## **Department of Planning and Development**

Diane Sugimura, Director

## **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-8600 City of Seattle General Information: (206) 684-2489 TTY: (206) 615-0476 On the Web at: http://www.cityofseattle.net/dpd/

## **Department Description**

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

- Seattle Land Use Code;
- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA);
- Seattle Shoreline Master Plan;
- Environmental Critical Areas Ordinance (ECA);
- Seattle Building Code;
- Seattle Mechanical Code;
- Seattle Energy Code;
- Stormwater, Grading, and Drainage Control Ordinance;
- Housing and Building Maintenance Code; and,
- Seattle Noise Ordinance

DPD reviews land use and construction related permits, annually approving over 23,000 permits and performing approximately 80,000 on-site inspections. The work includes public notice and involvement for Master Use Permits (MUPs); shoreline review; design review; approval of permits for construction, mechanical systems, site development, elevators, electrical installation, boilers, furnaces, refrigeration, signs and billboards; annual inspections of boilers and elevators; home seismic retrofits; and home improvement workshops in the community.

DPD enforces compliance with community standards for housing, zoning, shorelines, tenant relocation assistance, just cause eviction, vacant buildings, noise, and development-related violation complaints, responding to over 4,600 complaints annually.

In June 2002, a number of long-range physical planning functions were added to the Department's mission. These planning functions include monitoring and updating the City's Comprehensive Plan, evaluating regional growth management policy, developing sub-area and functional plans, implementing the Comprehensive and Neighborhood Plans, fostering urban design excellence in Seattle's public realm, and staffing the Planning and Design Commissions.

DPD services are paid for from a variety of fees and from General Fund resources. The Department must be able to demonstrate that its fees are set to recover no more than the cost of related services. To provide this accountability, DPD uses cost accounting to measure the full cost of its programs. Although not displayed, each program is allocated a share of departmental administration and other overhead costs in order to report the full cost and calculate the revenue requirements of the program.

## **Policy and Program Changes**

The 2004 Adopted Budget continues the development and implementation of a permitting and document management technology system in response to the recommendations of the Economic Opportunity Task Force and to meet the goals of the Mayor's Executive Order 01-03, which requires the Department to meet specific deadlines in reviewing building permits and issuing Land Use decisions. DPD is also instructed to eliminate multiple permits and approvals wherever possible.

DPD is the City's lead for conducting the state-mandated 10-year review and update of the Comprehensive Plan, which must be completed by the end of 2004. The goal for updating the Comprehensive Plan is to ensure that the Plan fully embodies the City's strategy for managing growth over the next 20 years.

The Department also converts seven long-term temporary positions to regular positions. The conversions comply with the City's temporary employee usage policy, provide stable service, and in some cases produce direct savings.

## **City Council Budget Changes and Provisos**

The Council has placed certain restrictions on opinion-gathering activities and has limited the use of appropriated funds for polls and surveys to \$2,500 unless authorized by ordinance. See Appendix C for full proviso text.

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Annual Certification & Inspection Budget Control Level	U2450U	2,065,012	2,397,029	2,468,823	2,469,925
Code Compliance Budget Control Level	U2400U	2,755,050	3,256,136	3,281,391	3,197,542
Construction Inspections Budget Co	ontrol Level				
Building Inspections Program		3,184,029	3,694,694	3,805,367	4,404,840
Electrical Inspections		1,946,692	2,628,352	2,695,961	2,747,265
Signs and Billboards		131,007	208,456	213,877	216,091
Site Review and Inspection		1,213,625	1,997,311	2,059,493	2,163,418
<b>Construction Inspections</b>	U2350U	6,475,353	8,528,813	8,774,698	9,531,614
<b>Budget Control Level</b>					
<b>Construction Permit Services Budg</b>	et Control I	Level			
Applicant Services Center		4,517,385	4,097,163	4,318,930	4,354,943
Construction Plans Administration	1	5,407,642	5,625,446	5,777,333	5,604,081
Operations Division Overhead		829,528	1,004,023	1,052,732	1,068,000
Public Resource Center		1,162,775	1,864,155	1,931,436	1,791,458
Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level	U2300U	11,917,330	12,590,787	13,080,431	12,818,482
Contingent Budget Authority Budget Control Level	U2600U	0	0	0	0
Department Strategy Budget Contr	ol Level				
Community Relations		329,640	392,948	409,409	408,380
Director's Office		725,614	872,332	896,810	897,808
Finance and Accounting Services		1,673,293	1,664,131	1,711,288	1,766,339
Human Resources		871,970	936,650	962,278	951,662
Information Technology Services		3,498,074	2,680,108	2,736,055	2,776,493
Department Strategy Budget Control Level	U2500U	7,098,591	6,546,169	6,715,840	6,800,682
Judgment and Claims Budget Control Level	U3000	0	1,399,970	1,399,970	1,399,970
Land Use Services Budget Control Level	U2200U	3,234,646	4,729,716	4,890,932	5,070,935

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Planning Budget Control Level					
Comprehensive and Regional Pla	nning	299,314	480,717	487,201	633,333
Land Use Policy and Code Devel	lopment	933,537	1,227,731	1,302,981	1,208,524
Planning Commission		0	176,934	188,923	187,049
Planning Division Overhead		105,714	166,786	171,414	170,907
Urban Design		618,559	681,197	703,191	1,306,007
Planning Budget Control Level	U2900U	1,957,124	2,733,365	2,853,710	3,505,820
Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level	U2800U	4,699,856	3,111,112	3,236,893	5,177,262
Department Total		40,202,962	45,293,097	46,702,688	49,972,232
<b>Department Full-time Equivalent</b> *FTE totals provided for information only (2002		<b>344.50</b> numbers). Authorized	<b>348.75</b> d positions are listed in	<b>350.75</b> Appendix A.	370.25

Resources				
General Subfund	6,764,502	9,525,186	9,781,970	9,754,482
Other Funds	33,438,460	35,767,911	36,920,718	40,217,750
Total	40,202,962	45,293,097	46,702,688	49,972,232

#### Selected Midyear Performance Measures

Committed to reviewing applications in a timely manner, providing consistent, predictable permitting services; timely, accurate public notice; and convenient public access to permit related information

Percent of simple building permits with initial review completed within 48 hours.

2002 Year End Actuals: 71%

2003 Midyear Actuals: 65%

2003 Year End Projection: Goal of reviewing 100% of simple building permits within 48 hours. Percent of Master Use Permit (MUP) applications reviewed within 120 days.

2002 Year End Actuals: 72%

2003 Midyear Actuals: 82%

2003 Year End Projection: Goal of reviewing 100% of MUPs within 120 days.

Percent of complex building permits with initial review completed within 6 weeks.

2002 Year End Actuals: 42%

2003 Midyear Actuals: 54%

2003 Year End Projection: Goal of completing initial review of 100% of complex building permits within six weeks.

## Committed to gaining property owner and tenant compliance with community standards for housing, zoning, shorelines, noise, tenant relocation, and just cause eviction

Percentage of cases resolved within designated timeframes

2002 Year End Actuals: 58% within 60 days; 68% within 90 days; 74% within 120 days
2003 Midyear Actuals: 54% within 60 days; 64% within 90 days; 72% within 120 days
2003 Year End Projection: 58% within 60 days; 70% within 90 days; 78% within 120 days
Number of service requests, inquiries, and complaint cases received
2002 Year End Actuals: 4,645 new cases

2003 Midyear Actuals: 2,250 new cases

2003 Year End Projection: 4,800 new cases

## **Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Add internally allocated expenses in the amount of \$6,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$5,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1,000.

29 2,468,823 2,469,925
.47 22.47 22.47

\*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## Code Compliance Budget Control Level

### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Eliminate \$40,000 for staff training, consultant services, and office supplies. Reduce from 1.0 to 0.5 FTE Housing and Zoning Inspector for a savings of \$24,000. Reducing the inspector position may delay initial response time to complaints and will also result in increased caseloads for remaining inspectors.

Reallocate \$4,000 in regular staff costs from this program to Construction Plans Administration to support designated staff participation in emergency response training.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$16,000, for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$84,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Code Compliance	2,755,050	3,256,136	3,281,391	3,197,542
Full-time Equivalents Total*	34.96	33.96	33.96	33.46
*ETE totals provided for information only (2002 ETE w	float adopted numbers) Author	izad positions and list	ad in Annandir 1	

## **Construction Inspections Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Construction Inspections Budget Control Level is to provide timely on-site inspections of property under development to help ensure substantial compliance with applicable City codes, ordinances, and approved plans.

Program Expenditures	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Building Inspections Program	3,184,029	3,694,694	3,805,367	4,404,840
Electrical Inspections	1,946,692	2,628,352	2,695,961	2,747,265
Signs and Billboards	131,007	208,456	213,877	216,091
Site Review and Inspection	1,213,625	1,997,311	2,059,493	2,163,418
TOTAL	6,475,353	8,528,813	8,774,698	9,531,614
Full-time Equivalents Total*	65.88	67.06	67.06	67.06

\*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## **Construction Inspections: Building Inspections Program**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$70,000 to offset salary calculation error resulting from dated salary schedule information and new departmental budgeting system. Add \$400,000 to the shared overhead from Construction Permit Services to correct a data entry error in this program. Reallocate \$11,000 in regular staff costs from this program to Construction Plans Administration for designated staff participation in emergency response training.

Add \$149,000 to this program for continued project management and construction assistance services for Sound Transit. These expenses will be reimbursed by Sound Transit. Reduce program budget by \$2,000 to offset staffing costs for a permanent Administrative Specialist I in the Land Use review program. Shift out internally allocated expenses of approximately \$1,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$7,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$599,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Building Inspections Program	3,184,029	3,694,694	3,805,367	4,404,840
Full-time Equivalents Total*	30.18	28.27	28.27	28.27

## **Construction Inspections: Electrical Inspections**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$42,000 to offset salary calculation error resulting from dated salary schedule information and new departmental budgeting system. Reallocate \$2,000 in regular staff costs from this program to Construction Plans Administration for emergency response training.

Add \$19,000 to this program for continued project management and construction assistance services for Sound Transit. These expenses are reimbursed by Sound Transit. Reduce allocated expenses of approximately \$3,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$4,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$51,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Electrical Inspections	1,946,692	2,628,352	2,695,961	2,747,265
Full-time Equivalents Total*	20.94	18.59	18.59	18.59
*ETE totals provided for information only (2002 ETE refle	ect adopted numbers) Author	ized positions are list	ed in Annandix A	

 $^{*}$ FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## **Construction Inspections: Signs and Billboards**

### **Purpose Statement**

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

### **Program Summary**

Add \$3,000 to offset salary calculation error resulting from dated salary schedule information and new departmental budgeting system.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by less than \$1,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$2,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Signs and Billboards	131,007	208,456	213,877	216,091
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.71	1.29	1.29	1.29
*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE refl	lect adopted numbers). Author	ized positions are list	ed in Appendix A.	

### **Construction Inspections: Site Review and Inspection**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Site Review and Inspection program is to ensure that construction projects comply with Grading, Drainage, Side Sewer, and Environmentally Critical Area codes; City of Seattle engineering standard details; and Best Management Practices for Erosion Control methods to ensure that ground related impacts of development are mitigated on the site and that sewer and drainage installations on private property are properly installed.

#### **Program Summary**

Add funding in the amount of \$52,000 for the administrative costs of implementing House Bill #2088, which requires the City to provide a 10% drainage rate discount for any new or remodeled commercial buildings that utilize permissive rainwater harvesting systems. These expenses are reimbursed by Seattle Public Utilities.

Add \$18,000 to this program for continued project management and construction assistance services for Sound Transit. These expenses are reimbursed by Sound Transit. Reduce \$1,000 in staffing costs as part of the conversion of a temporary to a permanent Admin Spec I position in the Land Use Review program. Add internally allocated expenses of approximately \$39,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$4,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$104,000.

2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
1,213,625	1,997,311	2,059,493	2,163,418
13.05	18.91	18.91	18.91
	Actual 1,213,625	Actual         Adopted           1,213,625         1,997,311	Actual         Adopted         Endorsed           1,213,625         1,997,311         2,059,493

## **Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level is to facilitate the review of development plans and processing of permits so that applicants can plan, alter, construct, occupy and maintain Seattle's buildings and property.

Program Expenditures	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Applicant Services Center	4,517,385	4,097,163	4,318,930	4,354,943
Construction Plans Administration	5,407,642	5,625,446	5,777,333	5,604,081
Operations Division Overhead	829,528	1,004,023	1,052,732	1,068,000
Public Resource Center	1,162,775	1,864,155	1,931,436	1,791,458
TOTAL	11,917,330	12,590,787	13,080,431	12,818,482
Full-time Equivalents Total*	111.87	112.06	112.10	113.10

\*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## **Construction Permit Services: Applicant Services Center**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Reallocate \$22,000 from the Public Resource Center to support the work of an Accounting Tech I position. This position will be shared with the Finance and Accounting Services program and will support continued elevated volumes and required coverage for essential customer service functions for cashiering and accounting in the Applicant Services Center.

Add \$51,000 to this program for continued project management and construction assistance services for Sound Transit. These expenses are reimbursed by Sound Transit. Reallocate \$13,000 in regular staff costs from this program to Construction Plans Administration for designated staff participation in emergency response training. Reduce internally allocated expenses by approximately \$14,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$10,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$36,000.

Actual	Adopted	Endorsed	Adopted
,517,385	4,097,163	4,318,930	4,354,943
49.62	50.45	50.40	50.40
	,517,385 49.62	,517,385 4,097,163 49.62 50.45	,517,385 4,097,163 4,318,930

## **Construction Permit Services: Construction Plans Administration**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$136,000 to offset salary calculation error resulting from dated salary schedule information and new departmental budgeting system. Shift \$400,000 of shared overhead from Construction Permit Services to the Building Inspections program to correct a data entry error. Reallocate \$75,000 in regular staff costs from other programs to support designated staff participation in emergency response training.

Add \$8,000 to this program for continued project management and construction assistance services for Sound Transit. These expenses are reimbursed by Sound Transit. Reduce program budget by \$5,000 to offset staffing costs for a permanent Administrative Specialist I position in the Land Use Review program. Reduce internally allocated expenses in the amount of \$9,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program. Add \$30,000 for costs related to the Monorail project, which will be paid for by the Monorail.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$9,000, for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$173,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Construction Plans Administration	5,407,642	5,625,446	5,777,333	5,604,081
Full-time Equivalents Total*	43.65	34.43	34.43	34.43
*FTF totals provided for information only (2002 FTF refle	et adopted numbers) Author	rized positions are list	ad in Annandir A	

## **Construction Permit Services: Operations Division Overhead**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$21,000 to offset salary calculation error resulting from dated salary schedule information and new departmental budgeting system. Reallocate \$4,000 in regular staff costs from this program to Construction Plans Administration for disaster management training.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$2,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$15,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Operations Division Overhead	829,528	1,004,023	1,052,732	1,068,000
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.64	8.45	8.45	8.45
* = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =			1	

\*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## **Construction Permit Services: Public Resource Center**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Unfund 0.5 FTE of a Public Resource Center (PRC) Permit Technician position, for a savings of \$32,000. This reduction may delay response times to phone inquiries. Reallocate \$2,000 in regular staff costs from this program to Construction Plans Administration for designated staff participation in emergency response training. Transfer in from Personnel 1.0 FTE Office/Maintenance Aide Supported Employee.

Reduce program budget by \$54,000 to offset staffing costs for a regular Accounting Tech I position in the Finance and Accounting Services program and the Applicant Services Center. Shift out internally allocated expenses of approximately \$46,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$6,000, for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$140,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Public Resource Center	1,162,775	1,864,155	1,931,436	1,791,458
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.96	18.73	18.82	19.82
*FTF totals provided for information only (2002 FTF rel	act adopted numbers) Author	rized positions are list	ad in Annandir A	

## **Contingent Budget Authority Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Contingency Budget Authority Budget Control Level is to provide a rapid response mechanism to unanticipated changes in demand for land use and construction services. Potential changes in authorized positions due to unanticipated demand changes are assigned to this budget control level to provide centralized control. The exercise of the contingency budget authority is subject to periodic review and approval by the City of Seattle's Director of Finance.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive program changes from the 2004 Endorsed Budget.

2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
0	0	0	0
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	<b>Actual</b> 0 0.00	Actual Adopted 0 0	Actual         Adopted         Endorsed           0         0         0           0.00         0.00         0.00

## **Department Strategy Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Department Strategy Budget Control Level is: (1) to develop and implement business strategies to improve the performance of the organization; (2) to ensure that managers and staff have the information, tools and training needed for managing and making decisions; (3) to set fees that reflect the cost of services; and (4) to maintain a community relations program.

Program Expenditures	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
• •		•		-
Community Relations	329,640	392,948	409,409	408,380
Director's Office	725,614	872,332	896,810	897,808
Finance and Accounting Services	1,673,293	1,664,131	1,711,288	1,766,339
Human Resources	871,970	936,650	962,278	951,662
Information Technology Services	3,498,074	2,680,108	2,736,055	2,776,493
TOTAL	7,098,591	6,546,169	6,715,840	6,800,682
Full-time Equivalents Total*	38.97	41.51	41.51	45.51

\*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## **Department Strategy: Community Relations**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive program changes from the 2004 Endorsed Budget.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by less than \$1,000, for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Community Relations	329,640	392,948	409,409	408,380
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.30	3.28	3.28	3.28

## **Department Strategy: Director's Office**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce department-wide funding for annual recognition activities, conference registration costs, and instructor fees for department training in the amount of \$15,000. Reallocate \$5,000 in regular staff costs from this program to Construction Plans Administration for designated staff participation in emergency response training. Shift internally allocated expenses by adding \$23,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$2,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Director's Office	725,614	872,332	896,810	897,808
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.26	9.03	9.03	9.03
		. 1 1	2.05	2.05

\*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## **Department Strategy: Finance and Accounting Services**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Convert one temporary Accounting Tech I to a regular position, which will be shared with the Applicant Services Center program. Funding for this position in the amount of \$32,000 is reallocated from the Public Resource Center to this program.

Shift internally allocated expenses by adding \$25,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$2,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$55,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Finance and Accounting Services	1,673,293	1,664,131	1,711,288	1,766,339
Full-time Equivalents Total*	15.38	14.25	14.25	15.25
*FTF ( ) 1 1 ( ) ( ) 1 (2002 FTF (		• 1 •.• 1• .	1	

## **Department Strategy: Human Resources**

#### Purpose Statement

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

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce department-wide funding for annual recognition activities, conference registration costs, and instructor fees for department training in the amount of \$9,000. Shift internally allocated expenses by subtracting approximately \$1,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$1,000, for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$11,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Human Resources	871,970	936,650	962,278	951,662
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.50	5.95	5.95	5.95

\*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## **Department Strategy: Information Technology Services**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$50,000 to offset salary calculation error resulting from dated salary schedule information and new departmental budgeting system. Convert two temporary Information Technology Professional B positions and one Information Technology Professional C position to regular positions, resulting in savings of approximately \$34,000.

Shift internally allocated expenses by adding \$27,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$3,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$40,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Information Technology Services	3,498,074	2,680,108	2,736,055	2,776,493
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.53	9.00	9.00	12.00
*FTE ( ) · · · · · · · · · · · · / (2002 FTE )		. 1 1	1	

## Judgment and Claims Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The Judgment/Claims Budget Control Level pays for judgments, settlements, claims, and other eligible expenses associated with legal claims and suits against the City.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive program changes from the 2004 Endorsed Budget.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Judgment and Claims	0	1,399,970	1,399,970	1,399,970
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect a	donted numbers) Author	ized positions are list	ed in Annendix A	

 $\cdot$  information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A

## Land Use Services Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Land Use Services Budget Control Level is to provide land use permitting services to project applicants, City of Seattle departments, public agencies, and citizens. Land Use provides permit process information and regulatory expertise to inform pre-application project design. Land Use reviews proposed development plans and facilitates the public process associated with permit applications. These services are intended to ensure that development proposals are reviewed in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner, and to ensure that the plans substantially comply with applicable codes, legal requirements, policies, and community design standards.

#### **Program Summary**

Convert a temporary Administrative Specialist I to a regular position to support the Review and Inspections Center in the side sewer permitting program and the maintenance of a new, complex database tracking system. Offsets for the slight increase in staffing costs due to this conversion come from the Building Inspections, Construction Plans Administration and Site Review and Inspections programs.

Add \$21,000 to this program for continued project management and construction assistance services for Sound Transit. These expenses are reimbursed by Sound Transit. Reallocate \$7,000 in regular staff costs from this program to Construction Plans Administration for designated staff participation in emergency response training. Reduce allocated expenses in the amount of \$34,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program. Add \$211,000 in planning and permitting support costs for the Monorail project, which will be paid for by the Monorail.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$10,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$180,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Land Use Services	3,234,646	4,729,716	4,890,932	5,070,935
Full-time Equivalents Total*	36.23	33.46	33.42	34.42
*ETE totals mounded for information only (2002 ETE a	affect a dented www.howa) Autho	uizad magitiana ana liat	ad in Annoudin A	

## Planning Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Planning Budget Control Level is to inform and guide choices for shaping and preserving vital, well-planned and well-designed urban environments in Seattle by fostering urban design excellence in Seattle's public realm and supporting the Comprehensive Plan's core values of community, environmental stewardship, social equity and economic opportunity.

Program Expenditures	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Comprehensive and Regional Planning	299,314	480,717	487,201	633,333
Land Use Policy and Code Development	933,537	1,227,731	1,302,981	1,208,524
Planning Commission	0	176,934	188,923	187,049
Planning Division Overhead	105,714	166,786	171,414	170,907
Urban Design	618,559	681,197	703,191	1,306,007
TOTAL	1,957,124	2,733,365	2,853,710	3,505,820
Full-time Equivalents Total*	21.24	25.48	25.48	29.48

\*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## Planning: Comprehensive and Regional Planning

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Comprehensive and Regional Planning program is to oversee, monitor and update the City's Comprehensive Plan, evaluate regional growth management policies, collect Buildable Lands data, and help develop policies and plans for the City, consistent with Seattle's Comprehensive Plan.

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$152,000 and one Public Relations Specialist and one Administrative Specialist II in order to conduct the state-mandated 10-year review and update of the Comprehensive Plan. Shift internally allocated expenses by subtracting \$1,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$4,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$146,000.

2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
299,314	480,717	487,201	633,333
3.57	5.00	5.00	7.00
	<b>Actual</b> 299,314	Actual         Adopted           299,314         480,717	Actual         Adopted         Endorsed           299,314         480,717         487,201

## Planning: Land Use Policy and Code Development

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Land Use Policy and Code Development program is to guide and inform policy choices as a basis for developing regulations that effectively implement the Comprehensive Plan, Neighborhood Plans and other adopted City policies, and to clearly articulate standards to permit applicants, property owners, residents, developers, the general public, and staff.

#### **Program Summary**

Eliminate resources for professional consultant service contracts to support planning initiatives in the amount of \$37,000. This may impact the department's ability to provide policy alternatives and choices in a timely manner.

Reallocate \$3,000 in regular staff costs from this program to Construction Plans Administration for designated staff participation in emergency response training. Reduce internally allocated expenses in the amount of \$1,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program. Reallocate 0.50 FTE Land Use Planner III to the Urban Design Program for special projects, for a reduction of \$49,000.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$6,000, for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$95,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Land Use Policy and Code Development	933,537	1,227,731	1,302,981	1,208,524
Full-time Equivalents Total*	10.75	11.28	11.28	10.78
*FTF totals provided for information only (2002 FTF reflect ado	nted numbers) Author	rized positions are list	ed in Annendix A	

FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## **Planning: Planning Commission**

### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive program changes from the 2004 Endorsed Budget.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$1,000, for a total reduction (or net increase) from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Planning Commission	0	176,934	188,923	187,049
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflec	t adopted numbers). Author	ized positions are list	ed in Appendix A.	

## **Planning: Planning Division Overhead**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Planning Division Overhead program is to oversee the functions of the four planning elements: Comprehensive and Regional Planning; Land Use Policies and Code Development; the Urban Design Program, including the Seattle Design Commission; and the Seattle Planning Commission.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive program changes from the 2004 Endorsed Budget.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$1,000, for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Planning Division Overhead	105,714	166,786	171,414	170,907
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.12	1.00	1.00	1.00
			7	

\*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

## Planning: Urban Design

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Urban Design program is to foster urban design excellence in Seattle's public realm, by upholding standards of design excellence in the City's review of public and private development, creating area plans for districts and neighborhoods, and providing City staff and neighborhoods with tools that promote good urban design.

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$96,000 to fund the Department's share of program management associated with the Right-of-Way Management Initiative led by the Seattle Department of Transportation. Reduce allocated expenses in the amount of \$7,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program. Add \$468,000 for planning and coordination costs related to the Monorail project, which will be paid for by the Monorail.

Add \$49,000 to account for a shift of 0.50 FTE Land Use Planner III position from Land Use Policy & Code Development to Urban Design to provide staffing resources for special projects. Add 1.0 FTE Planning Development Specialist, Supervising and 1.0 FTE Planning Development Specialist, Senior, to be funded by the Monorail pursuant to Ordinance 121321. These two positions are intended to be abrogated within six months of processing all permit applications to the Department for the Green Line.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$3,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$603,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Urban Design	618,559	681,197	703,191	1,306,007
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.80	6.20	6.20	8.70
*FTF totals provided for information only (2002 FTF re	flact adopted numbers) Author	izad positions are list	ad in Annandir A	

## Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The two purposes of the Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level are: (1) to allow DPD to plan and implement continuous improvements to its business processes, including related staff training and equipment purchases; and (2) to ensure that DPD's major technology investments are maintained, upgraded, or replaced when necessary.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase the program budget by \$1,961,000 for the phased implementation of Hansen Information Systems modules for construction and land use permitting. This will allow DPD to replace aging, unstable systems and increase customer service. Implement the next phase of the Hansen project using 4.0 FTE Information Technology Professional A positions, and 4.0 FTE Information Technology Professional B positions.

Add \$7,000 to offset salary calculation error resulting from dated salary schedule information and a new departmental budgeting system. Convert one temporary Information Technology Professional B and one temporary Information Technology Professional C to regular positions, resulting in savings of approximately \$15,000. Reduce internally allocated expenses by \$5,000 to accurately reflect administrative costs of the program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$7,000, for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1.94 million.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
Process Improvements and Technology	4,699,856	3,111,112	3,236,893	5,177,262
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.53	13.75	14.75	24.75
*FTF totals provided for information only (2002 FTF reflect	adopted numbers) Author	rized positions are list	ed in Annendir A	

### 2004 Revenues for the Planning and Development Fund

Summit Code	Source	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
422111	Building Development	\$ 14,210,000	\$ 13,085,000	\$ 13,085,000	\$ 15,500,000
443694	Site Review & Development	1,100,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,300,000
422115	Land Use	4,705,000	3,778,000	3,778,000	3,900,000
422130	Electrical	2,743,000	3,295,000	3,295,000	3,400,000
422150	Boiler	481,000	703,000	703,000	800,000
422160	Elevator	1,403,000	1,860,000	1,860,000	1,950,000
445800	Design Commission	375,000	431,000	431,000	400,000
587900	SPU MOA for Side Sewer	-	645,695	643,693	643,693
587001	General Fund	6,800,000	9,525,186	9,781,970	9,754,482
437010	Grant Revenues	104,000	-	-	400,000
461110	Interest	828,000	1,000,000	750,000	650,000
469990	Other Revenues	1,800,000	2,215,000	2,215,000	3,172,000
	Total Revenues (base case)	\$ 34,549,000	\$ 37,737,881	\$ 37,742,663	\$ 41,870,175
371000	Use of (addition to) Fund Balance	5,604,000	3,915,216	5,320,025	4,462,058
	Total Resources (base case)	\$ 40,153,000	\$ 41,653,097	\$ 43,062,688	\$ 46,332,233

#### DPD Contingent Expenditure Authority Revenues & Expenditures (see note and schedules below)

Summit Code	Source	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Adopted
422111	Building Permits	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000
422115	Land Use	-	500,000	500,000	500,000
422130	Electrical Permits	-	500,000	500,000	500,000
	Total Revenues (contingent)	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000
371000	Use of (addition to) Fund Balance	_	(1,360,000)	(1,360,000)	(1,360,000)
	Total Resources (with contingent)	\$ 40,153,000	\$ 45,293,097	\$ 46,702,688	\$ 49,972,233

Note:

Consistent with Council Resolution 30357, DPD shall prepare its budget in a manner that proposes authorizing additional expenditure and positions when warranted by increases in demand for services as indicated by revenues. The budget shall propose contingent budget authority that may be granted in increments of expenditure and full-time positions associated with increments of actual and forecasted revenues deviating from forecasted budgeted amounts. The Department of Finance (DOF) shall evaluate the adequacy of the forecasts and approve the use of contingent expenditure authority, request additional analysis, or deny the additional authority if, in DOF's opinion, the need is not demonstrated.

## 2004 Contingent Authority - Revenue & Expenditure Tables

This budget proposes the following four schedules for triggering contingent budget authority based on revenue deviating from the budget forecast.

\$	Budget	FTE
\$		
Ψ	(160,000)	(1.3)
\$	-	0.0
\$	160,000	1.3
\$	320,000	2.6
\$	480,000	4.0
\$	640,000	4.0
\$	800,000	4.0
	\$ \$ \$ \$	\$         160,000           \$         320,000           \$         480,000           \$         640,000

<b>Construction Plan Review</b>	nstruction Plan Review Contingent		
Unanticipated Revenue		Budget	FTE
¢ 400 000 1	¢		
-\$400,000 or less	\$	(288,000)	(2.5)
-\$399,999 to -\$200,000	\$	(144,000)	(1.2)
-\$199,999 to \$199,999	\$	-	0.0
\$200,000 to \$399,999	\$	144,000	1.2
\$400,000 to \$599,999	\$	288,000	2.5
\$600,000 to \$799,999	\$	432,000	3.7
\$800,000 to \$999,999	\$	576,000	5.0
\$1,000,000 to \$1,199,999	\$	720,000	5.0
\$1,200,000 to \$1,399,999	\$	864,000	5.0
\$1,400,000 to \$1,599,999	\$	1,008,000	5.0
\$1,600,000 to \$1,799,999	\$	1,152,000	5.0
\$1,800,000 to \$1,999,999	\$	1,296,000	5.0
\$2,000,000 and above	\$	1,440,000	5.0

## 2004 Contingent Authority - Revenue & Expenditure Tables (cont.)

Construction Inspection		Contingent	Contingent
Unanticipated Revenue		Budget	FTE
-\$400,000 or less	\$	(201,600)	(1.7)
-\$399,999 to -\$200,000	\$ \$	(100,800)	(1.7) (0.9)
-\$199,999 to \$199,999	\$	-	0.0
\$200,000 to \$399,999	\$	100,800	0.9
\$400,000 to \$599,999	\$	201,600	1.7
\$600,000 to \$799,999	\$	302,400	2.6
\$800,000 to \$999,999	\$	403,200	3.5
\$1,000,000 to \$1,199,999	\$	504,000	4.0
\$1,200,000 to \$1,399,999	\$	604,800	4.0
\$1,400,000 to \$1,599,999	\$	705,600	4.0
\$1,600,000 to \$1,799,999	\$	806,400	4.0
\$1,800,000 to \$1,999,999	\$	907,200	4.0
\$2,000,000 and above	\$	1,008,000	4.0

Electrical Inspection with Plan Review Unanticipated Revenue	Contingent Budget	Contingent FTE
-\$100,000 or less	\$ (50,400)	(0.4)
-\$99,999 to \$99,999	\$ -	0.0
\$100,000 to \$199,999	\$ 50,400	0.4
\$200,000 to \$299,999	\$ 100,800	0.9
\$300,000 to \$399,999	\$ 151,200	1.3
\$400,000 to \$499,999	\$ 201,600	1.7
\$500,000 and above	\$ 252,000	2.0
	,	