# Office of Economic Development

## Jill Nishi, Director

#### **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-8090

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

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

#### **Department Description**

The mission of the Office of Economic Development (OED) is to help create healthy businesses, thriving neighborhoods, and community organizations to contribute to a robust economy that will benefit all Seattle residents and future generations. OED's programs are designed to:

- Attract, welcome, and retain companies in traditional and emerging industries by promoting the advantages of doing business in Seattle, and providing one-on-one assistance to businesses;
- Strengthen neighborhood business districts and support community-based economic development across Seattle, with special emphasis on low-income communities;
- Assist large employers and small businesses to retain and grow Seattle's base of businesses and family-wage jobs;
- Increase apprenticeship and training opportunities to ensure Seattle will have skilled workers capable of meeting the region's current and future work force needs; and
- Improve customer satisfaction for businesses accessing City services.

## **Proposed Policy and Program Changes**

The 2006 Proposed Budget adds position authority for the purposes of administering the supplemental mitigation program and long-term community development activities of the Rainier Valley Community Development Fund for Southeast Seattle. This position is funded by the General Subfund as a portion of the 2006 contribution to the Transit-Oriented Community Development Fund (CDF).

The Proposed Budget also shifts funding for the Farmers Market and for the Work Force Development Program Manager position from Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) to General Subfunds to compensate for a reduction in CDBG revenue.

# **Economic Development**

	Summit	2004	2005	2006	2006
Appropriations	Code	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Office of Economic Development Bu	dget Control	Level			
<b>Business Development</b>		1,102,560	1,051,973	1,080,818	1,082,900
Community Development		995,510	886,463	880,107	930,593
Management and Operations		1,219,237	1,161,990	1,244,994	1,301,327
Work Force Development		3,110,185	2,567,900	2,509,593	2,564,800
Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level	X1D00	6,427,492	5,668,326	5,715,512	5,879,620
<b>Department Total</b>		6,427,492	5,668,326	5,715,512	5,879,620
Department Full-time Equivalents T *FTE totals provided for information purposes on		23.00 itions are reflected	21.00 in the Position List	21.00 Appendix.	21.60
		2004	2005	2006	2006
Resources		Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
General Subfund		6,427,492	5,668,326	5,715,512	5,879,620
Department Total		6,427,492	5,668,326	5,715,512	5,879,620

### Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level is to provide business assistance and community and work force development services to businesses, community organizations, and residents so Seattle has a strong economy, thriving neighborhoods, and broadly shared prosperity.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Business Development	1,102,560	1,051,973	1,080,818	1,082,900
Community Development	995,510	886,463	880,107	930,593
Management and Operations	1,219,237	1,161,990	1,244,994	1,301,327
Work Force Development	3,110,185	2,567,900	2,509,593	2,564,800
Total	6,427,492	5,668,326	5,715,512	5,879,620
Full-time Equivalents Total *	23.00	21.00	21.00	21.60

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## Office of Economic Development: Business Development Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Business Development program is to provide technical and financial assistance, business development and expansion services, and policy advice to Seattle's key industries and small business communities so Seattle maintains a diverse family-wage job base and low-income residents have access to these jobs.

#### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by approximately \$2,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Business Development	1,102,560	1,051,973	1,080,818	1,082,900
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## **Economic Development**

# Office of Economic Development: Community Development Purpose Statement

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

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$50,000 in funding for the Farmers Market previously funded by Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). This shift in funding will be reevaluated in 2006 as part of the 2007-2008 budget process.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Community Development	995,510	886,463	880,107	930,593
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.50	6.00	6.00	6.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# Office of Economic Development: Management and Operations Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Management and Operations program is to provide leadership and financial, administrative, communications, human resources, and special initiatives management to department personnel so they can effectively accomplish OED's mission and goals.

#### **Program Summary**

Add 0.6 FTE and \$54,000 to reflect the addition of a Community Development Specialist, Senior, for the purpose of administering the supplemental mitigation and long-term community development activities of the Southeast Seattle Transit-Oriented Community Development Fund (CDF). In 2005, OED assumed primary responsibility for the review and oversight of supplemental mitigation payments to businesses impacted by light rail construction in Southeast Seattle. This position is funded by the General Subfund as portion of the 2006 General Subfund contribution to the CDF.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by approximately \$2,000 or a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of \$56,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Management and Operations	1,219,237	1,161,990	1,244,994	1,301,327
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.75	10.00	10.00	10.60

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## **Economic Development**

### Office of Economic Development: Work Force Development Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Work Force Development program is to provide work force development services to businesses, community organizations, residents, the Mayor, City Council, and other public decision makers so employers meet their need for qualified workers, and all residents, particularly those who are disadvantaged, secure and retain family-wage jobs.

#### **Program Summary**

Add \$55,000 in funding for the Work Force Development Program Manager position previously funded by Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Work Force Development	3,110,185	2,567,900	2,509,593	2,564,800
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.25	0.50	0.50	0.50

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# Office of Housing

### **Adrienne Quinn, Director**

#### **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-0721

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

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

#### **Department Description**

The mission of the Office of Housing (OH) is to invest in and promote the development and preservation of housing in order for Seattle to thrive. To accomplish this mission, OH has established four programs, reflected in the budget as: the Multi-Family Production and Preservation program, Homeownership and Sustainability program, Community Development program, and the Administration and Management program.

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

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

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

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

## **Proposed Policy and Program Changes**

In 2006, the Department carries forward capital funds from the previous year's budget to provide appropriation authority and allow for expenditure. These capital funds were committed to specific housing development projects during the Department's Notice of Funding Availability process. Funds will not be encumbered by contract until 2006.

	Summit	2004	2005	2006	2006
Appropriations	Code	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing - 17820 Budget Control Level	XZ-R3	657,353	384,923	9,000	346,059
Low Income Housing Fund 16400 B	udget Contro	l Level			
Homeownership and Sustainability Multi-Family Production and Prese		3,551,303 15,315,045	8,158,504 22,125,482	5,902,053 22,051,290	5,927,053 24,975,176
16400 Low Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level	XZ-R1	18,866,348	30,283,986	27,953,343	30,902,229
Office of Housing Operating Fund 1	6600 Budget	Control Level			
Administration and Management -	16600	1,112,820	974,151	1,008,335	1,134,218
Community Development - 16600		33,687	187,734	191,656	270,904
Homeownership and Sustainability Multi-Family Production and Prese 16600		626,610 869,076	449,667 893,055	471,464 940,212	437,585 770,810
Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level	XZ-R2	2,642,193	2,504,607	2,611,667	2,613,517
<b>Department Total</b>		22,165,894	33,173,516	30,574,010	33,861,805
Department Full-time Equivalents T *FTE totals provided for information purposes on		43.25 sitions are reflected	41.75 in the Position List	41.00 Appendix.	41.00
		2004	2005	2006	2006
Resources		Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
General Subfund		0	0	0	2,425,000
Other		22,165,894	33,173,516	30,574,010	31,436,805
Department Total		22,165,894	33,173,516	30,574,010	33,861,805

### <u>Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing - 17820 Budget</u> Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing Fund 17820 Budget Control Level is to fund multi-family housing production. Multi-family housing production activity is also funded by the Low Income Housing Fund (16400) and the Office of Housing Operating Fund (16600). Unspent funds appropriated in this Budget Control Level shall carry forward to subsequent fiscal years until they are exhausted or abandoned by ordinance.

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

#### **Summary**

Carry forward approximately \$337,000 of the previous year's budget authority to allow for expenditure in 2006. These funds are committed to capital funding of specific housing development projects but will not be encumbered by contract until 2006.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Multi-Family Production and Preservation -	657,353	384,923	9,000	346,059
17820				

### **Low Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Low Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level is to fund multi-family housing production, and to support homeownership and sustainability. Unspent funds appropriated in this Budget Control Level shall carry forward to subsequent fiscal years until they are exhausted or abandoned by ordinance.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400	3,551,303	8,158,504	5,902,053	5,927,053
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400	15,315,045	22,125,482	22,051,290	24,975,176
Total	18,866,348	30,283,986	27,953,343	30,902,229

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

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Carry forward approximately \$25,000 of the previous year's budget authority to allow for expenditure in 2006. These funds are committed to capital funding of specific housing development projects but will not be encumbered by contract until 2006.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400	3,551,303	8,158,504	5,902,053	5,927,053

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

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Increase budget by \$2.4 million of General Fund to support development of affordable housing in South Lake Union. This General Fund support repays the Office of Housing for funds owed resulting from property transactions in the South Lake Union neighborhood. Projects will be selected through the Office Of Housing's Notice of Funding Availability process.

Carry forward approximately \$499,000 of the previous year's budget authority to allow for expenditure in 2006. These funds are committed to capital funding of specific housing development projects but will not be encumbered by contract until 2006. The net increase to this program from the 2006 Endorsed to the 2006 Proposed Budget is approximately \$2.9 million.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Multi-Family Production and Preservation -	15,315,045	22,125,482	22,051,290	24,975,176
16400				

### Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	<b>Actuals</b>	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Administration and Management - 16600	1,112,820	974,151	1,008,335	1,134,218
Community Development - 16600	33,687	187,734	191,656	270,904
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600	626,610	449,667	471,464	437,585
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600	869,076	893,055	940,212	770,810
Total	2,642,193	2,504,607	2,611,667	2,613,517
Full-time Equivalents Total *	43.25	41.75	41.00	41.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600: Administration and Management - 16600

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Transfer approximately \$126,000 to this program from within the Department to reflect a better realignment of expenditures.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Administration and Management - 16600	1,112,820	974,151	1,008,335	1,134,218
Full-time Equivalents Total*	15.00	13.50	13.50	13.50

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600: Community Development - 16600

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Transfer approximately \$79,000 to this program from within the Department to reflect a better realignment of expenditures.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Community Development - 16600	33,687	187,734	191,656	270,904
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600: Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Transfer approximately \$34,000 from this program to other programs within the Department to reflect a better realignment of expenditures.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600	626,610	449,667	471,464	437,585
Full-time Equivalents Total*	11.00	11.00	11.00	11.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600: Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Transfer approximately \$169,000 from this program to other programs within the Department to reflect a better realignment of expenditures.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600	869,076	893,055	940,212	770,810
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.25	12.25	11.50	11.50

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### **2006 Estimated Revenues for the Housing Fund**

Summit Code	Source	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
439090	Sound Families Grant	297,899	46,000	46,000	46,000
541490	Miscellaneous Revenues	1,686,090	2,458,607	2,565,667	2,567,517
Tota	al Revenues	1,983,989	2,504,607	2,611,667	2,613,517
379100	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	658,204	0	0	0
Tota	al Resources	2,642,193	2,504,607	2,611,667	2,613,517

### 2006 Estimated Revenues for the Low-income Housing Fund

Summit Code	Source	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
411100	Property Tax Levy	11,737,597	11,856,344	11,856,344	12,224,860
433010	Grants for Weatherization Program - Federal	964,304	1,116,660	936,100	936,100
434010	State Grants	0	1,200,000	0	0
439090	Other Contributions and Donations	4,827,392	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
439099	Other Contrib./Pass-Thrus (including TDR Revenues)	0	42,403	22,800	22,800
461110	Investment Earnings	905,460	1,258,000	1,258,000	1,350,967
461400	Interest on Contracts/Notes Receivable	64,211	122,000	65,000	90,000
462500	Bldg/Other Space Rental Charges	0	45,371	27,082	64,485
469930	Program Income - Miscellaneous	804,943	1,604,900	0	880,000
469930	Program Income - Miscellaneous (Including Bridge Loans)	0	5,000,000	5,880,000	5,000,000
469990	Miscellaneous Revenues	485	500,000	500,000	500,000
471010	Federal Grants - HOME Program	5,268,283	5,175,912	5,045,620	5,045,620
541490	Miscellaneous Revenues	0	1,362,396	1,362,397	1,362,397
587001	General Subfund Support	0	0	0	2,425,000
Tota	l Revenues	24,572,675	30,283,986	27,953,343	30,902,229
379100	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	(5,706,327)	0	0	0
Tota	l Resources	18,866,348	30,283,986	27,953,343	30,902,229

### **2006 Estimated Revenues for the Special Purpose Grants**

Summit Code	Source	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
461110	Investment Earnings	13,395	11,000	9,000	346,059
461400	Interest on Contracts/Notes Receivable	0	115,000	0	0
469930	Homebuyer PI	0	258,923	0	0
Tota	l Revenues	13,395	384,923	9,000	346,059
379100	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	643,958	0	0	0
Tota	l Resources	657,353	384,923	9,000	346,059

### **Department Description**

The purpose of the Neighborhood Matching Subfund is to provide resources for Seattle's communities so the City's diverse neighborhoods are preserved and enhanced, and people are empowered to make positive contributions to their communities.

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

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

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

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	Summit	2004	2005	2006	2006
Appropriations	Code	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Neighborhood Matching Fund Budge	et Control Le	vel			
Large Projects Fund		1,687,818	1,317,768	1,218,970	1,218,970
Management and Project Developm	ent	758,256	908,309	929,146	932,341
Neighborhood Outreach Fund		12,170	13,000	13,000	13,000
Small and Simple Projects Fund		466,159	1,262,042	1,062,042	1,062,042
Tree Fund		39,439	50,000	44,558	44,558
Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level	2IN00	2,963,842	3,551,119	3,267,716	3,270,911
Department Total		2,963,842	3,551,119	3,267,716	3,270,911
		2004	2005	2006	2006
Resources		Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
General Subfund		2,963,842	3,197,119	3,267,716	3,270,911
Other		0	354,000	0	0
Department Total		2,963,842	3,551,119	3,267,716	3,270,911

#### **Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	2004	2005	2006	2006
	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Large Projects Fund	1,687,818	1,317,768	1,218,970	1,218,970
Management and Project Development	758,256	908,309	929,146	932,341
Neighborhood Outreach Fund	12,170	13,000	13,000	13,000
Small and Simple Projects Fund	466,159	1,262,042	1,062,042	1,062,042
Tree Fund	39,439	50,000	44,558	44,558
Total	2,963,842	3,551,119	3,267,716	3,270,911

# **Neighborhood Matching Fund: Large Projects Fund Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Large Projects Fund	1,687,818	1,317,768	1,218,970	1,218,970

# **Neighborhood Matching Fund: Management and Project Development Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget. Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$3,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Management and Project Development	758,256	908,309	929,146	932,341

# Neighborhood Matching Fund: Neighborhood Outreach Fund Purpose Statement

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

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Neighborhood Outreach Fund	12,170	13,000	13,000	13,000

# **Neighborhood Matching Fund: Small and Simple Projects Fund Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Small and Simple Projects Fund	466,159	1,262,042	1,062,042	1,062,042

# Neighborhood Matching Fund: Tree Fund Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Tree Fund is to provide trees to neighborhood groups to plant along residential planting strips in exchange for ongoing care and maintenance.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Tree Fund	39,439	50,000	44,558	44,558

### 2006 Estimated Revenues for the Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Summit Code	Source	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
587001	General Subfund Support	3,168,429	3,197,119	3,267,716	3,270,911
Tota	al Revenues	3,168,429	3,197,119	3,267,716	3,270,911
379100	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	(204,587)	354,000	0	0
Tota	al Resources	2,963,842	3,551,119	3,267,716	3,270,911

### Neighborhood Matching Subfund

	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2005 Revised	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	354,057	897,346	897,346	543,346	543,346
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	338,702				
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	3,168,429	3,197,119	3,197,119	3,267,716	3,270,911
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	2,963,842	3,551,119	3,551,119	3,267,716	3,270,911
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	897,346	543,346	543,346	543,346	543,346

## **Department of Neighborhoods**

## **Yvonne Sanchez, Director**

#### **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-0464

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

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

#### **Department Description**

The Department of Neighborhoods works to bring government closer to the residents of Seattle by engaging them in civic participation, helping them become empowered to make positive contributions to their communities, and by involving more of Seattle's under-represented residents, including communities of color and immigrants, in civic discourse, processes, and opportunities. The Department of Neighborhoods has five major operating functions:

Administration and Historic Preservation: Administration provides executive leadership, communications, race relations and social justice programs, and operational support for the entire Department. Historic Preservation provides technical assistance, outreach and education to the general public, owners of historic properties, government agencies and elected officials in order to identify, protect, rehabilitate and re-use historic properties.

The Community Building Division includes the P-Patch, Neighborhood Matching Fund, Neighborhood District Coordinators, major institutions support, the Neighborhood Action Team, and neighborhood plan implementation functions.

The Operations and Customer Service Division includes the Citizens Service Bureau, Neighborhood Payment and Information Services, Finance, Human Resources, and Information Technology functions.

The Office for Education builds linkages between the City of Seattle and Seattle Public Schools. It administers the Families and Education Levy, provides policy direction to help children succeed in school, strengthens school-community connections, and increases access to high-quality early learning and care and out-of-school-time programs.

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

The Seattle Neighborhood Group contract is moved to the Human Services Department (HSD) to be managed under the outcome-based contract process in HSD.

Funding is added to Historic Preservation to create a Conservation District.

Anticipated funding reductions to the City's share of the federal Community Development Block Grant funds result in reductions to three CDBG-funded positions in DON. In addition, the funding source for part of two DON programs is transferred from CDBG to General Fund (see also the Community Development Block Grant section of this book).

Budget neutral technical adjustments include the transfer of some funding and positions to other programs within the Department to improve functional alignment. Unfunded positions are abrogated and two part-time positions are consolidated into one full-time position.

# Neighborhoods

				•	
	Summit	2004	2005	2006	2006
Appropriations	Code	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Administration and Historic Preserva	ation Budget	<b>Control Level</b>			
Communications		99,264	120,162	124,706	125,021
Executive Leadership		223,173	220,403	227,741	310,934
Historic Preservation		514,565	503,521	519,492	594,060
Internal Operations/Administrative S	Services	1,392,311	1,314,328	1,359,294	1,375,013
Administration and Historic Preservation Budget Control Level	I3100	2,229,313	2,158,414	2,231,233	2,405,028
<b>Community Building Budget Control</b>	Level				
Involving All Neighbors		86,416	57,779	60,223	58,708
Major Institutions and Project Mana	gement	139,990	192,100	192,002	345,079
Neighborhood Action Team		386,480	414,580	421,087	100,064
Neighborhood District Coordinators		1,273,731	1,398,933	1,439,744	1,444,340
Neighborhood Matching Fund Admi	nistration	0	0	0	0
P-Patch		440,979	492,559	508,356	545,868
Community Building Budget Control Level	I3300	2,327,597	2,555,951	2,621,412	2,494,059
<b>Customer Service Budget Control Le</b>	vel				
Citizens Service Bureau		413,956	430,081	443,321	444,172
Neighborhood Payment and Informa Services	tion	1,445,764	1,419,564	1,461,315	1,532,235
Customer Service Budget Control Level	I3200	1,859,720	1,849,645	1,904,636	1,976,407
Office for Education Budget Control Level	<b>I3700</b>	611,301	110,362	113,547	231,480
Research and Prevention Budget Control Level	I3600	146,345	164,118	167,112	0
<b>Department Total</b>		7,174,277	6,838,490	7,037,940	7,106,974
Department Full-time Equivalents To *FTE totals provided for information purposes only		<b>87.00</b> itions are reflected	<b>86.25</b> in the Position List	<b>86.25</b> Appendix.	85.50
		2004	2005	2006	2006
Resources		Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
General Subfund		7,174,277	6,838,490	7,037,940	7,106,974
<b>Department Total</b>		7,174,277	6,838,490	7,037,940	7,106,974

### **Administration and Historic Preservation Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Administration and Historic Preservation Budget Control Level is to provide executive leadership, communications, and operations support for the Department so that it can accomplish its overall purpose. Historic Preservation staff provide technical assistance, outreach and education to the general public, owners of historic properties, government agencies and elected officials in order to identify, protect, rehabilitate and re-use historic properties.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	<b>Actuals</b>	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Communications	99,264	120,162	124,706	125,021
Executive Leadership	223,173	220,403	227,741	310,934
Historic Preservation	514,565	503,521	519,492	594,060
Internal Operations/Administrative Services	1,392,311	1,314,328	1,359,294	1,375,013
Total	2,229,313	2,158,414	2,231,233	2,405,028
Full-time Equivalents Total *	22.75	20.50	20.50	21.25

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# Administration and Historic Preservation: Communications Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Communications program is to provide print and electronic information in order to increase citizen participation in the Department's programs and services as well as other opportunities for citizen involvement.

#### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by approximately \$300.

	2004	2005	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted		
Communications	99,264	120,162	124,706	125,021
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## Neighborhoods

# Administration and Historic Preservation: Executive Leadership Purpose Statement

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

#### **Program Summary**

Increase Executive Leadership program by \$82,000 to reflect technical adjustments as part of a departmental realignment of programs in order to better reflect program costs. One Strategic Advisor I is transferred from Data Analysis.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$1,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$83,000.

	2004	2005	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted		
Executive Leadership	223,173	220,403	227,741	310,934
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### Administration and Historic Preservation: Historic Preservation Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Historic Preservation program is to provide technical assistance, outreach, and education to the general public, owners of historic properties, government agencies, and elected officials in order to identify, protect, rehabilitate, and reuse historic properties.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase Historic Preservation by \$25,000 in order to create a Conservation District. A Conservation District is intended to protect the character of a neighborhood and ensure that alterations to buildings are in keeping with a neighborhood's architectural style and mindful of the relationship to the street and proximity to public viewpoints. Guidelines will be developed with citizen input; enforcement and evaluation will be done by a citizen oversight body. For 2006, \$25,000 is added for a consultant to develop guidelines and legislation, and staff a citizen oversight committee to create a conservation district in the Queen Anne neighborhood. The consultant will also do outreach to other neighborhoods to determine the level of interest in additional conservation districts and future staffing needs.

Increase program by \$48,000 to reflect reduction in available Community Development Block Grant funding for the Section 106 coordinator (Community Development Specialist). This position is funded with General Fund for 2006 only. This change includes a reduction in the position from 0.75 FTE to 0.5 FTE. CDBG funds are reduced due to anticipated reductions in the federal Community Development Block Grant fund award. Although position authority is in DON, funding for this position was previously shown in the Community Development Block Grant Fund section of this book.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$2,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$75,000.

	2004	2005	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted		
Historic Preservation	514,565	503,521	519,492	594,060
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.25	6.50	6.50	6.25

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### **Neighborhoods**

# Administration and Historic Preservation: Internal Operations/Administrative Services

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Internal Operations/Administrative Services program is to manage financial, human resources, facility, administrative, and information technology services so that the Department's employees serve customers efficiently and effectively.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase Executive Leadership by \$14,000 to reflect technical adjustments as part of a departmental realignment of programs in order to better reflect program costs.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$2,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$16,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Internal Operations/Administrative Services	1,392,311	1,314,328	1,359,294	1,375,013
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.50	11.00	11.00	11.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### **Community Building Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Community Building Budget Control Level is to deliver technical assistance, support services, and programs in neighborhoods so that local communities are strengthened, people become actively engaged in neighborhood improvement, resources are leveraged, and neighborhood-initiated projects are completed.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	<b>Actuals</b>	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Involving All Neighbors	86,416	57,779	60,223	58,708
Major Institutions and Project Management	139,990	192,100	192,002	345,079
Neighborhood Action Team	386,480	414,580	421,087	100,064
Neighborhood District Coordinators	1,273,731	1,398,933	1,439,744	1,444,340
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration	0	0	0	0
P-Patch	440,979	492,559	508,356	545,868
Total	2,327,597	2,555,951	2,621,412	2,494,059
Full-time Equivalents Total *	33.50	35.00	35.00	35.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# **Community Building: Involving All Neighbors Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Technical changes and citywide adjustments to labor costs reduce the budget by \$1,500 and abrogate an unfunded 0.5 FTE Planning and Development Specialist.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Involving All Neighbors	86,416	57,779	60,223	58,708
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.50

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## Neighborhoods

# **Community Building: Major Institutions and Project Management Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Major Institutions and Project Management program is to ensure coordinated community involvement in the development, adoption and implementation of Major Institution Master Plans and facilitate, coordinate, and monitor City efforts to implement neighborhood plans and provide project management expertise to major implementation projects.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase Major Institutions and Project Management by \$152,000 and 2.0 FTE (Planning & Development Specialist II and a Strategic Advisor I) to reflect technical adjustments as part of a departmental realignment of programs in order to better reflect program costs. Positions are transferred from the Research and Prevention Office, which is eliminated in this realignment; and from the Office for Education.

Reduce 1.0 FTE (Planning & Development Specialist II) due to anticipated reductions in the federal Community Development Block Grant fund award. Although position authority is in DON, funding for this position was previously shown in the Community Development Block Grant Fund.

Abrogate an unfunded 0.5 FTE Planning & Development Specialist.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$1,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$153,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Major Institutions and Project Management	139,990	192,100	192,002	345,079
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.00	2.50	2.50	3.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# **Community Building: Neighborhood Action Team Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Neighborhood Action Team program is to manage an interdepartmental problem-solving approach on behalf of the City and Seattle's communities so that progress can be made towards resolving chronic public safety and/or livability issues.

#### **Program Summary**

Transfer Neighborhood Action Team to the Community Building Budget Control Level from the Research and Prevention Budget Control Level (which is eliminated in this budget).

Reduce Neighborhood Action Team by \$320,000 to reflect the transfer of the Seattle Neighborhood Group to the Human Services Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs decrease the budget by \$1,000, for a net decrease of \$321,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Neighborhood Action Team	386,480	414,580	421,087	100,064
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# **Community Building: Neighborhood District Coordinators Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$5,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Neighborhood District Coordinators	1,273,731	1,398,933	1,439,744	1,444,340
Full-time Equivalents Total*	15.50	16.50	16.50	16.50

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# **Community Building: Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF) Administration program is to manage the NMF, work with other City departments and agencies involved in NMF projects, and support diverse neighborhood associations engaged in local improvement efforts so private resources are leveraged, neighborhood organizations are more self-reliant, effective partnerships are built between City government and neighborhoods, and neighborhood-initiated improvements are completed.

#### **Program Summary**

Costs for NMF administration are included in the NMF budget. Only position authority is shown here. There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	<b>Actuals</b>	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration	0	0	0	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# Community Building: P-Patch

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the P-Patch program is to provide community gardens, gardening space, and related support to Seattle residents so open space is preserved and productive, particularly in high density communities. The program's goals are for gardeners to become more self-reliant, and P-Patches to be focal points for community involvement.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase P-Patch program by \$37,000 to reflect the transfer of funding sources from Community Development Block Grant to General Fund for 2006 only. CDBG funds are reduced due to anticipated reductions in the federal Community Development Block Grant fund award.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$1,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$38,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
P-Patch	440,979	492,559	508,356	545,868
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### **Customer Service Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Customer Service Budget Control Level is to provide information, services, and coordination of services to community members in relation to their neighborhood issues.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Citizens Service Bureau	413,956	430,081	443,321	444,172
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services	1,445,764	1,419,564	1,461,315	1,532,235
Total	1,859,720	1,849,645	1,904,636	1,976,407
Full-time Equivalents Total *	22.75	23.75	23.75	23.25

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# **Customer Service: Citizens Service Bureau Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Citizens Service Bureau is to assist Seattle residents to access services, resolve complaints, and get appropriate and timely responses from City government.

#### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$1,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Citizens Service Bureau	413,956	430,081	443,321	444,172
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## Neighborhoods

# **Customer Service: Neighborhood Payment and Information Services Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Increase by \$70,000 to fund 1.0 FTE added by Ordinance #121497 in 2005 to allow the Central Area Neighborhood Service Center to accept cable payments. This position will be reimbursed by Comcast and Millennium Cable per an agreement between the cable companies and the Department of Neighborhoods. In prior years, the cable companies also funded a 0.5 FTE Customer Service Representative. That position is abrogated as the contract for 2006 has been reduced.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$1,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$71,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services	1,445,764	1,419,564	1,461,315	1,532,235
Full-time Equivalents Total*	16.50	17.50	17.50	17.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### Neighborhoods

#### Office for Education Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Program Summary**

Increase by \$190,000 in order to fund a school turnaround program in four middle schools and one elementary school. This program is intended to complement the efforts of the 2004 Families & Education Levy programs. Dollars will be matched by other fund sources one-to-one in order to allow for 10 schools to participate in the program.

Increase by \$41,000 in order to reflect General Fund allocated to OFE through the Children's Budget process.

Transfer \$113,000 and 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor I from Office for Education to Major Institutions to reflect technical adjustments as part of a departmental realignment of programs in order to better reflect program costs.

Add 1.0 Senior Planning & Development Specialist, 0.5 FTE Research & Evaluation Assistant, and 0.5 FTE Strategic Advisor II as a result of the implementation of the 2004 Levy (per Ordinance 115218).

Citywide adjustments to labor costs result in minor budget changes, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$118,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Office for Education	611,301	110,362	113,547	231,480
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.00	5.00	5.00	6.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### Neighborhoods

#### **Research and Prevention Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Data Analysis program is to use data, advanced technology, and structured problem-solving to address public safety issues in Seattle. The goal of the project is to gain a better understanding of the conditions that influence crime and disorder in neighborhoods, and to more effectively attack those problems. The Communities That Care (CTC) project also uses data to identify conditions that lead to problem behaviors by youth. Community progress toward reducing these behaviors is then measured by CTC and data analysis.

#### Summary

Decrease Data Analysis by \$167,000 and 2.0 FTE to reflect technical adjustments as part of a departmental realignment of programs in order to better reflect program costs. One FTE Strategic Advisor I is moved to the Executive Leadership and 1.0 FTE Planning & Development Specialist II is moved to Major Institutions and Project Management.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Data Analysis	146,345	164,118	167,112	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## **Department of Planning and Development**

### **Diane Sugimura, Director**

#### **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-8600

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

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

#### **Department Description**

The Department of Planning and Development (DPD), is responsible for both regulatory and long-range planning functions. On the regulatory side, 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 more than 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, additional long-range physical planning functions were included in 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 throughout the City and particularly in Seattle's public spaces, and staffing the Planning and Design Commissions.

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

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

The 2006 Proposed Budget reflects an increase in the General Subfund contribution, as well as increases in the amount of support from permit fees and outside grants.

The main changes to this Department's budget are found in the Planning Division program within the Planning Budget Control Level. The Division continues work on a variety of priority projects, originally highlighted in 2005, in an enhanced capacity. A key element of the Division's work plan is to act as lead for the Center City Strategy, to create livable, walkable urban neighborhoods in downtown and the adjacent neighborhoods. The Division's work plan includes funding for a Center City Coordinator and for Central Waterfront Planning.

The Division also engages an outside consultant to work with DPD staff to streamline the Land Use code so that it becomes more user friendly. Environmental and transportation mitigation issues are addressed through the expansion of the Developer Transportation Fee in Northgate, Downtown, and the University District. North Light Rail station area planning is included to identify and accommodate land use policy and regulatory changes related to the Light Rail stations in the University District, Roosevelt and Northgate.

Lastly, the Department worked with Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) and Seattle City Light (SCL) to consolidate the Green Building Team and house it in DPD. The new team has the focused goal of encouraging private developers to use sustainable building practices.

A variety of technical adjustments reallocate overhead costs and implement conversions of responsibilities performed by temporary workers and contractors to permanent Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions, and add positions granted through the contingent budget authority process in 2005.

A reporting change has been made in the 2006 Proposed Budget to individually report a proportionate share of the Departmental administration and overhead costs within each budget control level. The 2004 Actual and 2005 Adopted appropriations data has been recast to reflect this change and allow meaningful comparison with the 2006 Endorsed and Proposed budgets.

	Summit	2004	2005	2006	2006
Appropriations	Code	Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Annual Certification & Inspection Bu Annual Certification & Inspection O Allocations	_	<b>575,097</b>	855,044	861,576	824,551
Annual Certification and Inspection		1,987,681	2,716,668	2,757,286	2,750,075
Annual Certification & Inspection Budget Control Level	U24A0	2,562,778	3,571,712	3,618,862	3,574,626
<b>Code Compliance Budget Control Le</b>	vel				
Code Compliance		3,483,662	3,151,675	3,216,846	3,327,217
Code Compliance Overhead Allocati	ions	681,880	767,164	768,779	734,882
Code Compliance Budget Control Level	U2400	4,165,542	3,918,839	3,985,625	4,062,099
<b>Construction Inspections Budget Con</b>	trol Level				
<b>Building Inspections Program</b>		2,809,246	4,714,457	4,814,784	4,812,388
Construction Inspections Overhead A	Allocations	1,976,064	2,663,218	2,659,572	2,659,572
Electrical Inspections		2,242,205	3,011,540	3,073,829	3,085,379
Signs and Billboards		171,777	225,990	230,347	230,849
Site Review and Inspection		2,262,767	2,405,260	2,453,846	2,452,683
Construction Inspections Budget Control Level	U23A0	9,462,059	13,020,465	13,232,378	13,240,871
<b>Construction Permit Services Budget</b>	Control Lev	vel			
Applicant Services Center		4,681,193	5,043,613	5,148,932	5,181,013
Construction Permit Services Overhor Allocations	ead	2,019,236	2,133,371	2,130,450	2,066,293
Construction Plans Administration		4,061,598	7,203,563	7,376,672	7,574,811
Operations Division Management		849,419	1,774,299	1,830,241	1,836,920
Public Resource Center		1,242,809	1,327,461	1,351,362	1,347,694
Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level	U2300	12,854,255	17,482,307	17,837,657	18,006,731
Contingent Budget Authority Budget Control Level	U2600U	0	0	0	0

Appropriations	Summit Code	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
<b>Department Strategy Budget Control</b>	Level				
Community Relations		444,851	494,698	504,048	506,025
Department Strategy Overhead Alloc	eations	(6,840,565)	(8,499,861)	(8,458,683)	(8,481,018)
Director's Office		644,855	752,580	766,986	772,054
Finance and Accounting Services		1,869,532	2,514,211	2,384,474	2,388,938
Human Resources		910,181	995,121	1,004,296	1,006,529
Information Technology Services		2,971,146	3,743,251	3,798,879	3,807,472
Department Strategy Budget Control Level	U2500	0	0	0	0
Judgment and Claims Budget Control Level	U3000	1,399,968	332,633	332,633	332,633
Land Use Services Budget Control Le	vel				
Land Use Services		3,587,571	4,725,949	4,813,584	4,826,373
Land Use Services Overhead Allocat	ions	906,321	1,242,330	1,251,685	1,258,925
Land Use Services Budget Control Level	U2200	4,493,892	5,968,279	6,065,269	6,085,298
Planning Budget Control Level					
Comprehensive and Regional Planning	ng	491,501	526,894	491,245	965,812
Land Use Policy and Code Developn	nent	1,320,716	1,171,245	1,013,785	1,558,356
Planning Commission		238,851	240,856	130,294	192,344
Planning Division Management		337,133	255,553	260,772	262,477
Planning Overhead Allocations		681,967	838,734	786,621	936,795
Urban Design		1,153,422	1,205,183	1,175,512	1,252,681
Planning Budget Control Level	U2900	4,223,590	4,238,465	3,858,229	5,168,465
Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level	U2800	6,015,052	4,941,252	5,018,726	4,868,711
<b>Department Total</b>		45,177,136	53,473,952	53,949,379	55,339,434
Department Full-time Equivalents To *FTE totals provided for information purposes only		370.25 sitions are reflected	374.00 in the Position List	374.00 Appendix.	395.50
		2004	2005	2006	2006
Resources		Actuals	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
General Subfund		9,583,466	8,251,052	7,847,743	8,913,509
Other		35,593,670	45,222,900	46,101,636	46,425,925
<b>Department Total</b>		45,177,136	53,473,952	53,949,379	55,339,434

### **Annual Certification & 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 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. In addition, this Budget Control Level includes a proportionate share of associated departmental administration and other overhead costs.

Program Expenditures	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
Annual Certification & Inspection Overhead Allocations	575,097	855,044	861,576	824,551
Annual Certification and Inspection	1,987,681	2,716,668	2,757,286	2,750,075
Total	2,562,778	3,571,712	3,618,862	3,574,626
Full-time Equivalents Total *	22.47	24.54	24.54	24.54

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

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

#### **Purpose Statement**

The Annual Certification and Inspection Overhead Allocations program represents the share of Departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to the Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level.

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget by approximately \$37,000 to accommodate the reapportionment of Departmental overhead costs.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Annual Certification & Inspection Overhead Allocations	575,097	855,044	861,576	824,551

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

The purpose of the Annual Certification and Inspection program is to provide inspections of mechanical equipment at installation and on an annual or biennial cycle in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner. These services are provided to ensure 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**

Decrease budget by approximately \$20,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by approximately \$12,000, for a net reduction from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$7,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Annual Certification and Inspection	1,987,681	2,716,668	2,757,286	2,750,075
Full-time Equivalents Total*	22.47	24.54	24.54	24.54

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

#### **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, and deterioration of structures and properties is reduced. Additionally, this Budget Control Level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of Departmental administration and other overhead costs.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Code Compliance	3,483,662	3,151,675	3,216,846	3,327,217
Code Compliance Overhead Allocations	681,880	767,164	768,779	734,882
Total	4,165,542	3,918,839	3,985,625	4,062,099
Full-time Equivalents Total *	33.46	30.88	30.88	30.88

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# **Code Compliance: Code Compliance Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Code Compliance program 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**

Add \$120,000 to allow abatement services to be undertaken for properties deemed hazardous to health and/or safety of tenants, property owners, neighbors, or the general public. Funding comes from the Abatement Fund which is supported either voluntarily by the property owner, or through a tax lien on the property requiring the abatement. Prior to 2005, the budget authority for abatements was flagged as a continuing appropriation. Budget authority for abatement services will now be granted through the annual budget process.

Decrease budget by approximately \$19,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$10,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$110,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Code Compliance	3,483,662	3,151,675	3,216,846	3,327,217
Full-time Equivalents Total*	33.46	30.88	30.88	30.88

 $<sup>*</sup>FTE\ totals\ provided\ for\ information\ purposes\ only.\ Authorized\ positions\ are\ reflected\ in\ the\ Position\ List\ Appendix.$ 

## **Code Compliance: Code Compliance Overhead Allocations Purpose Statement**

The Code Compliance Overhead Allocations program represents a proportionate share of Departmental administration and other overhead costs to report the full cost of the related programs.

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget by approximately \$34,000 to accommodate the reapportionment of departmental overhead costs.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Code Compliance Overhead Allocations	681.880	767,164	768,779	734.882

#### **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. Additionally, this Budget Control Level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	<b>Actuals</b>	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Building Inspections Program	2,809,246	4,714,457	4,814,784	4,812,388
Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations	1,976,064	2,663,218	2,659,572	2,659,572
Electrical Inspections	2,242,205	3,011,540	3,073,829	3,085,379
Signs and Billboards	171,777	225,990	230,347	230,849
Site Review and Inspection	2,262,767	2,405,260	2,453,846	2,452,683
Total	9,462,059	13,020,465	13,232,378	13,240,871
Full-time Equivalents Total *	75.51	81.10	81.10	82.10

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# **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 to approve projects as substantially complying with applicable City codes, ordinances, and approved plans, and issue final approvals for occupancy.

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget by approximately \$18,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Approximately \$1.32 million in contingent budget authority is included in this program's budget. This amount was included in the 2006 Endorsed Budget and is not changed in the 2006 Proposed Budget. Consistent with Council Resolution 30357, the Department prepares a budget proposing contingent budget authority. This contingent budget authority may be granted in increments of expenditure and positions associated with increases to actual or revised revenue forecasts which deviate from the original revenue forecasts.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$16,000, for a net reduction from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
<b>Building Inspections Program</b>	2,809,246	4,714,457	4,814,784	4,812,388
Full-time Equivalents Total*	28.27	30.96	30.96	30.96

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## **Construction Inspections: Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations**

#### **Purpose Statement**

This cost allocation program represents the proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to this budget control level, in order to report the full cost and calculate the revenue requirements of the budget control level and programs.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations	1,976,064	2,663,218	2,659,572	2,659,572
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.45	9.25	9.25	9.25

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# 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 1.0 FTE Electrical Inspector Senior to extend contingent position authority granted in 2005 as part of a contingent budget authority request triggered by increased electrical permit volumes and revenue.

Reduce budget by approximately \$3,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the department.

Approximately \$325,000 in contingent budget authority is included in this program's budget. This amount was included in the 2006 Endorsed and is not changed in the 2006 Proposed Budget. Consistent with Council Resolution 30357, the Department prepares a budget proposing contingent budget authority. This contingent budget authority may be granted in increments of expenditure and positions associated with increases to actual or revised revenue forecasts which deviate from the original revenue forecasts. In addition, this program is using approximately \$87,000 in contingent budget authority granted in 2005 and proposed for re-appropriation in the 2006 Proposed Budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$15,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$12,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006	
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed	
Electrical Inspections	2,242,205	3,011,540	3,073,829	3,085,379	
Full-time Equivalents Total*	18.59	20.18	20.18	21.18	

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## **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**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget. Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$1,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Signs and Billboards	171,777	225,990	230,347	230,849
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.29	1.62	1.62	1.62

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

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

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

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget by approximately \$11,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$10,000, for a net decrease from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Site Review and Inspection	2,262,767	2,405,260	2,453,846	2,452,683
Full-time Equivalents Total*	18.91	19.09	19.09	19.09

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

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

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Applicant Services Center	4,681,193	5,043,613	5,148,932	5,181,013
Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations	2,019,236	2,133,371	2,130,450	2,066,293
Construction Plans Administration	4,061,598	7,203,563	7,376,672	7,574,811
Operations Division Management	849,419	1,774,299	1,830,241	1,836,920
Public Resource Center	1,242,809	1,327,461	1,351,362	1,347,694
Total	12,854,255	17,482,307	17,837,657	18,006,731
Full-time Equivalents Total *	104.65	112.08	112.08	119.08

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## **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**

Add 2.0 FTE Land Use Planner IIs, and 2.0 FTE Permit Review Specialists to extend contingent position authority granted in 2005 as part of a contingent budget authority request triggered by increased building permit volumes and revenue.

Increase budget by approximately \$6,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Approximately \$1.96 million in contingent budget authority is included for both the Applicant Services Center and the Construction Plans Administration programs in the Construction Plans Administration program. This amount was included in the 2006 Endorsed Budget and is not changed in the 2006 Proposed Budget. Consistent with Council Resolution 30357, the Department prepares a budget proposing contingent budget authority. This contingent budget authority may be granted in increments of expenditure and positions associated with increases to actual or revised revenue forecasts which deviate from the original revenue forecasts. In addition, this program is using approximately \$319,000 in contingent budget authority granted in 2005 and proposed for re-appropriation in the 2006 Proposed Budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$26,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$32,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Applicant Services Center	4,681,193	5,043,613	5,148,932	5,181,013
Full-time Equivalents Total*	50.40	52.95	52.95	56.95
*FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Author	ized positions are reflected	d in the Position Lis	t Appendix.	

## **Construction Permit Services: Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations program represents the proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs to report the full cost of the related programs.

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget by approximately \$40,000 to accommodate the reapportionment of Departmental overhead costs.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Construction Permit Services Overhead	2,019,236	2,133,371	2,130,450	2,066,293

# **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**

Transfer approximately \$171,000 to this program from the Process Improvements and Technology program to fund the addition of 2.0 FTE Structural Building Plans Engineers, with a corresponding reduction in temporary employee use.

Reduce budget by approximately \$54,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs for City services distributed throughout the Department.

Approximately \$1.96 million in contingent budget authority is included for the Construction Plans Administration program and is shared with the Applicant Services Center program. This amount was included in the 2006 Endorsed Budget and is not changed in the 2006 Proposed Budget. Consistent with Council Resolution 30357, the Department prepares a budget proposing contingent budget authority. This contingent budget authority may be granted in increments of expenditure and positions associated with increases to actual or revised revenue forecasts which deviate from the original revenue forecasts. In addition, this program is using approximately \$88,000 in contingent budget authority granted in 2005 and proposed for re-appropriation in the 2006 Proposed Budget.

Add 1.0 FTE Structural Plans Engineer to extend position authority granted in 2005 as part of a contingent budget authority request triggered by increased building permit volumes and revenue.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$35,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$152,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Construction Plans Administration	4,061,598	7,203,563	7,376,672	7,574,811
Full-time Equivalents Total*	34.43	47.27	47.27	50.27

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

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

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

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget. Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by approximately \$7,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Operations Division Management	849,419	1,774,299	1,830,241	1,836,920

# **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 Department regulations and current applications; to provide applicants with first point of contact; and to preserve, maintain, and provide access to records for Department staff and the public.

#### **Program Summary**

Decrease budget by approximately \$7,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by approximately \$3,000, for a net reduction from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$4,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
Public Resource Center	1,242,809	1,327,461	1,351,362	1,347,694
Full-time Equivalents Total*	19.82	11.86	11.86	11.86

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

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

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Contingent 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.

#### **Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Contingent Budget Authority	0	0	0	0

#### **Department Strategy Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Department Strategy Budget Control Level is to develop and implement business strategies to improve the performance of the organization; ensure that managers and staff have the information, tools and training needed for managing and making decisions; set fees that reflect the cost of services; and maintain a community relations program. Additionally, this Budget Control Level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Community Relations	444,851	494,698	504,048	506,025
Department Strategy Overhead Allocations	-6,840,565	-8,499,861	-8,458,683	-8,481,018
Director's Office	644,855	752,580	766,986	772,054
Finance and Accounting Services	1,869,532	2,514,211	2,384,474	2,388,938
Human Resources	910,181	995,121	1,004,296	1,006,529
Information Technology Services	2,971,146	3,743,251	3,798,879	3,807,472
Total	0	0	0	0
Full-time Equivalents Total *	45.51	40.02	40.02	40.02

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## **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, to explain the Department's responsibilities, processes, and actions so Department's services are clearly understood by applicants and the general public; and to respond to public concerns related to the Department's responsibilities.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget. Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$2,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Community Relations	444,851	494,698	504,048	506,025
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.28	3.65	3.65	3.65

 $<sup>*</sup>FTE\ totals\ provided\ for\ information\ purposes\ only.\ Authorized\ positions\ are\ reflected\ in\ the\ Position\ List\ Appendix.$ 

## **Department Strategy: Department Strategy Overhead Allocations Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Department Strategy Overhead Allocations program is to represent the proportionate share of Departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to the Department Strategy Budget Control Level, in order to report the full cost and calculate the revenue requirements of the related programs.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Department Strategy Overhead Allocations	-6,840,565	-8,499,861	-8,458,683	-8,481,018

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

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

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget. Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$5,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006	
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed	
Director's Office	644,855	752,580	766,986	772,054	
Full-time Equivalents Total*	9.03	5.58	5.58	5.58	

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## **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 Department management, and develop and maintain financial systems based on Program and Funding Study principles so that people, tools, and resources are managed effectively with a changing workload and revenue stream.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget. Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$4,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	<b>Actuals</b>	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Finance and Accounting Services	1,869,532	2,514,211	2,384,474	2,388,938
Full-time Equivalents Total*	15.25	13.74	13.74	13.74

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## Department Strategy: Human Resources Purpose Statement

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

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget. Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$2,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Human Resources	910,181	995,121	1,004,296	1,006,529
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.95	5.28	5.28	5.28

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# **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 the Department and other City staff, so that Department management and staff have the technology tools and support necessary to meet its business objectives.

#### **Program Summary**

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget. Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$9,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Information Technology Services	2,971,146	3,743,251	3,798,879	3,807,472
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.00	11.77	11.77	11.77

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### **Judgment and Claims Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Judgment and Claims	1,399,968	332,633	332,633	332,633

#### **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. These services are intended to ensure development proposals are reviewed in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner, and substantially comply with applicable codes, legal requirements, policies, and community design standards. Additionally, this Budget Control Level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
•	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Land Use Services	3,587,571	4,725,949	4,813,584	4,826,373
Land Use Services Overhead Allocations	906,321	1,242,330	1,251,685	1,258,925
Total	4,493,892	5,968,279	6,065,269	6,085,298
Full-time Equivalents Total *	34.42	36.35	36.35	38.35

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## Land Use Services: Land Use Services Purpose Statement

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

#### **Program Summary**

Add 2.0 FTE Land Use Planner II positions to extend position authority granted in 2005 as part of a contingent budget authority request triggered by increased land use permit volumes and revenue.

Decrease budget by approximately \$4,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$17,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$13,000.

Approximately \$180,000 in contingent budget authority is included in this program's budget. This amount was included in the 2006 Endorsed Budget and is not changed in the 2006 Proposed Budget. Consistent with Council Resolution 30357, the Department prepares a budget proposing contingent budget authority. This contingent budget authority may be granted in increments of expenditure and positions associated with increases to actual or revised revenue forecasts which deviate from the original revenue forecasts. In addition, this program is using approximately \$169,000 in contingent budget authority granted in 2005 and proposed for re-appropriation in the 2006 Proposed Budget.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Land Use Services	3,587,571	4,725,949	4,813,584	4,826,373
Full-time Equivalents Total*	34.42	36.35	36.35	38.35

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## Land Use Services: Land Use Services Overhead Allocations Purpose Statement

This Land Use Services Overhead Allocations program represents a proportionate share of Departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to the Land Use Services Budget Control Level, to report the full cost of the related programs.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase overhead by approximately \$7,000 to accommodate the reapportionment of Departmental overhead costs.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Land Use Services Overhead Allocations	906.321	1.242.330	1.251.685	1.258.925

#### **Planning Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Planning Budget Control Level to inform and guide planning and design choices for shaping and preserving Seattle so that it is a vital urban environment, and thus to develop appropriate land use policies. Planning staff does this work by researching and implementing the best in urban design strategies in Seattle neighborhood plans and in Seattle's public spaces such as the environment of streets, open spaces and related development patterns, and supporting the Comprehensive Plan's core values of community, environmental stewardship, social equity and economic opportunity. Additionally, this Budget Control Level includes the allocation of a proportionate share of departmental administration and other overhead costs.

Program Expenditures	2004	2005	2006	2006
	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Comprehensive and Regional Planning	491,501	526,894	491,245	965,812
Land Use Policy and Code Development	1,320,716	1,171,245	1,013,785	1,558,356
Planning Commission	238,851	240,856	130,294	192,344
Planning Division Management	337,133	255,553	260,772	262,477
Planning Overhead Allocations	681,967	838,734	786,621	936,795
Urban Design	1,153,422	1,205,183	1,175,512	1,252,681
Total	4,223,590	4,238,465	3,858,229	5,168,465
Full-time Equivalents Total *	29.48	29.81	29.81	36.31

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### 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**

Increase budget by \$50,000 for one year to use professional consultant services for the Duwamish Mitigation Plan in response to the City's Environmentally Critical Areas ordinance. The consultant works with Department staff to create a mitigation plan for shoreline/habitat improvements along the Duwamish. The plan allows developers to contribute to the implementation of coordinated improvements, rather than to site-by-site mitigation. Funding comes from a grant from the King County Conservation District.

Increase budget by approximately \$223,000 in one-time General Fund resources for the Department's portion of the joint Developer Transportation Fee with the Seattle Department of Transportation to expand transportation mitigation programs in Downtown, Northgate and the University District. This funding supports the salary and benefits associated with an existing 0.5 FTE Planning and Development Specialist Senior and consultant contracts to develop the funding formulas for developer mitigation payments. This request is combined with redirected funding of approximately \$441,000 for 0.35 FTE already budgeted for 2006, for a total staff level of 0.85 FTE in 2006.

Increase budget by approximately \$99,000 in Sound Transit resources and add 1.0 FTE Planning & Development Senior to staff the preparation of Light Rail Station Area Plans for the Brooklyn station in the University District, the Roosevelt station and Northgate station, as well as related revisions to the adopted Neighborhood Plans.

Increase budget by approximately \$109,000 for the salary and benefits associated with a currently unfunded Land Use Planner to implement the Mayor's Center City Strategy. This position coordinates Center City design and development projects between City departments and the public to ensure that a comprehensive urban design framework is used. The position works with City staff and the public to provide specific design direction for development gaps and opportunities existing in the Center City.

Reduce budget by approximately \$9,000 to accommodate the reallocation of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$2,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$475,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Comprehensive and Regional Planning	491,501	526,894	491,245	965,812
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.00	4.84	4.84	5.84

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### 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 land use policy choices leading to regulations that implement the Comprehensive Plan, Neighborhood Plans and other adopted City policies, and to clearly articulate these policies and regulations to development applicants, property owners, residents, developers, the general public, and staff.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase budget by approximately \$349,000 in other resources and approximately \$55,000 in General Subfund to consolidate the Green Building Team in the Department. Of the other resources, approximately \$201,000 is backed by funding from Seattle City Light and Seattle Public Utilities to support transfer of 2.0 FTE Planning & Development Specialists. Additionally, approximately \$155,000 of other resources are used from permit revenues to support 1.0 FTE Planning & Development Specialist Senior and half of the salary and benefits for a 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor. The other half of the Strategic Advisor position's salary and benefits are covered by approximately \$55,000 in General Fund Resources. The primary goal of the consolidation is to shift the team's efforts toward improved coordination and assistance for private development, and to encourage a greater market for sustainable development.

Increase budget by approximately \$156,000, including funds for a consultant to design and develop an interactive Land Use Code (LUC) website based on new organization principles, and create an improved hard copy design and layout of the LUC. The new LUC form will include physical illustrations and graphics suitable for both web and hard copy applications. Funding in the amount of approximately \$56,000 is added for an existing 0.5 FTE Planning & Development Specialist Senior to coordinate the overall LUC reformatting.

Reduce appropriation by approximately \$21,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$5,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$545,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Land Use Policy and Code Development	1,320,716	1,171,245	1,013,785	1,558,356
Full-time Equivalents Total*	10.78	9.21	9.21	13.21

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

## 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 to steward the ongoing development and implementation of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase appropriation by approximately \$62,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$200, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$62,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Planning Commission	238,851	240,856	130,294	192,344
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.00	2.26	2.26	2.26

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### Planning: Planning Division Management Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Planning Division Management 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 changes from the 2006 Endorsed Budget. Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$2,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Planning Division Management	337,133	255,553	260,772	262,477
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	4.70	4.70	4.70

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

# Planning: Planning Overhead Allocations Purpose Statement

The Planning Overhead Allocations program represents a proportionate share of Departmental administration and other overhead costs that apply to the Planning Budget Control Level, to report the full cost of the related programs.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase appropriation by approximately \$150,000 to accommodate the reapportionment of Departmental overhead costs.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Planning Overhead Allocations	681,967	838,734	786,621	936,795

## **Planning: Urban Design**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Urban Design program is to foster urban design excellence in Seattle's public spaces, 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**

Increase position authority by 0.5 FTE Planning & Development Specialist II position to convert ongoing work completed by temporary staff into a permanent position. The type of work accomplished is graphic support on presentation materials for different initiatives such as the Center City Strategy including the Waterfront Plan, downtown zoning and the South Downtown study, code simplification, Southeast Seattle, other Land Use Code changes, and other planning projects.

Increase budget authority by approximately \$99,000 representing the use of permit fee revenue to fund an existing 0.5 FTE Urban Design Planner and consultant contracts. This increment supports Department staff working with private developers to create and pay for the development of great public spaces, improvements made in the public right-of-way.

Increase budget by \$250,000 in one-time General Subfund resources for a consultant contract to create a coordinated plan for the development and design of sidewalks, streetscapes, open spaces and public art installations on and accessory to the downtown waterfront.

Increase budget by approximately \$97,000 in one-time General Subfund resources and add 1.0 FTE Planning & Development Specialist Senior to create recommendations for Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code and Seattle Shoreline Master Program (SSMP) amendments and to create Sustainable Development Guidelines and amend the Comprehensive Plan as necessary.

Increase budget by approximately \$70,000 to fund an existing 1.0 FTE Planning & Development Specialist Senior position. This position is funded by a grant from the Washington State Ferries (WSF) and will be responsible for working with WSF on Comprehensive Plan and SSMP code amendments necessary for redevelopment of the Colman Dock, as well as provide recommendations on the SEPA determination and the Environmental Impact Statement alternatives.

Reduce budget by approximately \$494,000 for expenditures related to planning for the Seattle Monorail Project's new Green Line Monorail facilities, pending resolution of the status of the monorail project.

Increase budget by approximately \$47,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$7,000, for a net increase from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$77,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Urban Design	1,153,422	1,205,183	1,175,512	1,252,681
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.70	8.80	8.80	10.30

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

#### **Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

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

#### **Summary**

Transfer approximately \$171,000 to the Department's Construction Plans Administration program. These funds previously supported temporary Structural Building Plans Engineers which are converted to permanent positions.

Add 1.0 FTE Information Technology Professional A Exempt, 2.0 FTE Information Technology Professional Bs, and 2.0 FTE Information Technology Professional Cs as a result of a central review of IT staff augmentation contract use. This budget-neutral adjustment transfers responsibilities from individuals working for outside agencies to permanent City employees.

Increase appropriation by approximately \$5,000 to accommodate the reallocation of costs of City services distributed throughout the Department.

Citywide adjustments to labor costs increase the budget by \$16,000, for a net reduction from the 2006 Endorsed Budget to the 2006 Proposed Budget of approximately \$150,000.

	2004	2005	2006	2006
Expenditures/FTE	Actuals	Adopted	<b>Endorsed</b>	Proposed
Process Improvements and Technology	6,015,052	4,941,252	5,018,726	4,868,711
Full-time Equivalents Total*	24.75	19.22	19.22	24.22

2005

2006

2000

<sup>\*</sup>FTE totals provided for information purposes only. Authorized positions are reflected in the Position List Appendix.

### 2006 Estimated Revenues for the Planning and Development Fund

Summit Code	Source	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
422111	Building Development	18,107,000	17,400,000	18,100,000	19,500,000
422115	Land Use	3,857,000	4,007,000	4,243,720	4,900,000
422130	Electrical	3,722,000	3,750,000	3,900,000	3,950,000
422150	Boiler	810,000	820,000	850,000	937,000
422160	Elevator	1,901,000	2,300,000	2,392,000	2,382,000
437010	Grant Revenues	1,090,000	1,400,000	1,458,000	901,000
443694	Site Review & Development	1,478,000	1,289,000	1,445,000	1,619,000
445800	Design Commission	218,000	313,000	321,000	335,000
461110	Interest	369,000	250,000	260,000	200,000
469990	Contigent Revenues	0	3,640,000	3,640,000	2,753,050
469990	Other Revenues	1,986,000	2,300,000	2,392,000	2,585,000
587001	General Subfund Support	9,583,466	8,251,052	7,847,743	8,913,509
587900	SPU MOA for Side Sewer & Drainage	745,000	950,000	950,000	1,011,000
Tota	l Revenues	43,866,466	46,670,052	47,799,463	49,986,559
379100	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	1,310,670	6,803,900	6,149,916	5,352,875
Tota	l Resources	45,177,136	53,473,952	53,949,379	55,339,434

#### 2006 Contingent Authority - Reserve & Expenditure Tables

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

Summit Code	Source	2004 Actual	2005 Adopted	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
422111	Building Development	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 3,280,000
422115	Land Use	-	500,000	500,000	180,000
422130	Electrical	-	500,000	500,000	325,000
	<b>Total Revenues</b>	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 3,785,000
371000	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	-	(1,360,000)	(1,360,000)	(1,031,950)
	<b>Total Resources</b>	\$ -	\$ 3,640,000	\$ 3,640,000	\$ 2,753,050

<u>Note:</u> Consistent with Council Resolution 30357, DPD shall prepare its budget in a manner that proposes authorizing additional expenditure and position 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.

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

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

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

## 2006 Contingent Authority - Reserve & Expenditure Tables (cont.)

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

<b>Electrical Inspection with Plan</b>	Review	
_	Contingent	Contingent
Unanticipated Revenue	Buget	FTE
-\$100,000 or less	(50,400)	-0.40
- \$99,999 to \$99,999	-	0.00
\$100,000 to \$199,999	50,400	0.40
\$200,000 to \$299,999	100,800	0.90
\$300,000 to \$399,999	151,200	1.30
\$400,000 to \$499,999	201,600	1.70
\$500,000 and above	285,000	2.00

#### **Planning and Development Fund**

	2004 Actuals	2005 Adopted	2005 Revised	2006 Endorsed	2006 Proposed
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	3,246,498	2,880,109	2,880,109	1,587,122	1,587,122
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	944,281				
Plus:Actual and Estimated Revenue	43,866,466	46,670,052	47,180,965	47,799,463	49,986,559
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	45,177,136	53,473,952	48,473,952	53,949,379	55,339,434
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	2,880,109	(3,923,791)	1,587,122	(4,562,794)	(3,765,753)

Note: In the 2005 and 2006 budgets, there is appropriation authority of approximately \$4.9 million each year in the Process Improvements and Technology BCL, primarily to complete implementation of new permitting systems and related process improvements. If all of this authority were expended, the result would overspend the set asides established for this BCL. In developing its 2005-06 budget, DPD prepared a business case for technology improvements that anticipated this deficit. Cash resources to cover these expenditures are available in the form of deferred revenues (payments in advance of services from customers) which are currently \$8.5 million and vary between \$7 million and \$10 million during an economic cycle.

DPD now expects that at least \$5 million of its 2005 authority is unnecessary, and is reduced in the 2005 3rd quarter supplemental ordinance. There may be additional underspending in 2006, so that the actual deficit will be much smaller than what is displayed in the table. Whatever deficit actually does result by the end of 2006 will be eliminated in the next few years as contributions to the Process Improvements and Technology set aside continue but expenditures are reduced.