a work program for curbing abuses of disabled parking privileges in Seattle, including consideration of using volunteers

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** No later than March 30, 2005, SPD (with SDOT's assistance) shall provide a written report to the Council Transportation Committee and Council Housing, Human Services, and Health Committee with recommendations and a work plan for curbing illegal use of disabled parking placards and license plates on Seattle streets. The report will:

- 1) describe the frequency of such illegal use and the areas of the City primarily affected;
- 2) the estimated impact of such illegal use on City revenues and on local businesses;
- 3) recommend operational performance measures that the Council can use to gauge progress in reducing illegal use of disabled parking;
- 4) evaluate, among other strategies for curbing abuses, a) changing current practices to allow PEOs to ticket illegal users and b) recruiting and training volunteers to enforce disabled parking regulations, including ticketing illegal users; and

- 5) clearly identify any incremental costs and labor requirements for enforcement and estimate offsetting fine and parking fee revenues.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation and Housing, Human Services and Health

**Date Due to Council:** March 30, 2005

### Parks, Neighborhoods and Education

#### 19. Department of Neighborhoods - Report to Council

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Department of Neighborhoods (DON) contracts with a variety of community based non-profit organizations for specific services. To provide greater clarity on what the City is contracting for and whether the contract requirements have been fulfilled, City contracts should include identified outcomes and performance measurements. Accordingly, Council directs DON to work with the Council and community based non-profit organizations to develop quantifiable performance measures and outcomes that would be appropriate for each specific contract. Quantifiable performance measures and outcomes should be included in all DON contracts beginning January 1, 2006. DON is directed to provide a briefing to Council on their work on this SLI by the end of the first quarter of 2005.

DON is directed to provide a written report to Council by the end of the second quarter 2005 that includes; 1) a compilation of all anticipated 2006 DON contracts, 2) the proposed performance measures and outcomes for each contract, and 3) the process used to develop them. If there are contracts DON feels, that due to their size or limited contracted purpose, should be evaluated differently, DON should outline this alternative evaluation method.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods and Education Committee

**Date Due to Council:** Briefing no later than March 30, 2005, written report to Council no later than June 30, 2005.

#### 20. Neighborhood Planning Implementation - status report and proposed approaches to keep track of implementation.

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** To provide City Council clarity on the status and the plan for implementing neighborhood plans, DON is directed, with the assistance of DOF, to report on the following:

1. Status reports on the neighborhood plan implementation.
  - For each plan, identify which plan recommendations have been completed and which ones are in progress; and
  - Specify which plan recommendations are in city departments' CIP program or work plans.
2. A method and work plan for improving ways to keep track of and produce reports about the status and plan for implementing Neighborhood Plan recommendations.
  - DOF is directed to work on improving the data they collect from CIP managers and ensuring thorough review and feedback from DON staff. The DOF database shall provide a greater level of detail about Neighborhood Plan implementation, including the specific matrix numbers and other details if needed on a project's relationship to a Neighborhood Plans, as part of developing the proposed 2006-2011 CIP.
  - The Executive shall submit a status report on CIP projects associated with neighborhood plans, to be included with the proposed 2006-2011 CIP. If the CIP identifies a Neighborhood Plan associated with a CIP project, the specific neighborhood plan recommendation being implemented shall be identified as well.
  - DON, with the assistance of DOF, shall report on possible ways or approaches for keeping track of neighborhood plan implementation. Should DOF and DON databases "relate" to each other?

If not, what approaches should be in place in order to make it effective for staff to report on the status of and plan for implementing neighborhood plans?

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods, and Education Committee

**Date Due to Council:** DON shall present status reports on 38 Neighborhood Plans implementation quarterly 2005. DOF and DON shall present a report on improving DOF database and developing approaches for tracking neighborhood plan implementation no later than April 2005.

## 21. Seattle Center Long Term Sustainability: Analysis of Policy Options and Business Plan

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The City Council directs Seattle Center Director to develop a business plan for each of Seattle Center's major lines of business and/or activities. Seattle Center staff should identify strategies and revenue generating activities that: 1) maximize the use of the campus and its buildings as appropriate; 2) improve Seattle Center's long term financial viability; and 3) minimize the need for additional General Subfund beyond historical levels. To prepare Council for review of the individual business plans, and to provide Council an opportunity to inform Seattle Center's development of the business plans, Council directs Seattle Center to develop and present the following information to Council by April 15, 2005:

1. Proposed new Budget Control Levels for 2007-08 budget, as required by SLI 55, 1, A, 1.
2. For each major business activity, Seattle Center will provide the following information:
  - a. Approximate anticipated revenue/expenditures for 2005
  - b. General Fund support
  - c. Demographics and business trends
  - d. Guiding business/policy assumptions
  - e. Current challenges
3. Seattle Center must submit a proposed work plan with a timeline for completing the individual business plans for Council review and approval, along with built-in check-ins with Council for each business plan so that Council can inform the development of the business plans. The City Council will approve the work plan that will include the expected timeline and scopes for the individual business plans by Council resolution. The first business plan, which the Executive proposes to be McCaw Hall, is due June 1, 2005.
4. Seattle Center staff will conduct periodic check-ins with the City Council's Parks, Neighborhoods & Education Committee members to report progress to date and obtain the Council's policy direction and guidance as business plans are being developed.

Business Plans (timeline for each to be determined in April)

Draft business plans prepared for Council review and approval should include, at a minimum, the following components:

- Overall description of lines of business, including proposed guiding policies and goals, revenues and expenditures, market and industry trends (as appropriate) and future opportunities and challenges
- Financial policies
- A range of options for cost containment strategies
- A range of options for revenue generating strategies

Each individual business plan needs to be presented in the context/framework of Seattle Center's overall operations so that Councilmembers can review the proposed business plan both individually and as part of the larger Seattle Center mission. Seattle Center will submit individual business plans to arrive at an overall financial strategy for Seattle Center that will be used in developing the 2007-08 budget and help Council determine the appropriate level of General Fund support and a repayment plan for the cash pool loan.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods, and Education

**Date Due to Council:** See deadlines for various activities above. Council also requests monthly briefings

from the Seattle Center Director to the Parks, Neighborhoods, and Education Committee, or the successor committee.

**22. Seattle Center: Restructure & rename budget control levels to more closely align with actual operations**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The City Council directs Seattle Center to work with the Department of Finance (DoF) to develop new Budget Control Levels that align with Seattle Center's operations, facilitate comparison of revenues with expenditures, and display major lines of business.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods and Education Committee

**Date Due to Council:** April 2005

**23. Aquarium - Pier 59 Piling Replacement Project Spending Plan**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In approving \$22.4 million for Aquarium - Pier 59 Piling Replacement (CIP Project K732202) in the 2005-2010 Capital Improvement Program, it is the Council's intent that the Parks Department provide the Parks, Neighborhoods and Education (PNE) Committee with a detailed briefing on the scope of work, budget, and a projected schedule of major milestones and spending plan. This briefing should be provided when the Department, in consultation with its design consultants and General Contractor/Construction Manager (GCCM), determines value-engineered designs and construction costs and prior to issuance of any requests for bids for construction work. It is also the Council's intent that the Parks Department will provide periodic updates or progress reports, no less than quarterly, to the PNE Committee corresponding to the major milestones noted above. Such reports shall be made to the PNE Committee to track against the projected schedule and spending plan.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods and Education

**Date Due to Council:** January 2005 for initial briefing; Quarterly reports throughout life of project.

**24. Pier 62/63 Design Concepts and Master Plan Amendments**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In approving \$500,000 in Cumulative Reserve Fund (REET II) for Pier 62/63 Piling Replacement (CIP Project K731082) project planning in the 2005 Budget, it is the Council's intent that the Department of Parks and Recreation present the Council with alternative design concepts for a renovated Pier 62/63 open space. Also, the Department is requested to transmit a companion set of amendments to the Central Waterfront Master Plan for Council's consideration. The design concepts should derive from work underway in 2004 by the Department of Planning and Development on waterfront and viaduct/seawall planning.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods and Education

**Date Due to Council:** April 1, 2005

**25. Late Night Recreation Program Design Changes Evaluation**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In approving the 2005-2006 Budget, the Council directs the Parks Department to conduct an evaluation of the changes proposed to the Late Night Recreation Program and to report to the Parks, Neighborhoods and Education Committee on the following:

1. Numbers and types of youth served at each of the locations for the Late Night Program (e.g., age, race/ethnicity, neighborhood, etc.)
2. Evaluation of the types of programming that worked and did not work as expected.
3. Outcomes achieved in the redesigned offerings in the program.
4. Recommendations for any additional changes needed, if any.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods and Education

**Date Due to Council:** September 1, 2005

## 26. Parks Department Enterprise Division Policy Framework

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** Working with the Board of Park Commissioners and the City Council, the Department of Parks and Recreation should develop a policy framework for implementing new revenue ideas. Prior to Board recommendation to the Superintendent, the Department should submit the policy framework for review by the Parks, Neighborhoods and Education Committee. The policy framework should identify all types of new revenue sources that will be considered and evaluated for implementation in 2006 and beyond. Any increased use of advertising, sponsorships and naming rights, rentals, concessions, letting bids for major renovation and operation of facilities by private or non-profit entities, or other new revenue ideas/sources should be approached with careful consideration of the costs and benefits to various categories of park and recreation facility users, as well as the risk for commercialization of and reduced access to the public realm, particularly for low-income citizens.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods and Education

**Date Due to Council:** April 1, 2005

## 27. Volunteer Park Conservatory Donations and Funding Plan

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Council directs the Department of Parks and Recreation to implement a more rigorous donation system at the Volunteer Park Conservatory, including but not limited to improved donation signage, possible relocation of the donation box, and potential volunteer staffing of the donation box by Friends of the Conservatory. In addition, an implementation plan for making such improvements shall include other options such as possible spin-off of the Conservatory to non-profit management, increased fundraising beyond admission donations through, for example, the Seattle Parks Foundation, and/or cost-saving measures such as reducing hours and days of operation. The Volunteer Park Conservatory Donations and Funding plan is due to Council on March 15, 2005.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods and Education

**Date Due to Council:** April 15, 2005

## 28. Parks Department Major Maintenance Strategic Plan

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Council requests the Executive to prepare for Council review and approval a Parks Major Maintenance Strategic Plan that addresses the following plan elements: 1) the basis of how and when Parks assess their existing facilities to determine when major maintenance is required; 2) the criteria and rationale by which Parks prioritize their facilities for renovation/replacement/improvement; 3) how Parks determines the priority list for funding; and 4) the rationale, criteria, and process by which Parks funds new projects versus major maintenance in the budget, and that the rationale, criteria, and process shall be included in the 2006-2011 CIP submittal. Based on the plan elements, develop a six-year Strategic Major Maintenance Plan (based on historic CRF funding levels, assuming around \$7 million for projects after debt service/zoo payments are removed) that does not include new projects, including new facilities at existing Parks facilities.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods and Education

**Date Due to Council:** The Plan elements are due April 1, 2005. The Strategic Major Maintenance Plan is due September 1, 2005.

## 29. Strategic Business Plan for Parks and Recreation Department

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Council requests the Department of Parks and Recreation to develop a strategic business plan for Council review and approval that addresses two specific components: 1) potential new revenue sources to cover the funding needs in future years, especially after the end of the Parks Levy in 2008, and 2) a prioritization of Parks programs and services in the event that new revenues are unattainable.

- 1) The first component should address potential new revenue sources to address a projected funding gap in 2009. Potential sources should include, but not be limited to, fees or charges, advertising, sponsorships and naming rights, rentals, concessions, letting bids for major renovation and/or operation of facilities by private or non-profit entities, or other new revenue ideas/sources. Any new revenue idea should include a cost/benefit analysis, as well as a price elasticity of demand for fee or charge changes.
- 2) The second component should provide an assessment and prioritization of parks programs and services, including rationale and criteria for how these items are prioritized. This component should also include recommendations for potential cuts, modifications or transfers/contracts with others of programs and services based on the assessment should new revenue/funding sources for Parks not be sufficiently developed by 2009.

The goal of doing this plan is to have the Department of Parks and Recreation in a position to sustain its operations into the future.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Neighborhoods and Education Committee

**Date Due to Council:** By April 1, 2005 transmit a scope and approach to the preparation of the plan; by March 1, 2006 transmit the plan itself.

### **Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts**

#### **30. Arts Office Annual Analyses of Admissions Tax Spending**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The City Council directs the Mayor's Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs (MOACA) to provide two reports detailing how 2005 and 2006 Admissions Tax funding will be used in accordance with the purposes set forth in Ordinance 120183. Ordinance 120183 appropriates a percentage of admissions tax revenue to MOACA for the following purposes:

- a. Initiatives to keep artists living, working, and creatively challenged in Seattle;
- b. Initiatives to build community through the arts and create opportunities for the public to intersect with artists and their work, and;
- c. For each new generation, initiatives that include art opportunities for youth in and out of school.

Each report shall include a two-page or less Executive summary and will detail:

- 1) Programs and related administrative costs;
- 2) Program goals, and;
- 3) The evaluation methods used to assess the effectiveness and success of each program.

The first will be a progress report. The second will be a full report, analyzing all planned and completed admissions tax program spending, program goals, and program evaluations beginning in 2005 and running through 2006, as related to the three program areas listed above. These analyses will allow the Executive, the Council, and the public being served by MOACA to better understand and evaluate the effectiveness of programs, their adherence to the directives contained within Ordinance 120183, and funding allocations resulting from their 2005-2006 budget. Such analyses will also allow for program and funding adjustments to be made responsive to Executive, Council, and community comment.

**Responsible Council Committee:** Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts Committee.

**Date Due to Council:** The progress report is due to be presented to the Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts Committee on or before August 16, 2005. The full report is due to be presented to the Public Safety, Civil Rights, and Arts Committee or its equivalent on or before June 15, 2006.

#### **31. Arts Office Analysis of Increasing in 2006 the Percent For Art Appropriation Amount for Eligible Construction Projects.**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The City Council directs the Mayor's Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs (MOACA) to perform an analysis, in partnership with MOACA's volunteer citizen advisory body

the Seattle Arts Commission, on whether to amend SMC 20.32.030 to increase the percentage of eligible construction project budgets beginning in 2006. This increase would be dedicated to the public acquisition of works of art in order to restore funding affected by the elimination in 2004 of utility revenues from the Percent For Art program (% Program) budget. The 1998 Libraries For All capital program, the 1999 Seattle Center/Community Centers Fund, the 2000 Parks Levy Fund, and the 2003 Fire Facilities Fund would be exempt from any % Program percentage increase.

The analysis will include:

- a. An assessment by MOACA of revenue and scope of work changes to the % Program and its arts projects resulting from the elimination beginning in 2004 of utility revenues;
- b. A recommendation from MOACA in partnership with the Seattle Arts Commission on whether and why an increase in the % Program percentage beginning in 2006 is advisable and, if so, a recommended increase amount, and;
- c. If recommending an increase in the % Program percentage beginning in 2006, a preliminary work plan developed by MOACA in partnership with the Seattle Arts Commission accommodating the increase.

This analysis will include two parts: a progress report and a final report. The analysis will allow the Executive, the Council, and the public being served by MOACA and the Seattle Arts Commission to better understand and evaluate the effectiveness of the % Program and its project funding allocations resulting from the 2006 budget. This analysis will allow for % Program funding adjustments to be made responsive to Executive, Council, and community comment.

**Responsible Council Committee:** Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts Committee.

**Date Due to Council:** The progress report is due to be presented to the Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts Committee on or before May 17, 2005. The final report is due to be presented to the Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts Committee on or before July 8, 2005.

### 32. **General Subfund Revenues, Police: Special Events Recovery**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In approving the Proposed Budget for Special Events Recovery in General Subfund Revenue, it is the Council's intent that the Council and Executive review current special events cost recovery policies and develop and consider options for recovering a larger portion of Police overtime costs for special events. The Council will not consider charging fees for policing events in which the primary purpose is free speech. The Executive shall present a work plan for this review no later than March 2005.

**Responsible Council Committee:** Public Safety, Civil Rights & Arts

**Date Due to Council:** Written work plan by March 2005

### 33. **Goals and Measures of buy-bust program as part of Seattle Police Department Anti-Crime Teams (ACT) budget**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Seattle City Council wants to determine the effectiveness of buy-bust drug enforcement as a strategy and wants to look at program goal(s) and how one measures progress toward those goal(s). The SPD buy-bust program is funded as part of Seattle Police Department Anti-Crime Teams (ACT) budget. ACT teams are used extensively not only on tactical missions to combat street-level trafficking in illegal drugs, but also to control prostitution, and to work on pattern crimes such as the recent series of arson fires. The Council is interested in finding out how much of the ACT budget is spent on buy-bust drug enforcement as a strategy. Toward that end, the City Council directs the Police Department to prepare an analysis of the resources devoted to buy-bust drug activities by Seattle Police Department Anti-Crime Teams (ACT). In adopting the 2005-2006 budget it is the intent of the City Council that the Police Department report to the Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts Committee by August 1st for the first 6 months of 2005. The report should include the following information:

- A) Please identify for each precinct, a breakout of ACT budget FTE hours devoted to buy-bust related drug enforcement.
- B) Please identify for each precinct, a breakout of the overtime patrol hours devoted to buy-bust related drug enforcement.
- C) With regards to buy-bust related drug activity: 1) the number of drug arrests made, 2) the average amount and kind of drugs confiscated, 3) the number of drug cases forwarded to the City Attorney or County Prosecutor, and 4) the number of cases pursued by the City Attorney or County Prosecutor.
- Responsible Council Committee(s):** Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts Committee  
**Date Due to Council:** August 1, 2005

**34. Status report regarding community agencies performance in assisting individuals with suspended drivers licenses and in recovering delinquent fines owed to Seattle.**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** It is the City Council's intent in reinstating funding to community agencies providing DWLS and repayment options education and outreach that the Municipal Court shall provide a status report on the number of individuals the community agencies have served or assisted and the amount the City of Seattle has collected resulting from those community contacts in 2005 and 2006.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Public Safety, Civil Rights and Arts  
**Date Due to Council:** May and September 2005 and 2006

**Transportation**

**35. Rainier Valley Community Development Fund: Annual Report to the Seattle City Council**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Seattle City Council requests that the Office of Economic Development, in cooperation with the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund (CDF), prepare a semi-annual report for the City Council that includes an accounting of all funds appropriated to date. This report should include, at a minimum, the following:

1. Appropriations to OED broken out by year and revenue source.
2. Information on the amount and type of funds (e.g., CDBG vs. General Subfund) that OED has disbursed to the CDF and when the funds were disbursed and for what purpose.
3. Information on CDF's expenditures to date, including how much it has spent, when it was spent, and for what purpose.
4. Information on any contracts that OED has executed with the CDF, including the purpose of the contracts, progress to date, and cost.
5. Information on whether CDF is meeting its goals and outcomes.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** February 1 & August 1, 2005 and every year thereafter

**36. Mercer Corridor Project TCIP-Monitor spending related to environmental review process**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In 2005, the Executive proposes to add \$612,000 in bond funds to complete the environmental review for the Mercer project. This is in addition to \$1.830 million authorized in 2004 and a carry over of \$1.133 million from 2003. The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) currently anticipates that the project may require an Environmental Assessment and may not require an EIS. SDOT will also be required by ordinance to do some additional analysis and program development related to the project, which is not formally part of the required environmental review. SDOT is directed to submit quarterly financial and project progress reports that at a minimum include the following information:

- 1) A detailed spending plan for the environmental review including additional analysis and program development detailed in CB 115088 for 2005 and 2006.

- 2) A full accounting of spending to date including a description of what the funds have been spent on.
- 3) A proposed contingency budget if a full EIS becomes warranted.
- 4) Identification of any budget issues that may warrant further discussion.

These quarterly reports may be integrated with the quarterly progress reports regarding the Mercer Corridor analysis described in CB 115088.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** Quarterly reports: 1st quarter due: March 17, 2005, 2nd quarter due: June 9, 2005, 3rd quarter due: September 8, 2005, 4th quarter due: December 1, 2005

### 37. **SDOT Long Term Budget Sustainability - SDOT Financial Policy Limit on Debt**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** SDOT and DOF will produce a written analysis and recommendations regarding whether SDOT's financial policies should be changed to provide a different limitation on the amount of debt that can be issued for transportation projects now that the debt service on some major transportation projects is proposed to be included in SDOT's budget - and if so, how should it be changed? The analysis will include a comparison of SDOT's current and any proposed new debt policies with that of other City departments/funds and explain the reasons for differences in SDOT's debt policies. The analysis and recommendations shall be ready for presentation to the Council's Transportation Committee no later than May 1, 2005.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** May 1, 2005

### 38. **Enhancing Parking Enforcement Effectiveness**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Council requests that several City departments including SPD, SDOT, the Municipal Court, DOF, and the Office of the City Auditor cooperate in investigating the effectiveness of the City's parking enforcement and reporting back to the Council. The issues under I. below will be the primary responsibility of SPD with the assistance of SDOT and DOF. The issues under II. below will be the primary responsibility of the Office of the City Auditor with the assistance of the Municipal Court. The departments will coordinate the development of a written report to be made available to the Council's Transportation Committee no later than June 1, 2005.

I. SPD with the assistance of SDOT and DOF

- A. Issues to be included in a report delivered to the Council Transportation Committee no later than June 1, 2005 include a recommended set of performance measures that can be used by the Council to track how the City's PEOs are being used. At a minimum the performance measures will include:
  1. average annual PEOs employed compared to the number of PEO positions authorized and funded;
  2. minimum percent of annual PEO total time on the job that is used for on-duty time with no significant restrictions such as light duty;
  3. minimum annual and monthly (may vary by month) percent of on-duty time spent on routine patrol; and
  4. average number of tickets written per routine duty hour.
- B. A Work Plan to suggest recommended approaches and timing for addressing the issues below should be delivered to the Council no later than September 1, 2005. (Note it is anticipated that the approach taken in addressing the issues below will depend on what new hand held ticketing device (HHTD) technology is selected, if any, to replace the existing obsolete units. Therefore this work plan is to be developed after a decision on whether to replace the HHTDs and with what. If it is decided not to replace the HHTDs in 2006, then the work plan will suggest what is feasible with

the existing devices.)

1. A geographical analysis comparing levels of parking enforcement and overall enforcement effectiveness in different areas of the City with controlled parking spaces and development of enforcement standards that could guide redeployment of PEOs to enhance consistency of enforcement throughout the City.
2. A review of the efficiency of PEO procedures for locating violations of parking regulations and citing them.
3. Provided that the Office of the City Auditor pursuant to task II. B. recommends that the City enhance its capability to determine a-c below, SPD will provide recommendations for ways to estimate and monitor the data, along with an estimate for the cost and labor requirements of data collection and analysis:
  - a. the average number of hours per day each controlled parking space is in use in various parts of the City by customers who should pay (e.g., Ballard, 4.6 hours per 10 hour day);
  - b. the number of hours during which controlled parking spaces in various parts of the City are not available for pay parking and the reasons therefore; and
  - c. the annual number of violations of parking regulations by regulation violated and section of the City.

The Office of City Auditor with the assistance of the Municipal Court

- A. A briefing to the Council Transportation Committee no later than March 15, 2005 on progress and potential problems that could compromise the scope of the report in B. below or delay its completion.
- B. Issues to be included in a report delivered to the Council Transportation Committee no later than June 1, 2005:
  1. Ticketing Technology. A survey of new ticket-writing technology (utilizing/complementing pay and display station functionality) and its implementation in other similar jurisdictions using pay and display stations. This might also include supporting work by SPD and DOIT on a high-level analysis. Also an analysis of how new technologies compare with the technology now used by Seattle PEOs and the advantages and disadvantages they offer with an assessment of the efficiencies from adoption of new technology (e.g., average reduction in time to locate a violation, to ticket a violator, to travel to and from duty areas, to enter violations into a data base, etc.).
  2. Pay Station Implications on PEO Deployment and Procedures. A survey of other jurisdictions that have implemented pay stations to identify potential changes to PEO deployment and procedural changes necessitated by the introduction of pay stations.
  3. Parking Enforcement Performance Measures. A survey of how other City's assess the adequacy of parking enforcement activities (e.g., what performance measures are used, how data on performance is collected, and how the information is used), including but not limited to whether they estimate or collect data on how many hours each day controlled parking spaces are in use by customers who should pay, the number of hours during which controlled parking spaces are not available for pay parking and the reasons therefore, and an estimate of the total annual number of violations of parking regulations by the regulation violated.
  4. Fine Collection. An analysis of payment process; fine-setting, fine amounts vs. payment amounts, receivables processing and collections, and record keeping and accountability, along with possible recommendations for improvement.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** Varies. See above.

**39. Work Program for Implementing and Enforcing a Four Hour Limit on Disabled Parking in parts of the City**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** No later than February 1, 2005, SPD (with SDOT's assistance) will report to the Council Transportation Committee with a proposed 2005-6 program for implementing a four hour limit on disabled parking in certain areas of the City. The report will:

- 1) recommend in which areas of the City the four hour limit should be imposed;
- 2) for each such area, the report will estimate a) how many parking spaces there are and of these how many are or will ultimately be controlled by parking pay stations and how many by parking meters and b) when the limit is proposed to be implemented; and
- 3) what steps will be taken to ensure that the new limit is being effectively enforced.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** February 1, 2005

**40. Requesting SPD (with SDOT's assistance) to develop recommendations and a work program for curbing abuses of disabled parking privileges in Seattle, including consideration of using volunteers (See #18 under Housing, Human Services and Health, page X)**

**41. Extending Pay Parking Hours to Evenings and Sundays**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** No later than July 1, 2005, SDOT will provide a written report to the Council Transportation Committee on the feasibility of extending the hours of operation of City parking meters and pay stations in areas of the City where parking demand is great after 6 PM on weekdays or Saturday and/or on Sunday.

The report will include:

- 1) criteria for areas of the City where pay parking hours will be extended;
- 2) which areas satisfy the criteria and for each -
  - a) the number of parking spaces meeting the criteria;
  - b) whether these spaces will ultimately be controlled by parking pay stations or meters;
  - c) recommended extended hours; and
  - d) proposed hourly fee and projected incremental parking revenues from extended hours;
- 3) the cost of implementing extended hours, including signage, reprogramming meters and pay stations, and public outreach;
- 4) the incremental cost of enforcement in areas with extended hours and whether additional PEOs are needed;
- 5) the recommended timeline for implementation of any extended hours; and
- 6) strategies for mitigating any impacts of extended hours on local businesses and residents who now park free on the street in the off hours and the cost to the City or to local businesses and residents for mitigation.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** July 1, 2005

**42. Establishing Funding for the Replacement of Parking Enforcement Officers' Handheld Ticketing Devices as a Priority Use of Any Excess Parking Fee Revenues Expected in 2006 and Requesting Information from SPD to Implement This Priority**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** It is the Council's intention to designate any projected 2006 parking fee revenues in excess of \$15,711,000 (the amount assumed in the endorsed 2006 budget) to helping fund the replacement of the existing aged handheld ticketing devices (HHTs) used by the City's Parking Enforcement Officers as part of the 2006 budget. The Council requests SPD to make a recommendation to the Council regarding the technologies needed in new HHT's, the number of HHTs to purchase, and any

supporting systems or software the City should acquire to get maximum effectiveness from any new HHTs and the estimated cost.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** Prior to or with the Mayor's 2006 budget submittal to the Council.

### Urban Development and Planning

#### 43. North Helpline Food Bank and Emergency Services

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** North Helpline must relocate to either an existing vacant space or into a new dedicated facility. The Office of Housing, Fleets and Facilities and the Fire Department are requested to work with North Helpline and Emergency Services on the development of strategies to assist them in their efforts to find a suitable site for North Helpline. In particular, the departments will explore the possibility of co-locating North Helpline with the new Fire Station 39. The Executive will report on its findings by June 2005. The findings may lead to the allocation of \$250,000 in the 2006 budget to assist with the relocation project. The funding commitment depends on identifying a location and developing a full project budget and credible funding plan.

**Responsible Council Committee:** Urban Development and Planning will take the lead on this.

**Date Due to Council:** June 2005

#### 44. DPD - Funding for Priority Projects

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** It is the Council's intent that the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) Planning Division have adequate resources in 2005 and 2006 to address priority projects. In 2005, \$870,000 in funding in the Planning BCL is subject to budget provisos which restrict the use of these funds to certain priority projects. It is the Council's intent to establish similar provisos in the 2006 budget to address projects identified by the Council as priorities.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Urban Development and Planning

**Date Due to Council:** Written status reports on priority projects due quarterly to UDP Committee during 2005 and 2006.

#### 45. Office of Economic Development - report to Council

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Office of Economic Development (OED) is charged with helping to create healthy businesses, thriving neighborhoods and community organizations to contribute to a robust economy that benefits Seattle residents and businesses. Work to accomplish this is done through staff and contracts with a variety of community-based organizations. To provide greater clarity on OED programs and understanding about how well OED is accomplishing its mission and strategic plan, City Council requests OED to submit a report to the Urban Development and Planning Committee that provides for each line of business (Business Development, Community Development, Management and Operations and Workforce Development), the following information:

1. A brief description of each program and its staffing;
2. Specific quantitative outcomes and performance measures for each program and contracts with specific organizations and agencies, when applicable; and
3. A list of contracts funded to outside agencies or organizations in each line of business.

**Responsible Council Committee:** Urban Development and Planning Committee

**Date Due to Council:** Briefing no later than March 31, 2005, and a written report to Council no later than April 30, 2005.

**Utilities and Technology****46. Web-based Access to City Lien and Utility Bill Data**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** In adopting the 2005 budget and endorsing the 2006 budget the Council directs the Department of Information Technology, Seattle City Light, and Seattle Public Utilities, to analyze providing web-based access to City lien and outstanding utility bills. The specified departments shall work together to evaluate and report to the Council on the potential for the City to provide faster and more efficient access to this information while at the same time generating revenue and staff efficiencies. The City currently provides this information to escrow and title companies at no cost and in a labor-intensive fashion. An assessment comparing the costs and benefits of a web-based service versus the current practice should include the following:

- 1) Identification of potential vendors and satisfaction data from customers of those vendors.
- 2) The feasibility of integrating all lien and outstanding utility bills relevant to a single address or land parcel, including the potential use of the City's geographic information system.
- 3) Study of the design requirements needed for data interfaces and interoperability between the City and any third-party vendor.
- 4) Study of any estimating algorithm needed between the City and any third-party vendor.
- 5) Study of a payment system for remittance to the various City funds.
- 6) Analysis of security issues with City's data in a web-based system.
- 7) Feasibility of in-house design, development and operation of a web-based system.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Utilities and Technology

**Date Due to Council:** June 30, 2005

**47. Recommendations for Use and Users of Community Notification System**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** It is Council's intent that the steering committee overseeing implementation and operation of the City's community notification system, or the Chief Technology Officer to whom the steering committee reports, recommend to Council proposed written policies explaining what types of emergencies would warrant use of the system, how "emergency" will be defined, whether there are any non-emergency situations that might warrant use of the system, and who may use the system.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Utilities and Technology

**Date Due to Council:** June 30, 2005

**48. Seattle Public Utility Assistance to Seniors, Disabled, and Low-Income Customers**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Council intends to review Seattle Public Utilities' (SPU's) programs to identify whether effective types of rate and bill payment assistance are being provided at adequate levels to seniors, disabled, and low-income customers. The City Council directs SPU to conduct a review of its assistance programs for these customer groups that includes, at a minimum:

1. Descriptions of SPU's existing assistance programs including the level of funding and resources devoted to each program, including the methods of outreach used to reach the targeted customer groups.
2. The number of delinquent accounts and shut-off notices issued over the last 5 years for customers receiving rate assistance compared to the number of delinquent accounts and shut-off notices for customers not receiving assistance.
3. A comparison of SPU assistance programs to the assistance programs offered by Seattle City Light and those offered by other city departments that have relevant assistance programs for these customer groups.

4. Options for new assistance programs and for improving existing programs.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Utilities and Technology Committee

**Date Due to Council:** March 31, 2005

**49. Evaluation of criteria for debt-financing for certain CIP activities.**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** As part of the upcoming consideration of the Mayor's proposed water rate legislation, the Council intends to review Seattle Public Utilities' (SPU's) approach toward debt-financing certain types of costs. To help support this review, the City Council directs SPU to conduct a review of its capital improvement program (CIP) to evaluate appropriate financing for CIP-related activities that are limited to planning, that recur every year at fairly consistent levels, or are short-lived assets. The review is intended to identify whether equity between current and future ratepayers would be better served by using current year revenues (rather than debt) to fund these types of CIP-related activities. The review should include, at a minimum:

1. An explanation of current SPU policies regarding debt-financing of capital projects.
2. An evaluation of the current criteria and guidelines for determining whether projects are appropriate for inclusion in the CIP and for debt-financing, and recommendations for any changes to those criteria and guidelines. The evaluation should look at the current and future capital program to identify whether the mix of projects and expenditures unduly emphasizes CIP-related activities that are limited to planning, that recur every year at fairly consistent levels, or are short-lived assets.
3. A review of other jurisdictions' practices including: a) their debt-financing criteria and guidelines; b) their practices regarding debt-financing of planning and monitoring activities, short-lived assets, and projects that recur each year at consistent levels; and c) their rationale for different practices.
4. Options for cash-financing of CIP-related activities that are limited to planning or monitoring, that recur every year at fairly consistent levels, are short-lived assets, or consist of ongoing analysis of asset classes and life cycle costs. Moving these activities to the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) budget should be included in at least one option. Cost estimates for each option should include any added administrative costs associated with project tracking and reporting under the new procedures, and the potential rate impacts associated with shifting activities to the O&M budget.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Utilities and Technology

**Date Due to Council:** January 31, 2005

**Other**

**50. KeyArena Negotiations with Seattle Sonics**

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Seattle City Council requests that the Executive and Seattle Center management consult with the Council on all significant policy decisions related to Seattle Sonics contract negotiations, especially those having any short or long term financial impacts to the City. KeyArena is the single largest contributing factor to Seattle Center's recent financial difficulties, which highlights the importance of striking a fair and balanced contract with the Sonics that minimizes the financial risks to the City.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Briefings/Consultations should be offered to all Councilmembers

**Date Due to Council:** Periodic, as necessary.



# Glossary

**Abrogate:** A request to eliminate a position. Once a position is abrogated, it cannot be administratively reinstated. If the body of work returns, a department must request new position authority from the City Council.

**Allocation:** The expenditure amount planned for a particular project or service that requires additional legislative action or appropriation before expenditures are authorized.

**Appropriation:** A legal authorization granted by the City's legislative authority (the City Council) to make expenditures and incur obligations for specific purposes.

**Biennial Budget:** A budget covering a two-year period.

**Budget - Adopted and Proposed:** The Mayor submits to the City Council a recommended expenditure and revenue level for all City operations for the coming fiscal year as the Proposed Budget. When the City Council agrees upon the revenue and expenditure levels, the Proposed Budget becomes the Adopted Budget, funds are appropriated, and legal expenditure limits are established.

**Budget - Endorsed:** The City of Seattle implements biennial budgeting through the sequential adoption of two one-year budgets. When adopting the budget for the first year of the biennium, the Council endorses a budget for the second year. The Endorsed Budget is the basis for a Proposed Budget for the second year of the biennium, and is reviewed and adopted in the fall of the first year of the biennium.

**Budget Control Level:** The level at which expenditure levels are controlled to meet State Budget Law provisions, generally at the Line of Business level.

**CAFR or Comprehensive Annual Financial Report of the City:** The City's annual financial statement prepared by the Department of Executive Administration.

**Capital Improvement Program (CIP):** Annual appropriations from specific funding sources are shown in the City's budget for certain capital purposes such as street improvements, building construction, and some kinds of facility maintenance. These appropriations are supported by a six-year allocation plan detailing all projects, fund sources, and expenditure amounts, including many multi-year projects that require funding beyond the one-year period of the annual budget. The allocation plan covers a six-year period and is produced as a separate document from the budget document.

**Chart of Accounts:** A listing of expenditure, revenue, and other accounts describing and categorizing financial transactions.

**Community Development Block Grant (CDBG):** A U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development annual grant to Seattle and other local governments to support economic development projects, low-income housing, and services in low-income neighborhoods.

**Cumulative Reserve Subfund (CRF):** A significant source of ongoing local funding to support capital projects in general government departments. The CRF consists of two accounts: the Capital Projects Account and the Revenue Stabilization Account. The Capital Projects Account has four existing subaccounts: REET I, REET II, Unrestricted, and South Lake Union Property Proceeds. There are two new subaccounts proposed in the 2005 budget - the Asset Preservation Subaccount, Fleets and Facilities and the Street Vacation Subaccount. The Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) is levied on all sales of real estate, with the first .25% of the locally imposed tax going to REET I and the second .25% to REET II.

**Debt Service:** Annual principal and interest payments the City owes on money it has borrowed.

**Education & Development Services Levy (Families & Education Levy):** In September 1997, a property tax levy was approved by voters allowing the City to collect revenues from 1998 to 2004. In September 2004, voters approved a new Families & Education Levy for \$116.7 million to be collected from 2005 through 2011. Appropriations are made to Educational and Development Services Department and are overseen by the Department of Neighborhoods. Once implementation plans are written, appropriations will be made to specific departments to support school- and community-based programs for children and families.

**Errata:** Adjustments, corrections, and new information sent by departments through the Department of Finance to the City Council during the Council's budget review as an adjunct to the Mayor's Proposed Budget. The

## Glossary

purpose is to adjust the Proposed Budget to reflect information not available upon submittal and to correct inadvertent errors.

**Full Time Equivalent (FTE):** A term expressing the amount of time for which a position has been budgeted in relation to the amount of time a regular, full-time employee normally works in a year. Most full-time employees (1.00 FTE) are paid for 2,088 hours in a year (or 2,096 in a leap year). A position budgeted to work half-time for a full year, or full-time for only six months, is 0.50 FTE.

**Fund:** An accounting entity with a set of self-balancing revenue and expenditure accounts used to record the financial affairs of a governmental organization.

**Fund Balance:** The difference between the assets and liabilities of a particular fund. This incorporates the difference between the revenues and expenditures each year.

**General Fund:** A central fund into which most of the City's general tax revenues and discretionary resources are pooled, and which is allocated to support many of the operations of City government. Beginning with the 1997 Adopted Budget, the General Fund was restructured to encompass a number of subfunds, including the General Fund Subfund (comparable to the "General Fund" in prior years) and other subfunds designated for a variety of specific purposes. These subfunds are listed and explained in more detail in department chapters, as well as in the Funds, Subfunds, and Other section of the budget document.

**Grant-Funded Position:** A position funded 50% or more by a categorical grant to carry out a specific project or goal. Seattle Municipal Code 4.04.030 specifies that "categorical grant" does not include Community Development Block Grant funds, nor any funds provided under a statutory entitlement or distribution on the basis of a fixed formula including, but not limited to, relative population.

**Line of Business:** A group of programs within a department, aligned by common purpose.

**Neighborhood Matching Subfund (NMF):** A fund supporting partnerships between the City and neighborhood associations to produce neighborhood-initiated planning, organizing, and improvement projects. The City provides a cash match to the community's contribution of volunteer labor, materials, professional services, or cash. The NMF is administered by the Department of Neighborhoods.

**Operating Budget:** That portion of a budget dealing with recurring expenditures such as salaries, electric bills, postage, printing, paper supplies, and gasoline.

**Position/Pocket Number:** A term referring to the title and unique position identification number assigned to each position authorized by the City Council through the budget or other ordinances. Positions may have a common title name, but each position has its own unique identification number assigned by the Records Information Management Unit of the Personnel Department at the time position authority is approved by the City Council. Only one person at a time can fill a regularly budgeted position. An exception is in the case of a job-share, where two people work part-time in one full-time position.

**Program:** A group of services within a department, aligned by common purpose.

**Reclassification Request:** A request to change the job title or classification for an existing position. Reclassifications are subject to review and approval by the Classification/Compensation Unit of the Personnel Department and are implemented upon the signature of the Personnel Director, as long as position authority has been established by ordinance.

**Reorganization:** Reorganization refers to changes in the budget and reporting structure within departments.

**SUMMIT:** The City's central accounting system managed by the Department of Executive Administration.

**Sunsetting Position:** A position funded for only a specified length of time by the budget or enabling ordinance.

**TES (Temporary Employment Service):** A program managed by the Personnel Department. TES places temporary workers in departments for purposes of filling unanticipated, short-term staffing needs, such as vacation coverage, positions vacant until a regularly-appointed hire is made, and special projects. TES placements are not shown separately in the budget document because departments may utilize regular position authority already authorized in the budget to fill these types of short-term needs.

## Glossary

**Type of Position:** There are two types of positions authorized through the position lists adopted at the same time as the budget. They are identified by one of the following characters: **F** for **Full Time** or **P** for **Part Time**. Temporary/Intermittent positions are not included in the position lists, but information about these types of positions is included here in the interests of clarity.

- **Regular Full Time** is defined as a position budgeted for 2,088 compensated hours per year, 40 hours per week, 80 hours per pay period, and is also known as one full-time equivalent (FTE).
- **Regular Part Time** is defined as a position designated as part time, and requiring an average of 20 hours or more, but less than 40 hours of work per week during the year. This equates to an FTE value of at least 0.50 and no more than 0.99.
- **Temporary/Intermittent** is defined as a temporary, emergency, or short-term position. The term includes persons employed in seasonal or intermittent positions, and those employed less than an average of 20 hours per week during a year. Temporary/intermittents can have an FTE value of 0.01 to 1.00.



**CITY GOVERNMENT**

Date of incorporation	December 2, 1869
Present charter adopted	March 12, 1946
Form: Mayor-Council (Nonpartisan)	

**GEOGRAPHICAL DATA**

Location:	
Between Puget Sound and Lake Washington	
125 nautical miles from Pacific Ocean	
110 miles south of Canadian border	
Altitude:	
Sea level to 521 feet	
Average elevation 10 feet	
Land Area (Square Miles)	83.1
Climate	
Temperature	
30-year average, mean annual	52.3
January 2003 average high	51.1
January 2003 average low	40.4
July 2003 average high	79.0
July 2003 average low	56.7
Rainfall	
30-year average, in inches	37.07
2003, in inches	41.27

**ELECTIONS**

Active registered voters	362,270
Percentage voted last general election	36.58
Total voted	132,513

**CITY EMPLOYEES**

General Government Administration (includes Judicial and Legal)	1,376
Public Safety	2,705
Utilities	2,949
Transportation	554
Housing and Human Services	311
Planning and Development	443
Cultural and Recreation	1,675
Total Employees	10,013

**PENSION BENEFICIARIES**

Employees' Retirement	4,876
Firemen's Pension	998
Police Pension	788

**VITAL STATISTICS**

Rates per thousand of residents	
Births (2002)	12.8
Deaths (2002)	8.3

**FIRE PROTECTION**

Personnel	
Uniformed	1,040
Other	70
Boats	2
Fire fighting apparatus	163
Stations	33
Fire loss - property	
Total City fire loss	\$22,433,417
Per capita	\$39.23
Training tower	1
Alarm center	1
Utility shop	1

**LIBRARY (Municipal)**

Personnel	
Full-time	301
Part-time	281
Central and branch libraries	24
Mobile units	4
Books, audio and video materials, newspapers, and magazines – circulated	
	5,804,388
Collection, print and non-print	2,004,718
Library cards in force	352,194

**PARKS AND RECREATION**

Personnel	
Full-time - permanent	798
Part-time - permanent	126
Temporary	1,040
Major parks	13
Open space acres acquired since 1989	630
Total acreage	6,036
Children's play areas	130
Neighborhood playgrounds	38
Community playfields	33
Community recreation centers	24
Visual and performing arts centers <sup>a</sup>	6
Theaters <sup>a</sup>	2
Community indoor swimming pools	8
Outdoor heated pool (one saltwater)	2
Boulevards	18
Golf courses (includes one pitch and putt)	5
Squares, plazas, triangles	62
Viewpoints	8
Bathing beaches (lifeguarded)	7
Park use permits issued	633
Facility use permits issued <sup>b</sup>	N/A
Picnic permits issued	2,921
Ball field usage (scheduled hours)	138,976
Weddings	160
Aquarium specimens on exhibit	14,577

<sup>a</sup> Activities under contract with private nonprofit organizations.

<sup>b</sup> Includes permits with fee waivers.

# Statistics

## BUILDING PERMITS

Year	Issued Permit Value	Number of Permits Issued
1994	\$621,237,548	5,019
1995	561,011,739	5,329
1996	664,854,251	5,409
1997	995,315,670	5,923
1998	1,159,231,667	6,756
1999	1,669,777,218	6,770
2000	1,612,566,932	6,510
2001	1,736,825,632	6,658
2002	1,282,588,182	6,728
2003	1,175,475,274	6,683

## MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC PLANT

Personnel (Full Time Equivalents)	1,625
Customers	365,445
Plant capacity (KW)	1,888,700
Maximum system load (KW)	1,645,998
Total system energy (1,000 KW) (firm load)	9,610,856

### Operating Revenue and Meters by Year

Year	Operating Revenue	Meters
1994	\$335,113,006	347,114
1995	329,808,276	348,296
1996	356,670,693	350,088
1997	366,138,163	351,624
1998	363,913,130	354,721
1999	372,750,765	368,942
2000	505,628,699	372,329
2001	632,453,970	375,953
2002	698,617,249	379,257
2003	741,761,472	380,828

## MUNICIPAL WATER PLANT & GROUND WATER

Sources: Cedar and Tolt Rivers and Highline Well Field	
Population served	1,330,327
Reservoirs, standpipes, tanks	38
Fire hydrants	18,356
Water mains	
Supply, in miles	181 Miles
Distribution, in miles	1,662 Miles
Billed water consumption, in gallons	
Daily average	130,670,298
Water storage, in gallons	506,570,000

### Operating Revenue and Meters by Year

Year	Operating Revenue	Meters
1994	\$ 62,605,515	174,193
1995	65,400,593	174,672
1996	68,940,665	174,987
1997	71,956,360	175,698
1998	82,847,279	176,006
1999	86,254,799	177,122
2000	105,358,307	178,122
2001	105,345,318	179,330
2002	118,160,130	179,268
2003	129,561,327	180,149

## MUNICIPAL DRAINAGE & WASTEWATER UTILITY

Established	April 1, 1956
Combined sewers, life-to-date, in miles	587
Sanitary sewers, life-to-date, in miles	908
Storm drains, life-to-date, in miles	461
Pumping stations	68

### Operating Revenue by Year

Year	Operating Revenue
1994	\$102,044,080
1995	114,457,794
1996	121,151,483
1997	119,363,778
1998	120,706,449
1999	125,697,879
2000	130,816,605
2001	136,238,195
2002	144,485,761
2003	150,452,288

## MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE UTILITY

Transfer stations	2
Residential can customers	91,317
Residential dumpsters customers	111,822
Commercial customers	8,710

### Operating Revenue by Year, CAFR Basis

Year	Operating Revenue <sup>a</sup>
1994	\$ 69,846,474
1995	75,221,212
1996	77,349,623
1997	80,413,680
1998	81,451,385
1999	81,093,039
2000	85,257,112
2001	105,510,879
2002	112,089,944
2003	114,821,373

<sup>a</sup> Separately issued financial statements of the Utility consider transfers in as operating revenues. CAFR statements do not.

## POLICE PROTECTION

Personnel	
Sworn	1,224
Student Officers	3
Civilian	555
Stations (5 precincts)	5
Vehicles	
Patrol cars	252
Motorcycles	41
Scooters	63
Trucks, vans, minibuses	67
Automobiles	181
Patrol boats	7
Bicycles	126
Horses	9
Intake filings and citations	
Non-traffic criminal filings	10,502
Non-traffic infraction filings	17,350
Traffic	72,104
Parking	441,048
Jail	
County facilities	

# Statistics

## POPULATION

Year	City of Seattle	Seattle Metropolitan Area <sup>ab</sup>
1910	237,194	N/A
1920	315,685	N/A
1930	365,583	N/A
1940	368,302	N/A
1950	467,591	844,572
1960	557,087	1,107,203
1970	530,831	1,424,611
1980	493,846	1,607,618
1990	516,259	1,972,947
2000	563,374	2,279,100
2001	568,100	2,376,900
2002	570,800	2,402,300
2003	571,900	2,416,800
King County		1,779,300
Percentage in Seattle		36%

<sup>a</sup> Source: Washington State Office of Financial Management.

<sup>b</sup> Based on population in King and Snohomish Counties.

## STREETS, SIDEWALKS, AND BRIDGES

Arterial streets	1,534 Miles
Non-arterial streets - paved	2,404 Miles
Non-arterial streets - unpaved	8 Miles
Sidewalks	1,953 Miles
Stairways	479
Length of stairways	33,683 Feet
Number of stairway treads	22,471
Street trees	
City maintained	34,000
Maintained by property owners	100,000
Total platted streets	1,666 Miles
Traffic signals	1,000
Parking meters	
Downtown <sup>c</sup>	7,136
Outlying	1,967
Bridges (movable)	
City-owned	4
City-operated	4
Bridges (fixed)	
City maintenance	85
Partial City maintenance	58
Retaining walls/seawalls	561

<sup>c</sup> Includes Belltown, Central Business District, First Hill, International District, Pioneer Square, and the Waterfront.

## PROPERTY TAXES

Assessed valuation (January 2003 )	\$80,128,288,305
Tax levy (City)	\$251,590,502

## EXAMPLE – PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENTS

Real value of property	\$335,000
Assessed value at	\$335,000

Property tax levied by:	Dollars per Thousand	Tax Due
City of Seattle	\$3.15990	\$1,058.57
Emergency medical services	.24143	80.88
State of Washington	2.89680	970.43
School District No. 1	2.39470	802.22
King County	1.34948	452.08
Port of Seattle	.25895	86.75
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$10.30126</b>	<b>\$3,450.93</b>

## PORT OF SEATTLE

Bonded indebtedness	
General obligation bonds	\$217,285,000
Utility revenue bonds	2,272,015,000
PFC bonds	250,940,000
Commercial Paper	105,050,000

## Waterfront (mileage)

Salt water	13.4
Fresh water	0.7

## Value of land facilities

Waterfront	\$1,759,061,526
Sea-Tac International Airport	2,865,196,245

## Marine Container Facilities/Capacities

3 container terminals with 10 berths covering 448 acres  
 1.486 million TEU's (20-ft. equivalent unit containers)  
 1 grain facility, 4 general cargo facilities

## Sea-Tac International Airport

Scheduled passenger airlines	26
Cargo airlines	11
Charter airlines	2
Loading bridges	64

## PUBLIC EDUCATION (2002-03 School Year)

Enrollment (October 1)	46,730
Teachers and other certified employees (October 1)	3,337
School programs	
Regular elementary programs	62
Regular middle school programs	10
Regular high school programs	10
Other school programs	28
Total number of school programs	110

