

2010 STATEMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT

STATEMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT – SUMMARY BY COUNCIL COMMITTEE 2010 ADOPTED BUDGET

<u>#</u>	<u>SLI #</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project Committee of the Whole		
1	67-1-A-2	Financing Plan for the City's Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
2	67-2-A-2	Preliminary Analysis of Local Improvement District(s) financial support for the City's Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
Committee on the Built Environment		
3	108-1-A-2	Council Land Use and Urban Planning Priorities
Energy, Technology and Civil Rights Committee		
4	89-1-A-1	DoIT -- Citywide Computer Inventory
5	92-1-A-1	DoIT -- Study a possible new assistance program to help provide high-speed Internet access to low income households
6	114-1-A-1	Better define role of advisory commission on disability issues
Finance and Budget Committee		
7	86-1-A-1	DOF -- Review use of reserve funds vs. issuing debt for periodic replacement of City equipment, hardware, software, etc.
8	117-1-A-1	Review of the City's Human Resource Services
9	119-1-A-2	Request that DEA develop and implement a policy for procuring uniforms for City employees that ensures they are manufactured using fair labor standards.
10	122-3-A-1	Span of Control Reductions for 2011

Housing, Human Services, Health and Culture Committee		
11	6-1-A-1	Workplan to implement Cultural Overlay District Advisory Committee (CODAC) recommendations
12	38-2-A-1	Planning for Seattle's senior centers and the delivery of services to seniors.
13	39-2-A-1	Contracting for Enhanced Public Health Services.
14	40-1-A-1	Review existing City youth mentoring programs and recommend enhancements.
15	41-1-A-1	Outreach and Engagement Services to the Homeless
16	48-2-A-1	Shelter Services
Parks and Seattle Center Committee		
17	61-2-A-2	Completing Funding for SDOT's Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas St. CIP Project or Reallocating Parks Levy Funds
18	73-2-A-1	DPR Fee Schedule Policies
19	77-2-A-1	Criteria for Evaluation of Park Ranger Pilot Program
20	78-1-A-2	Othello Park Public Safety Improvements -- Short-Term and Long-Term Improvement Plans
Public Safety and Education Committee		
21	33-4-A-1	Crime Prevention Programs (Co-STARS, CURB, GOTS)
22	42-2-A-1	Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Children
23	102-1-A-2	DON: Evaluation of Youth Violence Prevention Initiative

Regional Development and Sustainability Committee		
24	5-1-A-2	OED - Restructuring of contracting practices related to the provision of business attraction and retention services by non-City entities
25	31-1-A-1	OSE climate adaptation work plan
26	95-1-A-1	Library Funding Options
27	113-1-A-2	Food System Interdepartmental Team
28	113-2-A-1	Interdepartmental Agreements on Using City Land for Urban Agriculture
29	113-4-A-1	Economic Development for the Local Food Sector
30	120-1-A-1	Coordinated Community Development Strategy
Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods Committee		
31	16-1-A-1	SPU indicators of zero-waste progress
32	104-1-A-1	Request that DON develop a work plan to address the recommendations in the Neighborhood District Council Audit developed by the City Auditor
33	110-1-A-1	2010 Neighborhood Planning Update Process
34	113-5-A-1	Incorporating Local Food Planning into Neighborhood Planning
Transportation Committee		
35	54-1-A-1	Speed Infraction Revenues for Pedestrian Master Plan
36	60-2-A-1	Clarifying Council intent and providing direction to SDOT with regard to the Linden Avenue North Complete Streets CIP project.
17	61-2-A-2	Completing Funding for SDOT's Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas St. CIP Project or Reallocating Parks Levy Funds
37	64-2-A-1	South Lake Union Streetcar Interfund Loan Extension

**STATEMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT – FULL TEXT BY COUNCIL COMMITTEE
2010 ADOPTED BUDGET**

ALASKAN WAY VIADUCT REPLACEMENT PROJECT COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

1) Financing Plan for the City's Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program
SLI 67-1-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests that the Mayor propose specific recommendations for implementing either or both of the following new funding sources: an increased Commercial Parking Tax (CPT) and a new Transportation Benefit District. Council requests that the Mayor report back to Council by June 1, 2010.

Background and Additional Information:

Council approved C.B. 116668 authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement between the City and the State of Washington related to the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program (AWVSRP Agreement). The AWVSRP Agreement contemplates that the City will be responsible for funding an estimated \$927 million in costs related to the Bored Tunnel Alternative.

The Proposed 2010-15 Capital Improvement Plan assumes that Council will act to approve either an increased Commercial Parking Tax or a new vehicle license fee (Transportation Benefit District) or both sometime in 2010.

The Mayor has thus far provided a “Funding Feasibility Analysis” rather than a detailed finance plan. The Mayor has indicated that there are a number of different options for implementing each of these two new funding sources, including but not limited to the following:

Commercial Parking Tax:

1. Total percent increase needed to support a total of \$200 million in planned cash and bonds for City’s project funding;
2. Phasing the increase over one or more than one years; and
3. Length of time needed to support planned debt service.

Transportation Benefit District:

1. Total new annual vehicle license fee needed to support a total of \$100 million in planned cash and bonds for City’s project funding;
2. Phasing the increase over one or more than one years; and
3. Length of time needed to support planned debt service.

The Council also requests that the Mayor identify which projects in the AWVSR Program Agreement will use the recommended new funding source(s), identify cash spending and bonds supported by each recommended new funding source, and for each project identify all other anticipated sources of funding for planned spending through 2018.

This SLI is related to another SLI under consideration by Council (SLI 67-2-A) regarding Local Improvement District funding for the projects in the AWVSR Program Agreement.

Responsible Council Committee: Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project Committee of the Whole

Date Due to Council: Report due by Tuesday, June 1, 2010

2) *Preliminary Analysis of Local Improvement District(s) financial support for the City's Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program*
SLI 67-2-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests that the Executive conduct a preliminary analysis of using Local Improvement District(s) for funding various elements of the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program, including but not limited to Central Waterfront improvements and a potential First Avenue Streetcar. Council requests that the Mayor report back to Council by June 1, 2010.

Background and Additional Information:

Council approved C.B. 116668 authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement between the City and the State of Washington related to the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program (AWVSRP Agreement). The AWVSRP Agreement contemplates that the City will be responsible for funding an estimated \$927 million in costs related to the Bored Tunnel Alternative.

The Mayor has thus far provided a “Funding Feasibility Analysis” rather than a detailed finance plan. In this feasibility analysis, the Mayor has included a future Local Improvement District to generate \$175 million to help fund Central Waterfront improvements and a potential First Avenue Streetcar.

The Mayor plans to use other new funding sources – Commercial Parking Tax (CPT) increase and Transportation Benefit District (TBD) – to pay for the City’s funding responsibility under the AWVSRP. The Council would like to know to what extent an LID or LIDs could reduce the need for CPT or TBD funding for the AWVSRP.

The Council requests that the Executive conduct a preliminary investigation of the ability of the City to use an LID or LIDs for the various elements/projects in the AWVSRP that the City has funding responsibility. This analysis should be based on preliminary element/project cost estimates or estimates based on similar projects, and based on planned spending through 2018 (whether supported by cash or bonds).

The Council requests that the Executive hire a property appraiser to assist with determining the special benefits to property owners that might accrue from implementation of these elements/projects.

The scope of the analysis should include:

1. Identify a preliminary estimate of the portion of the costs for the AWVSRP elements/projects that could be attributed to an LID.
2. Identify the potential area or areas for an LID or LIDs and benefit zones within each LID, if any.
3. Provide a reasonable estimate of what the market would bear in the way of LID assessments for the elements/projects identified under Task 1 based on an evaluation of existing property conditions (zoning, site, and building improvements), neighborhood trends, and overall property values proximate to the proposed AWVSRP projects.
4. Provide the Council with at least three scenarios of LID(s) formation for its consideration that could generate an amount to cover the costs of the applicable program elements/projects, including identification of boundaries and duration of LID(s). One scenario should identify the highest amount that could be attributable to LID(s) for all the elements/projects in the AWVSRP for which the City has funding responsibility. Another scenario should identify the minimum LID(s) funding amount required given the other funding sources the Executive proposes to use. A third and any additional scenarios should be between these bookends.

This SLI is related to another SLI under consideration by Council (SLI 67-1-A-2) regarding a Financing Plan for the City's Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program.

Responsible Council Committee: Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Project Committee of the Whole

Date Due to Council: Preliminary Analysis / Report due by Tuesday, June 1, 2010

COMMITTEE ON THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

3) *Council Land Use and Urban Planning Priorities* SLI 108-1-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Responsibility for setting land use and urban planning policy direction and balancing the benefits and burdens that flow from land use policy decisions rests with the Council. Moreover, incorporation of policies into the Comprehensive Plan and adoption of implementing regulations in the Seattle Municipal Code require Council action. In establishing policy and adopting regulations the Council relies on the advice of the Department of Planning and Development, other departments with expertise, and the Planning Commission.

The Council recognizes that the Mayor may identify needed policy changes and recommend those to the Council. The Council further recognizes that resources available to the Mayor and Council for developing land use and urban planning policy, and implementing development regulations and policy changes, are finite and that policy initiatives often take longer than one budget year from conception to implementation.

Consequently, the Council requests that Mayor and the Department of Planning and Development work with the Council and Planning Commission to prioritize a work program for 2010 and a tentative work program for 2011 that reflects shared priorities. The proposed work program should include, but does not have to be limited to, the following elements:

- Planning and Policy Implementation Improvements. The work program should include proposed initiatives to improve land use policy implementation. These should include improvements to the design review process, such as updates to the Citywide Guidelines for Multifamily and Commercial Development and changes consistent with the recommendations of the City Auditor report published in 2007; an analysis of how SEPA planned action ordinances could function with existing processes such as project based SEPA and design review; a proposal for developing capacity to draft environmental impact statements in-house; and a proposal for revisiting proposed Land Use Code changes for lowrise zones.
- Area Planning. The work program should establish which criteria the Mayor will use to prioritize new area planning efforts that are not currently part of the City's neighborhood plan update process. These criteria should include an explanation of how area planning will be prioritized after growth targets are allocated through the County-wide Planning Policies and the 2011 Comprehensive Plan update is complete.
- Livability Initiatives. The work program may include livability initiatives that do not necessarily require Council action, such as development of streetscape concept plans. However, those initiatives should identify adopted policies with which they are consistent and that they would seek to implement.

To ensure that the Mayor work cooperatively with the Council in identifying land use and urban planning priorities and to ensure that sufficient resources are available to develop policy and implementing regulations consistent with those priorities, the Council has restricted spending on \$750,000 in DPD's Planning BCL. See the proviso in Green Sheet 108-2-A. This represents approximately 20% of the General Subfund allocation to the Planning BCL that is not programmed for mandated planning functions, such as operation of the Planning Commission and Design Commission. The Council anticipates lifting this restriction after the report to Council in March.

Responsible Council Committee: Built Environment

Date Due to Council: Work Program due by Monday, March 15, 2010

ENERGY, TECHNOLOGY AND CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE

4) DoIT -- Citywide Computer Inventory
SLI 89-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that the Department of Information Technology (DoIT), working with other City departments, compile an inventory report of all City-owned or City-leased personal computers and laptop computers used by City staff. This report will help Council evaluate current hardware and software replacement policies and potential hardware and software upgrades in the future. Based on the inventory report the Council receives in 2010, it may consider institutionalizing this reporting request for future years.

Responsible Council Committee: Energy, Technology and Civil Rights

Date Due to Council: Inventory report due by Wednesday, June 30, 2010

5) *DoIT -- Study a possible new assistance program to help provide high-speed Internet access to low income households*

SLI 92-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that the Department of Information Technology (DoIT), working with Council staff, study a possible new assistance program for low income households to obtain high-speed Internet Access. The study should identify: 1) cost to manage and administer a sustainable assistance program, 2) income threshold for a household to qualify for the assistance program, 3) Internet Service Providers (Comcast, Broadstripe, Qwest) the City can partner with to administer this voluntary program, 4) means by which the system could receive voluntary donations from the public, 5) policy mandating that 100% of any donation go directly to households that qualify for the program, and 6) promotional activities that will encourage donations to the assistance program.

Responsible Council Committee: Energy, Technology and Civil Rights

Date Due to Council: Study / report due by Wednesday, March 31, 2010

6) *Better define role of advisory commission on disability issues*

SLI 114-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests that the Seattle Office of Civil Rights work with the Department of Planning and Development, Seattle Center, the Seattle Department of Transportation and other relevant departments to define the types of policies and actions that will require review by the body that is charged with advising the City on disability issues and more generally to clarify the advisory role of this body.

Responsible Council Committee: Energy, Technology and Civil Rights

Date Due to Council: Report due by Wednesday, March 31, 2010

FINANCE AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

7) *DOF -- Review use of reserve funds vs. issuing debt for periodic replacement of City equipment, hardware, software, etc.*

SLI 86-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that the Department of Finance (DOF) report back to the Council to address City policy on how best to pay for periodic replacement of City equipment, hardware, software, etc. DOF is requested to address questions including:

- What do the City's existing financial policies say about this issue?
- What has been the recent practice in various departments?
- What are the pros and cons of using sinking or reserve funds vs. issuing debt, including considerations such as net present value (NPV) analysis, preservation of debt capacity for other uses, sustainability in a "down" economy, etc.?

- How do other comparable cities fund similar expenditures? Is there a “best practices” approach?
- How might the City revise its financial policies to address this issue?
- What current or anticipated projects, in what departments, would be affected by a change in City policy?

Responsible Council Committee: Finance and Budget

Date Due to Council: Report due by Wednesday, March 31, 2010

8) *Review of the City's Human Resource Services*

SLI 117-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

The Council intends to review the relative roles of the centralized Personnel Department and decentralized human resource (HR) staff in City departments with the goal of identifying best practices to most effectively and efficiently provide personnel services to the City and its employees. This review will be conducted in consultation with the City Auditor and potentially in conjunction with the new Mayor. Council’s final approach will depend upon the outcome of discussions with the new Mayor and his staff.

Background:

Except for some small City departments that use the Personnel Department or the Department of Executive Administration for all their HR needs, most City departments have their own HR functions, some of which are quite large. For example, Seattle City Light has 62 HR FTE for its 1,830 employees, averaging 1 per 30 City Light employees. Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) has 39 HR FTE, averaging 1 per 36 SPU employees. At the same time, the City’s centralized Personnel Department maintains a staff of more than 90. Both the Personnel Department and other departmental HR staff provide a variety of personnel services, including assistance in recruiting and hiring, labor relations, benefits, apprenticeships, workforce development and training. However, it is not clear what different services are provided by these various staff and it seems likely that there is at least some duplication of effort.

Timeline:

The Council anticipates that this review will be initiated by the end of March 2010 and looks forward to an opportunity to consult with Executive staff on a time line that is consistent with this deadline. Council staff will report to the Council Committee with oversight of Personnel issues before March 31, 2010, to provide a status update and recommendations on the best approach for the review.

Responsible Council Committee: Finance and Budget

Date Due to Council: Report and briefing due by Wednesday, March 31, 2010

9) *Request that DEA develop and implement a policy for procuring uniforms for City employees that ensures they are manufactured using fair labor standards*

SLI 119-1-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Sweatshops are not an aberration in the global apparel industry; U.S. Department of Labor cites over 50% of the sewing shops in the United States as sweatshops. Sweatshops definitively violate labor, environmental, and human rights laws and standards at the local and/or international level.

From 2001 to 2004, Washington lost 66,700 manufacturing jobs, 27,000+ being trade-related losses.

The City of Seattle has an interest in encouraging the creation of local jobs and businesses by its policies. In turn, the local economy thrives when incentives exist for fair business practices, increasing the competitive ability of companies with fair labor practices, and leveling the playing field for regional manufacturers.

City funding using taxpayer dollars should be used in responsible ways that comply with existing goals and policies. The City should investigate other regional governmental jurisdictions for best practices that fit with the City's goals and practices.

The Council requests the Department of Executive Administration (DEA) develop and implement a procurement policy that ensures that uniforms for City employees are not manufactured in facilities using unfair labor practices. To ensure balance and equity in crafting the procurement policy, Council requests that DEA use a participatory process that includes relevant community stakeholders and representatives. At a minimum this policy would require the following of bidders on uniform contracts:

List of Manufacturing Locations: The bidder must submit a list of all contractors, subcontractors and manufacturing plants involved in the manufacturing process of the product. If the vendor intends to change any company on this list during the course of the contract, the vendor must notify the City and comply with contract terms regarding approval of subcontracting.

Code of Conduct: The City requires that the bidder agree to a code of conduct that will apply to the vendor, subcontractors and manufacturing plants that are involved in the manufacturing process of the product.

Fair Labor Monitoring: The bidder must agree to submit the name of an independent monitoring agency that the vendor will use for this contract. The monitoring agency must be accredited by the Fair Labor Association (FLA) to monitor compliance with the code of conduct per the FLA Principles of Monitoring, for all of the contractors and manufacturing plants that are involved in the manufacturing process for the product. The name of the monitoring agency can be submitted at time of bid or provided upon the City's intent to award. If the bidder chooses to wait until the City issues an intent to award to the bidder, the bidder must supply the name in a timely way to not delay execution of the contract, or the City may reject the offer and proceed to the next compliant bidder. During the contract, the City may request information about monitoring and compliance, which the bidder shall provide to the City as a condition of the contract.

In 2010 the policy need not cover uniforms purchased through collectively bargained uniform allowances. However, Council requests that DEA propose a plan and schedule for incorporating the policy into future negotiations for labor contracts. Additionally, the Council requests that DEA seek out opportunities to participate in a state and local government sweatshop free consortium. This consortium could pool resources for the investigation and the monitoring of supplier factories and coordinate the implementation and enforcement of sweatfree procurement standards.

Responsible Council Committee: Finance and Budget

Date Due to Council:

Implementation of short-term procurement policy changes due by June 1, 2010;
Report and briefing to Council committee on implementation of short-term procurement policy changes and schedule for implementation of longer-term procurement policy and labor contract changes due by June 1, 2010.

10) *Span of Control Reductions for 2011*

SLI 122-3-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council recognizes that significant additional budget reductions will be needed for 2011. It is Council's intent that these reductions be achieved with the minimum necessary impact on the direct services provided to Seattle's residents and businesses. To help achieve this aim, Council requests that each Executive Branch department and office provide a preliminary report to Council, in advance of the proposed budget that identifies specific options for achieving cost savings through changes in management's span of control and administrative efficiencies. These reports should review all levels of management and explain how each option was developed. For smaller offices (as opposed to departments), where staffing is limited and staff reductions may not be possible, Council is interested in opportunities to achieve efficiencies by more directly involving management staff in providing direct services. Council requests that a written response be submitted by each department and office.

Responsible Council Committee: Finance & Budget

Date Due to Council: Reports due by Wednesday, June 30, 2010

HOUSING, HUMAN SERVICES, HEALTH AND CULTURE COMMITTEE

11) *Workplan to implement Cultural Overlay District Advisory Committee (CODAC) recommendations*

SLI 6-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: It is the intent of the Council that Executive staff from the Office of Economic Development (OED), the Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs (OACA), and the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) work together with Council staff to develop a plan for implementing the final recommendations of the Cultural Overlay District Advisory Committee (CODAC), which were delivered to the Council on April 30, 2009.

Between July 2008 and April 2009, CODAC, a volunteer advisory group established by the Council, worked to identify incentives and regulations to preserve and promote affordable spaces for arts, culture, and entertainment uses across the City. CODAC made six recommendations for further action that the Council endorsed in Resolution 31155. These recommendations included establishing designated cultural districts, developing or strengthening other incentives to encourage the creation of arts spaces, and providing technical assistance both to arts organizations and to property owners and developers who are interested in providing space for arts-oriented uses. The recommendations also included hiring a cultural overlay district manager whose responsibilities would apply within and extend beyond any cultural overlay districts that may be established.

It is the intent of the Council that an interdepartmental team comprised of Executive staff from OED, OACA, and DPD, together with Council staff, review and develop a workplan for implementing the recommendations included in CODAC's final report. The workplan should include a proposal for seeking outside funding, such as foundation and philanthropic support, that could, in future years, fulfill CODAC's recommendation regarding the creation of a cultural overlay district manager position.

The interdepartmental team should consult with the Seattle Arts Commission as it moves forward with this work by including Commission members in meetings, seeking their advice, and incorporating such advice into the workplan. Additionally, the interdepartmental team should identify a key contact person who will serve as the team's primary liaison to department staff and the Council. The workplan, which is due to the Council's Housing, Human Services, Health and Culture Committee by Monday, March 1, 2010, should, at a minimum:

- Detail the amount of City staff time required to implement CODAC's recommendations, including the designation of a cultural overlay district;
- Identify which City departments should be responsible for managing and carrying out the workplan; and
- Provide a breakdown of how the staff time required to implement CODAC's recommendations should be allocated across these departments. Recognizing the limited funding resources that are currently available to support this work, this analysis should not assume the near-term creation of any new City staff position(s). However, City departments are expected to allocate existing resources to this effort and encouraged to seek foundation and philanthropic funding to support this work in the future.

After March 1, 2010, the interdepartmental team should continue to meet on a monthly basis as it moves forward with the execution of the workplan. The interdepartmental team should also continue to report back to the Council on its progress and consult with the Seattle Arts Commission as appropriate.

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

Date Due to Council: Progress report and Committee briefing due by Monday, February 1, 2010; final workplan due Monday, March 1, 2010

12) Planning for Seattle's senior centers and the delivery of services to seniors

SLI 38-2-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests that the Human Services Department (HSD) coordinate and undertake a comprehensive planning process that will identify recommendations for:

1. The City of Seattle's policy goals for engaging older adults in healthy activities that support their independence, enhance their dignity, and encourage their involvement and contribution to the community;
2. The role of senior centers and related initiatives such as senior programming in Parks Department facilities to support these goals; and
3. Steps the City can take to implement effective services for older adults and develop and support a sustainable path for the programs and services provided by senior centers and related organizations to meet the City's stated goals for older adults.

The planning process should include an assessment of the delivery of services currently provided by senior centers and their role in supporting the City's goals for older adults.

The Council requests that HSD work with the Parks Department and any other relevant City departments and its community partners that provide senior services, such as King County, Senior Services, United Way of King County, the eight currently existing senior centers in the city, and other private and not-for-profit organizations.

Council requests that HSD report back to Council with a detailed work plan outlining the objectives, tasks, deliverables and schedule for the comprehensive planning process by Monday, March 1, 2010. Council then requests a final report to Council by Monday, August 2, 2010.

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

Date Due to Council: Work Plan due by Monday, March 1, 2010;
Final Report due by Monday, August 2, 2010

13) Contracting for Enhanced Public Health Services

SLI 39-2-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

The Human Services Department (HSD) is requested to provide the Council with a plan to modify the contracting relationship for services with Public Health – Seattle and King County (PHSKC). This proposal should achieve administrative efficiencies and budget savings within HSD while maintaining accountability for the City's enhanced public health funding. The plan should meet the following criteria:

- Result in no negative impacts to direct service delivery;
- Enable the City of Seattle to maintain an acceptable level of accountability;
- Assure a strong City presence and influence on PHSKC's activities and services in Seattle;

- Agreement is consistent with and supports the City's Healthy Communities Initiative Policy Guide and the Public Health Operational Master Plan;
- Clearly delineate all staffing and oversight responsibilities of HSD and PHSKC regarding the City's enhanced public health funding and services;
- Directly yield efficiencies such as budget and staffing savings within HSD; and
- The terms of the relationship are agreed upon by PHSKC, the City, and the County and formalized as part of a memorandum of understanding or Inter-local agreement between the City of Seattle and King County.

The Executive is requested to provide the Council with a proposal no later than Monday, August 2, 2010. Any budget impacts and changes to appropriation authority related to public health funding are expected to be proposed by the Executive as part of the 2011-2012 biennium budget.

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

Date Due to Council: Proposal due by Monday, August 2, 2010

14) Review existing City youth mentoring programs and recommend enhancements

SLI 40-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

In Resolution 31134, Council expresses support for expanding the City's youth mentoring efforts as part of its budget priorities. While the City engages in various forms of youth mentoring across departments, the extent and effect of these investments have not been well documented or examined comprehensively. This SLI is intended to produce information to: (1) determine whether existing City funded youth mentoring efforts align with Council's priorities, (2) better understand the goals and outcomes of the City's existing programs and (3) inventory major youth mentoring programs and activities in Seattle (not necessarily supported or funded by City government).

The Executive is requested to:

- Inventory all existing mentoring programs funded by the City (develop a matrix that identifies the lead department, program description, objectives and outcomes, source and level of funding). This inventory should include the following:
 - Programs that most closely fit the standard industry definition of "youth mentoring" – a caring, responsible adult who helps and supports a younger person transition into adulthood over a substantial period of time;
 - Programs that provide mentoring services, that may not perfectly fit the standard industry definition of "youth mentoring" but are providing similar youth engagement opportunities and outcomes.
- Inventory major youth mentoring programs and activities in Seattle that are not funded by the City (develop a matrix that identifies the agency, program description, objectives and outcomes and funding information, if available);
- Review best practices and what other cities are doing with regard to youth mentoring investments;
- Identify any potential gaps in service delivery based on community needs and existing City priorities; and

-
- Provide Council with recommendations regarding where future new investments in youth mentoring should be focused and how existing investments could be strengthened.

The Executive is requested to work with Council staff to refine the scope of the SLI as necessary. The work will be based on continued dialogue and discussion in the first quarter of 2010. The Executive is requested to provide Council with a final response to the SLI no later than Thursday, July 1, 2010.

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

Date Due to Council: Report due by Thursday, July 1, 2010

15) Outreach and Engagement Services to the Homeless

SLI 41-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The City invests nearly \$40 million annually in homeless services. The Council requests that the Human Services Department (HSD), with assistance from Council staff, complete an assessment of current outreach and engagement services to people who are homeless. This assessment should include whether outreach programs are meeting their goals and specific recommendations for how these services could be improved, including whether they should be expanded. HSD should share a draft of the assessment with the relevant provider agencies for feedback before submitting a final copy to the Council.

Specifically, the assessment should include the following elements:

1. A list of programs and social service agencies that provide outreach and/or engagement services to the homeless population in the City. This section of the assessment could include a map of provider locations, a short description of the services each provides, the type of outreach and engagement services the organization engages in, the goals or outcomes intended to be achieved through its outreach, its target population and the level of funding each receives from the City and/or other entities.
2. An assessment of existing coordination efforts on outreach and engagement services among human service agencies and the criminal justice system.
3. A comparison of Seattle’s outreach and engagement efforts to those in other municipalities across the country, including but not limited to San Diego and Philadelphia. Included in this section of the assessment should be a list and description of current best practices across the country.
4. Answers to these specific questions:
 - a. Are the outreach and engagement activities and service delivery to Seattle’s homeless population sufficient to address current needs? If not, what changes does HSD recommend?
 - b. What, if any, improvements can be made that do not require additional funds or would require only minimal funds?

5. A summary of current services beyond outreach provided to homeless individuals and families in Seattle based on existing data sources. This information will help launch a broader discussion on coordination of services, improvements that may be necessary and the effectiveness of these services.

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

Date Due to Council: Assessment due by Thursday, April 1, 2010

16) Shelter Services

SLI 48-2-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Concerns have been raised regarding potentially inadequate compensation levels for employees of shelters serving single adults and the extent to which such compensation levels may impact retention of workers and the quality of services provided.

The Human Services Department (HSD) conducted a survey in July of 2009 that obtained information about the wages, training, job responsibilities, retention rates, and operational budgets for direct service personnel employed in City-funded single adult shelters in Seattle. The results of this survey did not show a correlation between wage rates and retention rates, but further analysis is desired to fully understand the responses provided.

HSD is scheduled to conduct a Request For Proposal (RFP) process for shelter services in mid-2010, setting the stage for new contracts at the beginning of 2011.

In advance of this process, the Council requests HSD to report back on the results of the July 2009 survey including additional supplementary information such as: average tenure of employee by job title; # of employees in each job title included in survey; reason for employee turnover (voluntary leave, firing, promotion); the minimum qualifications required for each job; staff to client ratio; population served by shelter; and other related information that might help provide greater understanding regarding some of the differences noted in the initial July 2009 survey data. The report could include recommendations regarding changes to evaluation criteria, such as: outcomes, program or contract funding levels, etc.

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

Date Due to Council: Report due by Tuesday, March 30, 2010

PARKS AND SEATTLE CENTER COMMITTEE

17) Completing Funding for SDOT's Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas St. CIP Project or Reallocating Parks Levy Funds

SLI 61-2-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) work collaboratively with the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to provide the Council with a report by March 31, 2010 showing how SDOT can complete the Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas Street CIP Project (Project ID: TC366210), funded in part with 2000 Parks Levy Fund and 2008 Parks Levy Fund. The Council requests a report back on this by March 31, 2010, as well as a detailed explanation of funds expended to date on the project.

Responsible Council Committees: Parks and Seattle Center (secondary committee)

Date Due to Council: Report due by Wednesday, March 31, 2010

Note: The SLI above is listed twice, under the Parks and Seattle Center and Transportation Committees.

18) DPR Fee Schedule Policies

SLI 73-2-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The City Council requests the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to submit a fee policy proposal no later than March 31, 2010.

As part of its deliberations to adopt fee policies for DPR recreational programs, Council will need to understand program costs (both direct and indirect) for various activities and user groups. It will also need to understand the amount DPR currently recovers in fees to assess the impacts of various cost recovery goals on both the end-user and the City's ability to fund delivery of services.

In addition to considering how fee policies factor in to DPR's role in promoting active recreation for all ages, the Council will evaluate DPR's proposal based on the following:

- Equity and fairness
- Cost recovery
- Affordability
- Transparency

In addition, Council is open to considering differential fees for residents vs. non-residents and for user groups that have robust scholarship programs.

DPR should also present information regarding its own scholarship fund for various park-sponsored fee-based activities, including:

- Availability
- Accessibility
- Eligibility

Responsible Council Committee: Parks and Seattle Center

Date Due to Council: Proposal due by Wednesday, March 31, 2010

19) Criteria for Evaluation of Park Ranger Pilot Program

SLI 77-2-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

In 2008 the City Council approved SLI 114-1-A-3, which requested that the Executive provide a written evaluation of the Department of Parks & Recreation's (Parks') Park Rangers Pilot Program (Program) by July 1, 2010. Through this new SLI, the Council is providing supplemental guidance to the Executive in the development of this evaluation. The Council intends to use this evaluation to inform its decisions on whether to expand, keep, or eliminate the pilot Program as part of its review of the 2011-2012 Proposed Budget.

The evaluation should be quantitative and qualitative in nature and should explicitly quantify the public safety improvements attributable to or correlated with the Program's presence at City parks. When discussing public safety improvements and other program outcomes Parks should detail the assumptions used to arrive at the evaluation's conclusions.

Council requests that the Parks Department provide a report and briefing, detailing the parameters of the program evaluation, to the Council's Parks & Seattle Center Committee by Monday, February 8, 2010.

The evaluation should address the following questions about the Program:

1. How has it reduced or eliminated crime and antisocial behavior in parks?
2. How has it encouraged people to use parks legally and to respect other users' rights?
3. How has it encouraged the local community to take ownership of parks, where applicable?
4. How has it otherwise improved conditions and user experiences / perception at parks? Has it resulted in increases in the number of people who feel safe using parks?

The evaluation should also address the following questions about the effects of the Program:

- a. Is there evidence of a change in the way people are using parks, so that legitimate use is dominant?
- b. Is there evidence of increased recreational and social use of parks?
- c. Is there evidence that the local community is actively ensuring that there is less crime and disorder in parks?
- d. What is the Program's impact on quality of life infractions and public property damage, such as graffiti, vandalism, loitering, illegal camping and drug dealing?
- e. How does Parks propose measuring or documenting the changes to communities that are adjacent to parks? This might be accomplished through direct observation and interviews, focus groups and/or community surveys.

- f. What is the total number of citations for Parks Code violations issued by Park Rangers? Are there any measurable impacts to Parks Code compliance? Is there any indication about a trend or change from citations since inception of the Program?

With the exception of statistics on Parks Code citations issued, Parks should exercise restraint in using evaluation measures that rely on “widget-counting” to assess the benefits of the program. Examples of “widget-counting” evaluation measures might include:

- Number of minutes of park patrol provided.
- Number of visits / “ranger patrols” provided.
- Number of positive public interactions / “positive encounters” recorded.

Parks might, instead, develop measures such as:

- Reduction in calls for police assistance by park users.
- Reduction in incidents of harassment / violent crime / antisocial and criminal behavior at parks.
- Increase in legitimate use of parks, as measured by frequency / number of community events scheduled at parks, or other parks-use measures.

Responsible Council Committee: Parks and Seattle Center

Date Due to Council: Report and briefing on evaluation plan due by Monday, February 8, 2010; Final evaluation due by Thursday, July 1, 2010

20) Othello Park Public Safety Improvements -- Short-Term and Long-Term Improvement Plans
SLI 78-1-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent:

The City Council requests that the Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks):

- a) Conduct a public input process and begin implementing short-term public safety improvements at Othello Park no later than Wednesday, March 31, 2010, and,
- b) Provide a written report on the short-term improvements to the Council’s Parks & Seattle Center Committee, also no later than Wednesday, March 31, 2010, and,
- c) Provide a written report and briefing on long-term improvements (2010 - 2012) proposed for or possible at the Park to the Council’s Parks & Seattle Center Committee no later than Monday, August 16, 2010.

Short-term public safety improvements in Items (a) and (b) above are proposed to include landscaping improvements, vegetation management (e.g., removal or trimming of bushes, shrubs and/or trees, to improve sightlines at the Park) and lighting improvements in the Mayor’s 2010-2015 Proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Long-term public safety improvements in Item (c) above might consist of major park redevelopment or renovation or construction of additional park features (play areas, picnic areas, etc.). Improvements might also include increased programming and public events at the park, with a focus on increasing legitimate park usage and discouraging antisocial behavior and crime at the park and in surrounding communities.

The Council intends that Parks work with local community groups, including groups such as Friends of Othello Park and the Othello Park Alliance, to devise short- and long-term improvement plans that address community members' concerns about public safety and park use.

Responsible Council Committee: Parks and Seattle Center

Date Due to Council: Report on Short-term Improvements due by Wednesday, March 31, 2010; Report and Briefing on Long-Term Improvements due by August 16, 2010

PUBLIC SAFETY AND EDUCATION COMMITTEE

21) Crime Prevention Programs (Co-STARS, CURB, GOTS)

SLI 33-4-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

In approving funding through 2010 for Co-STARS (Court Specialized Treatment and Access to Recovery Services), CURB (Communities Uniting Rainier Beach), and GOTS (Get Off the Streets) and with plans to continue to fund the programs in 2011, it is the Council's intent that the City continue to strongly support alternatives to traditional arrest and incarceration and work to improve the success rates of those alternatives. This is critical because we know that similar intervention programs have achieved good results. Furthermore, the Council believes that the rate of incarceration in the United States and our communities is unacceptable and that we must continue to seek creative, effective approaches to helping offenders turn their lives around.

To these ends, the Council requests that the Executive take a series of short-term and longer-term steps to strengthen effectiveness of these programs.

Short-Term Activities

1. All three programs should develop more formal communications with the King County District and Superior courts, Seattle Municipal Court, the Washington State Department of Corrections, the King County Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (the King County jail), the King County Sheriff's Office and the Seattle Police Department. Given that clients in these programs will relapse and re-offend, it is advisable that each program consistently interact with the appropriate components of the criminal justice system to ensure coordination and minimize the use of unnecessary jail services. HSD should require the programs to establish these formal arrangements as an element of its contract requirements and stipulate that they be in effect by June 1, 2010.
2. The Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) should assist CURB and Co-STARS in developing and implementing new recordkeeping systems to ensure that required client data are consistently captured and maintained over time. The CURB and Co-STARS programs are responsible for organizing and deploying their administrative resources to achieve this end. Effective recordkeeping arrangements should be put in place by June 1, 2010.

3. Sound Mental Health, the administering agency of Co-STARS, should collaborate with Plymouth Housing to resolve current misunderstandings about the proper scope of responsibilities of each organization in delivering client support services at permanent and transitional housing facilities provided by Plymouth Housing. Clarification of responsibilities should be established by June 1, 2010.
4. While some clients in all three programs drop out and otherwise become inactive, the proportion doing so in the CURB program is high—and very much higher than in the other two programs. CURB should review and revise its intake and screening mechanisms to ensure that clients enrolled in its programs are likely to benefit from available services. In doing so, it should develop clear standards for determining who is appropriate for enrollment. The revision of the intake and screening tools should be completed by Tuesday, June 1, 2010.

By Tuesday, June 1, 2010, HSD is requested to provide information to the Council's Public Safety and Education Committee about the status of steps taken to meet these short term improvements.

Longer Term Activities

In advance of anticipated ongoing funding in 2011 and beyond, the Council requests HSD to develop performance goals and metrics that clarify the public safety and client outcomes intended by these programs.

In doing so, HSD is expected to take into account the performance goals, public safety and client outcomes and metrics applied by programs judged effective in other parts of the country, and to work in concert with academics, current providers, law enforcement, and criminal justice partners in developing ones for the Seattle programs. In addition, HSD is expected to outline an evaluative model, and its associated costs, that would allow a longitudinal analysis of client contact with the criminal justice system that would provide the means to determine program effectiveness in improving public safety. The Council commends to HSD two memos concerning these programs prepared by the Council Central Staff, both dated April 27, 2006, for background to aid in assessing options.

As part of this work, HSD should also detail:

1. The rationale for the specific performance goals, public safety and client outcomes and metrics chosen;
2. The characteristics of the population(s) and the geographic area(s) targeted by each program;
3. The data to be maintained by providers, including both service and criminal justice information;
4. The templates to be used by providers to report data and the frequency with which the reports are to be filed; and
5. The administrative structures required to adequately manage the programs, including the capabilities needed to achieve appropriate scale, sustain cross-agency partnerships, deliver services, and evaluate performance. HSD should determine the merit of maintaining the current three stand-alone programs and identify the advantages and disadvantages of combining programs and/or consolidating administrative functions.

By Tuesday, June 1, 2010, HSD is requested to review with the Council's Public Safety and Education Committee a draft of the performance goals, public safety and client outcomes and metrics it expects to adopt and the rationale for their selection. All of the remaining work associated with the longer term activities should be completed by July 31, 2010.

The Council intends to fund the revamped services during the 2011-2012 biennium and will consider funding a more rigorous evaluation component based on HSD's proposed model during budget deliberations in Fall 2010. The Council intends that HSD use the new guidelines developed in response to this Statement of Legislative Intent in the new contracts to be signed for services delivered in 2011 and beyond.

Responsible Council Committee: Public Safety and Education

Date Due to Council:

Tuesday, June 1, 2010

(Complete Short Term Activities)

Tuesday, June 1, 2010 (Report to PSE on Short Term Activities)

Tuesday, June 1, 2010 (Report to PSE on Evaluation Planning)

Friday, July 30, 2010

(Complete Longer Term Activities)

22) Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Children

SLI 42-2-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

In approving funding for the pilot residential recovery program for prostituted children, it is the Council's intent that the Human Services Department (HSD) will apply a rigorous evaluation component in order to establish a program that will be a national model over the longer term. Another goal is for the program to evolve into a network of providers serving prostituted children statewide while allowing them to be close to family members, as appropriate. Finally, the Council intends that the selected provider will work closely with an advisory committee of program experts to be established by HSD and convened throughout the pilot period. The purpose of the advisory committee is to (1) offer advice and support, (2) address problems and remove barriers as they arise and, (3) to the extent possible, review outcome information and suggest program revisions as needed.

Expectations for performance should take into account the extremely challenging circumstances of prostituted children. Research indicates that most were victimized before ever engaging in prostitution. Because they have been psychologically manipulated, physically coerced and deeply indoctrinated by their exploiters, they tend to run back to the streets if they have the opportunity. And, because they have often experienced violence and high levels of trauma on a repeated basis, they can be difficult to engage. Most have missed normal developmental experiences and lack basic life skills; they often have decreased coping skills, poor self-concepts and developmental delays; and

some may be bipolar or suffer from other mental illnesses. As a consequence, relapse and program exits will occur.

The Council intends for HSD to contract with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, as well as other evaluators, to assess the effectiveness of the program. In addition to basic service numbers, other outcomes that may be measured include:

- Do participants in the residential recovery program have lower involvement (recidivism) with the criminal justice system as a result of their involvement in the program vs. those who are not in the program but have similar backgrounds?
- Are children in the program more likely to participate in the prosecution of their pimp/exploiter(s) than those not in the program but with similar backgrounds?
- Are participants able to set and achieve personal goals?
- Is there a decrease in mental health and substance abuse symptoms for children served vs. those not served but with similar backgrounds?
- What are the key program components that help participants achieve their goals, decrease recidivism and address mental health and drug use symptoms?
- What are key characteristics of children coming into the program that help them achieve their goals, decrease recidivism, and address mental health and drug use symptoms?

The Council requests that HSD provide the Public Safety and Education Committee an initial report of program service delivery and performance by Thursday, September 30, 2010. A more detailed report, including the findings of contracted evaluators, should be provided to the Public Safety and Education Committee within 15 months of initiating services but no later than June 30, 2011.

Responsible Council Committee: Public Safety and Education

Date Due to Council:

Initial report to Public Safety and Education Committee by Thursday, September 30, 2010

Detailed report, including contracted evaluation findings to Public Safety and Education Committee within 15 months of initiating services but no later than Thursday, June 30, 2011

23) DON: Evaluation of Youth Violence Prevention Initiative

SLI 102-1-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent:

In approving the budget for the Youth Violence Prevention Initiative in the Department of Neighborhoods, it is the Council's intent that the City periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the basis for continuing the initiative in its current form or revising it to better achieve this goal.

Each element of the initiative should be evaluated. One way to evaluate an element is to determine whether the element replicates a model that has been tested and shown to be effective elsewhere. Replication includes applying the model to the same kind of situation and people. It also includes

determining whether the local implementation achieves the initial results shown by the model to be predictors of effectiveness. Another way to evaluate an element is to collect local evidence on effectiveness. This must include some basis for determining what the results would have been without the element; that is, some form of control or comparison group. With either replication or local evidence, effectiveness means effectiveness in reducing violent crimes by juveniles.

To this end, the Council requests the Executive to provide an evaluation plan in the first quarter of 2010. The plan should do the following:

- (a) Explain whether each element will replicate a model shown to be effective elsewhere, or will be evaluated by local evidence of effectiveness, or both.
- (b) If the approach includes replication, explain the model and how it will be applied. Explain how fidelity to the model will be achieved and tested. Based on the magnitude of the effects shown by the model, explain the likely effects that successful replication would achieve in Seattle.
- (c) If the approach includes collecting local evidence on effectiveness, explain what data will be collected, how they will be collected, and how they will be analyzed.
- (d) Propose a schedule for evaluation. Explain the relationship of the schedule to the timing of future decisions on continuing or revising the elements of the initiative.
- (e) Explain the organizational requirements for evaluation. Explain who will do what. Explain the costs.

Responsible Council Committee: Public Safety and Education

Date Due to Council: Evaluation Plan due by Wednesday, March 31, 2010

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

24) OED - Restructuring of contracting practices related to the provision of business attraction and retention services by non-City entities

SLI 5-1-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent: It is the intent of the Council that the Office of Economic Development (OED) develop and execute a formal strategy for awarding contracts that support the provision of business attraction and retention services by non-City entities.

In recent years, OED has annually allocated more than \$500,000 in General Subfund support to outside organizations that are engaged in business attraction and retention efforts in the greater Seattle area. This funding has been provided to the same non-City entities for many years without any significant contractual modifications and without offering other organizations an opportunity to apply for such funding through a formal Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Other City Departments go through regular RFP processes in order to provide outside organizations with an

opportunity to access City funds. OED currently provides funding for business attraction and retention services to enterpriseSeattle, the Manufacturing and Industrial Council, Seattle First, the Downtown Seattle Association, the Environmental Coalition of South Seattle, and the Seattle/King County Convention and Visitors Bureau.

To make OED's contracting practices more consistent with those of other City departments, OED is requested to complete the following tasks by Friday, April 30, 2010:

- Develop a strategy for awarding contracts related to business attraction and retention efforts to non-City entities;
- Write an RFP that executes that strategy, includes specific measurable outcomes to be accomplished by organizations receiving City funds, and requires those organizations to coordinate their work with OED staff; and
- Issue the RFP and provide a variety of organizations with an opportunity to apply for City funding.

It is the intent of the Council that the contracting strategy and RFP process described above will be used to restructure and reallocate OED's contracts related to business attraction and retention services in 2010 and beyond. Each contract should include clear, quantifiable outcomes and support a body of work that is consistent with OED's two key functions: delivering direct services to businesses and advancing the City's economic development interests.

The 2010 contracting strategy and RFP process will directly impact OED's existing contracts with enterpriseSeattle, the Manufacturing and Industrial Council, Seattle First, the Downtown Seattle Association, and the Environmental Coalition of South Seattle. OED's contract with the Seattle/King County Convention and Visitors Bureau would not be affected by an RFP process in 2010. Rather, OED would conduct a separate RFP process in 2011 with a specific focus on tourism contracts.

Because OED will not be able to execute new contracts related to business attraction and retention services until late April 2010, OED is directed to allocate enterpriseSeattle, the Manufacturing and Industrial Council, Seattle First, the Downtown Seattle Association, and the Environmental Coalition of South Seattle 33 percent of the amount they would have received from the City in 2010 absent an RFP process (\$101,425). This allocation would provide the organizations with interim funding during the first four months of 2010, after which new, 20-month contracts (May 2010-December 2011) that are awarded per the RFP process will be executed. The interim support is intended to help ensure the short-term stability of the affected organizations, which only recently learned that their annual funding allocations from the City will no longer be guaranteed.

OED staff are also requested to report back to the Council's Regional Development and Sustainability Committee on the content of the contracting strategy and the RFP scope of work by Tuesday, January 19, 2010. A report on the results of the RFP process is expected by Friday, April 30, 2010. OED staff will also provide the Housing and Economic Development Committee with a status report on the newly executed contracts by Tuesday, August 31, 2010.

Responsible Council Committee: Regional Development and Sustainability

Date Due to Council: Proposed contracting strategy and scope of work due Tuesday, January 19, 2010; report on results of RFP process due Friday, April 30, 2010; status report on new contracts due Tuesday, August 31, 2010.

25) OSE climate adaptation work plan

SLI 31-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that by Wednesday, June 30, 2010 the Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) submit a 2010-2011 work plan for identifying climate adaptation actions and priorities for the City. OSE should:

1. Assemble an interdepartmental team to help develop and implement the work plan with representation from the Seattle Department of Transportation, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU), Seattle City Light, the Department of Fleets and Facilities, the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Human Services Department, Council staff, and other departments as needed.
2. Consider for inclusion in the work plan the tasks identified in the June 2008 “Mitigating and Adopting to Climate Change: Recommendations to the Seattle City Council Final Report” by the Cascadia Consulting Group, as well as the following tasks:
 - A. Assemble a list of adaptation actions already underway in City departments.
 - B. Identify assessment tools or techniques for departments to use to identify their activities that might need additional actions to adapt to climate change.
 - C. Use identified assessment tools or techniques to review department activities to identify potential adaptation needs. Coordinate this work with the OSE/SPU climate change pilot project to be conducted in 2010 in response to 2009 SLI 111-1-A-1.
 - D. Establish a system for prioritizing the adaptation needs of various departments. When setting priorities, consider whether potential impacts to people, property and the environment are immediate and severe, or moderate and longer term.
 - E. Propose climate adaptation goals for the City.
 - F. For priority department adaptation needs, identify cost-effective adaptation actions that could be undertaken in the short-, medium- and long-term. Identify any cross-department priorities among those actions.
3. Propose a schedule for accomplishing work plan tasks.

Responsible Council Committee: Regional Development and Sustainability

Date Due to Council: Work Plan due by Wednesday, June 30, 2010

26) Library Funding Options

SLI 95-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that the City Librarian work with the Library Board, the Executive, the City Attorney's office and Council staff in 2010 to explore potential new sources of ongoing revenue for the Seattle Public Library (SPL). This work should include the preparation of a written report for the Council's review. The written report should include, but not be limited to: (1) information on revenue sources used to fund libraries in other jurisdictions, (2) the pros and cons of any potential new revenue sources, (3) the amount and stability of those revenue sources, and (4) any changes in state or municipal law that would be required.

Council requests that the written report be submitted by no later than June 30, 2010 to the Council's Regional Development and Sustainability Committee.

Responsible Council Committee: Regional Development and Sustainability

Date Due to Council: Report due no later than Wednesday, June 30, 2010

27) Food System Interdepartmental Team

SLI 113-1-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that by March 30, 2010 the Department of Neighborhoods in collaboration with the Mayor's Office, Department of Planning and Development, Parks Department, Department of Human Services, Department of Transportation, Office of Economic Development, Office of Sustainability, Seattle King County Public Health Department, the Legislative Department and other appropriate departments establish a Food System Interdepartmental Team. The purpose of the Food System Interdepartmental Team (IDT) will be to establish a strong interdepartmental focus among City departments on programs and policies affecting food system sustainability and security, identify ways to meet goals established in Resolution 31019, and to review and discuss implementation of a Seattle Food System Policy Plan. DON is requested to provide a briefing on the formation and structure of the IDT in Committee by March 30, 2010.

Responsible Council Committee: Regional Development and Sustainability

Date Due to Council: Briefing due by Tuesday, March 30, 2010

28) Interdepartmental Agreements on Using City Land for Urban Agriculture

SLI 113-2-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

The Council requests that by Monday, August 2, 2010 the Department of Neighborhoods (DON), in collaboration with other departments, establish clear guidelines and procedures for developing interdepartmental agreements for using City land for urban agriculture and report back to Council on the guidelines and procedures. DON is also requested to identify ways to communicate this information to the public when requested.

Responsible Council Committee: Regional Development and Sustainability

Date Due to Council: Briefing due by Monday, August 2, 2010

29) *Economic Development for the Local Food Sector*

SLI 113-4-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that by August 16, 2010 the Office of Economic Development (OED) provide a report that identifies potential actions that could be taken to support the Food and Beverage sector as a key part of Seattle's economy. This should include identifying strategies and policies to recruit, incubate, and support locally owned food businesses that sell healthy and locally grown food and locally produced food items, and to identify opportunities for expanding the Healthy Corner Store Initiative model currently being piloted in the Delridge neighborhood.

At the same time, OED is also requested to identify and address any remaining issues related to establishing permanent locations for farmers' markets, including working with the Department of Planning and Development and the Department of Transportation on any regulatory or policy issues related to establishing small individual produce stands or small farmers' markets.

Responsible Council Committee: Regional Development and Sustainability

Date Due to Council: Report due by Monday, August 16, 2010

30) *Coordinated Community Development Strategy*

SLI 120-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

The City Council recognizes that the City can and must play a critical role in community development and neighborhood revitalization. In some areas, the City's role is to take the lead on economic development and promote the investments needed to spur development, provide opportunity and restore vitality. In other areas, the City's role is to help manage the growth that is already happening and to implement the policies and programs needed to accommodate realized and projected growth. Both situations require engagement with the affected neighborhoods in planning for change and implementing the policies and projects needed to achieve their identified goals.

The City's work in this area requires a high degree of coordination across many different City departments, including the Department of Planning and Development, the Department of Neighborhoods, the Office of Economic Development, the Office of Housing, the Seattle Department of Transportation and the City's utilities. The Council believes that the new Mayor has a great opportunity to enhance this coordination and provide greater focus and clarity to the City's work in community development and neighborhood revitalization. The Council looks forward to working with the new Mayor on setting clearer priorities for the City's community development efforts.

Southeast Seattle has been and remains a clear priority for Council, but the Council believes that the City's ongoing work in this area needs greater focus and clearer sense of purpose. Council has also worked hard in recent years to advance planning work in the Roosevelt and Greenwood neighborhoods and hopes to partner with the Executive to move this work forward. Concurrently, planning and mobilization have also taken shape through "action agendas" in South Park and Southeast Seattle, as well as on Aurora and Broadway. Urban center plans have been spearheaded by the City in order to capitalize and revitalize South Lake Union and South Downtown. *Needs exist across the City and identifying what staffing resources are required and how they should be allocated are among the issues that Council hopes to work with the new Mayor to address.*

The Council recognizes that there are many different organization models that could be used to manage this work and provide the leadership that is required. For example, if appropriately staffed, one of the City's existing departments could take on the role. Alternatively, a more centralized office could be formed to manage and coordinate the work of the relevant departments. Recognizing that the Mayor must play a critical role in such organizational decisions, the Council requests that by April 30, 2010, the Executive provide a proposal for a coordinated community development function that carries out the goals described above. The Executive should explain how the proposed organizational structure will engage community partners, provide neighborhood business district support, support developing, updating, and implementing neighborhood plans for urban centers and villages, leverage regulatory tools, and take advantage of available financing mechanisms and other economic development strategies.

Responsible Council Committee: Regional Development and Sustainability

Date Due to Council: Proposal due by Friday, April 30, 2010

SEATTLE PUBLIC UTILITIES AND NEIGHBORHOODS COMMITTEE

31) SPU indicators of zero-waste progress

SLI 16-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that by April 30, 2010 Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) submit an evaluation of methods for measuring progress toward implementing the City's zero-waste strategy that recommends indicators that document progress toward City zero-waste goals. The document should include:

- A description of performance measures currently being used to measure the City's zero-waste progress, current methods of collecting and evaluating data to track performance, and the advantages and disadvantages of current approaches.
- A description of other influences on the City's waste stream that complicate the task of distinguishing the effects of City zero-waste actions from the effects of the recession and other factors. Include a discussion of whether each factor has a potential for small or large impacts on the City's waste stream and possible methods for better distinguishing the impacts of each factor.

- Recommendations for how implementation progress might be better tracked through improvements in the types of data collected, the actions or materials being measured, and the models used to evaluate data.
- Recommendations for indicators of progress and performance.

Responsible Council Committee: Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods

Date Due to Council: Evaluation due by Friday, April 30, 2010

32) Request that DON develop a work plan to address the recommendations in the Neighborhood District Council Audit developed by the City Auditor
 SLI 104-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) develop a work plan to address the findings and recommendations from the June 2009 audit, “Seattle District Council System Needs Renewal.”

In June 2009 the City Auditor released findings from an audit of district council performance, a study requested by the City Council. The Auditor concluded that directives from the City regarding district council responsibilities are unclear; that city involvement in district councils has been uneven and even leads to conflict; and that the City fails to perform some prescribed tasks when it comes to supporting civic engagement through the district councils. The Auditor made 10 recommendations.

The Council recognizes DON has developed preliminary responses to some of the City Auditor’s recommendations. Council requests a work plan addressing all ten recommendations made by the Auditor be provided to members of the Planning, Land Use & Neighborhoods (or successor) Committee by June 1, 2010.

Council is particularly interested in the estimated timeline and schedule for completing the tasks outlined in the proposed work plan, the type and scale of collaboration with district councils and the City Neighborhood Council, and plans for involving people not involved in the district council system.

Responsible Council Committee: Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods

Date Due to Council: Work Plan due by Tuesday, June 1, 2010

33) 2010 Neighborhood Planning Update Process
 SLI 110-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The City Council will be authorizing approximately \$1.4 million in General Subfund (GSF) appropriations for neighborhood planning activities in 2010. In doing so, the Council expects the Executive will undertake the following general activities:

1. Continue working on three neighborhood plan updates currently underway in Southeast Seattle, including work needed to consider related Comprehensive Plan amendments, complete “Approval and Adoption” matrixes (or a similar tool) for each, develop implementing text amendments and rezones, and review proposed actions pursuant to the State Environmental
2. Commence activities to update two additional neighborhood plans that contain transit stations (not necessarily light rail).

2010 Neighborhood Plan Update Process

No later than December 18, 2009, the City Council, by a letter from the Planning Land Use and Neighborhoods Committee, intends to confirm with DPD the two neighborhood plan updates the Executive will initiate in 2010. The purpose of Neighborhood Plan updates is to identify on-going issues in the original neighborhood plan and any new and emerging issues that have since arisen, reinvigorate stewardship efforts, and reaffirm the partnership between neighborhoods and the City.

Council anticipates that it will use feedback from the Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee (NPAC) as part of the discussions it will have with the Executive regarding future neighborhood plan updates. To that end, Council anticipates NPAC will complete any outstanding tasks established by Resolution 31085 and Ordinance 122799 by December 31, 2009 and provide a written report of its findings and recommendations to Council.

Council also intends to provide on-going policy direction to the Executive during the 2010 update process. “Mid-course corrections” may be called for based on Council’s review of the 2009 Southeast Seattle neighborhood plan updates and city-wide status reports. This review is expected to occur in the first quarter of 2010. In the meantime, the Council requests the Executive submit, no later than January 15, 2010, a written proposal for Council review that addresses the following:

- How will the Executive provide for a more broad-based approach to updating neighborhood plans than assumed in the initial proposal that emphasized station areas?
- How will the 2010 update process involve neighborhoods in defining the scope of the update process, building community participation and responsibility, and determining which issues and geographic areas within the neighborhood plan boundaries will be a priority focus for the plan updates?
- What is the Executive’s proposed timeline for completing new neighborhood plan updates, assuming a more broadly-scoped agenda? (Note: the City Council does not expect future neighborhood plan updates to be completed within a one-year timeframe).
- How does the Executive intend to conduct outreach and provide for on-going community partnership in the update process, including, but not limited to, developing neighborhood-specific advisory groups to help guide the update process?

The Council requests the Executive brief the appropriate Council committee about the proposal described above.

For post-2010 neighborhood plan updates, Council anticipates working with the Executive to determine criteria for prioritizing future neighborhood plan updates and identifying how the City can support on-going plan stewardship and implementation.

Responsible Council Committee: Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods

Date Due to Council: Proposal due by Friday, January 15, 2010

34) Incorporating Local Food Planning into Neighborhood Planning

SLI 113-5-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: The Council requests that within 60 days after receiving the final copy of the Seattle Food System Policy Plan from the consultants, the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) in coordination with the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) develop planning tools to help neighborhoods incorporate planning for local and healthy food into the neighborhood planning process. These tools should implement recommendations from the Seattle Food System Policy Plan, appropriately applicable work from the American Planning Association on local food planning, work currently underway at Seattle King County Public Health Department on neighborhood based health initiatives, as well as any additional applicable recommendations and resources. Local food planning in neighborhood planning efforts may include community gardening, neighborhood food security, opportunities for increasing access to healthy food, neighborhood farmers' markets, community kitchens, and other strategies that help to promote neighborhood approaches to local food sustainability and public health.

DON and DPD are requested to report back to the committee with specific approaches and tools.

Responsible Council Committee: Seattle Public Utilities and Neighborhoods

Date Due to Council: Within 60 days after receiving the final copy of the Seattle Food System Policy Plan

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

35) Speed Infraction Revenues for Pedestrian Master Plan

SLI 54-1-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests that the Mayor evaluate and make specific recommendations to change policy with respect to use of General Subfund revenues collected from the mobile speed van program. Specifically, Council wants to explore the possibility of dedicating infraction revenues (net of costs to implement the speed van program and net of costs related to Municipal Court's processing of the infractions) for pedestrian safety purposes consistent with the Seattle Pedestrian Master Plan.

In 2008, Council passed Ordinance 122725 amending Seattle Municipal Code Section 11.31.090 and Seattle Municipal Code Subsection 11.31.120 C to provide that Seattle Municipal Code Section 11.52.100 may be enforced through the use of evidence detected by an automated traffic safety camera and providing penalties for such violations. Ordinance 122725 contemplated that mobile speed vans would be used only in school zones. Council is considering a green sheet (53-1-A) that would expand the use of mobile speed vans to other areas beyond school zones.

In 2009, Council adopted Resolution 31157 approving the Seattle Pedestrian Master Plan. The City has been allocating a minimum of \$10 million per year to address pedestrian safety issues and intends to continue to do so in 2010, with the City striving both to increase this to a minimum of \$15 million per year and to identify a dedicated funding source for implementation of the Seattle Pedestrian Master Plan.

Responsible Council Committee: Transportation

Date Due to Council: Evaluation and recommendations due by Monday, March 1, 2010

36) Clarifying Council intent and providing direction to SDOT with regard to the Linden Avenue North Complete Streets CIP project
SLI 60-2-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent:

As part of the 2010 budget process, Council requests that the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) proceed with full corridor design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the Linden Avenue Complete Streets CIP project. The Council requests that SDOT not phase the implementation of the Linden project as earlier proposed by the Executive. Rather, Council requests SDOT to continue advancing full corridor design from 128th to 145th along Linden Avenue North with the goal of completing project construction by the end of 2012.

The Executive has provided Council with estimated total costs and annual appropriation authority to maintain an accelerated project schedule. Green Sheet 60-1-A amends the 2010-2015 CIP to reflect revenues and expenditures necessary in order to fund and implement the full corridor project as outlined in the chart below. Council hereby endorses the following proposed project schedule and cost estimates provided by SDOT for the Linden project:

	Phase	Schedule	SDOT Cost*
1	Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete design 2Q 2011 	\$1,700,000
2	Acquisition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acquire construction easements by 2Q 2011 	\$85,000
3	Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ad 3Q 2011 Complete construction 4Q 2012 	\$10,166,000
			\$11,951,000

*Does not reflect project costs prior to 2010

With Green Sheet 60-1-A, Council has added \$1,664,000 in the 2010-2015 CIP in Commercial Parking Tax revenues to support the project. This brings the total identified funding available in 2010 and 2011 to implement full corridor improvements to \$5,838,000. In 2012, there remains a \$6,113,000 funding gap listed in the CIP as “TBD.” It is Council’s expectation that in the 2011-2012 Biennium Budget, the Mayor will identify specific revenue sources to fully fund the Linden project and close this remaining funding gap.

Council recognizes that there is an additional estimated \$600,000 in costs associated with Seattle City Light (SCL) and utility relocation. Council requests that the Mayor also propose funding in the 2011-2012 Biennium Budget to fund SCL's costs associated with this project.

The Executive is requested to provide a progress report on the Linden project to the Council no later than Wednesday, September 1, 2010. This progress report should include an update on design, environmental review and cost estimates related to the project.

Responsible Council Committee: Transportation

Date Due to Council: Progress report due by Wednesday, September 1, 2010

17) Completing Funding for SDOT's Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas St. CIP Project or Reallocating Parks Levy Funds
SLI 61-2-A-2

Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) work collaboratively with the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to provide the Council with a report by March 31, 2010 showing how SDOT can complete the Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas Street CIP Project (Project ID: TC366210), funded in part with 2000 Parks Levy Fund and 2008 Parks Levy Fund. The Council requests a report back on this by March 31, 2010, as well as a detailed explanation of funds expended to date on the project.

Responsible Council Committees: Transportation (lead committee)

Date Due to Council: Report due by Wednesday, March 31, 2010

Note: The SLI above is listed twice, under the Parks and Seattle Center and Transportation Committees.

37) South Lake Union Streetcar Interfund Loan Extension
SLI 64-2-A-1

Statement of Legislative Intent: C.B. 116694 extends the term of an interfund loan for the South Lake Union (SLU) streetcar's outstanding capital costs from December 31, 2009 to December 31, 2012.

The City Council requests the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) to prepare a proposal outlining viable options to repay the interfund loan prior to the authorized extension date of December 31, 2012 (December 31, 2010 would be ideal). In addition to various loan repayment options, the proposal should address the following issues related to the disposition of the SLU streetcar's surplus maintenance base property: current value, various options for the use of the property, and the likelihood the property will be needed for staging purposes for the Mercer Project or expanding the streetcar network.

Responsible Council Committee: Transportation

Date Due to Council: Proposal due by Wednesday, June 30, 2010