

# Department of Planning and Development

## Diane Sugimura, Director

### Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-8600

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

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

### Department Description

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

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

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

DPD enforces compliance with community standards for housing, zoning, shorelines, tenant relocation assistance, just cause eviction, vacant buildings, noise, and development-related violation complaints, responding to more than 7,000 complaints annually.

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

## Planning and Development

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

### Policy and Program Changes

The Department of Planning and Development's 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget maintains funding for the Department to continue to meet its regulatory responsibilities, and continues to fund City priorities to the extent possible while responding to significant fiscal challenges. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. The 2010 Adopted Budget anticipated a slowing in regional construction activity and, as a result, the Department reduced expenditures by eliminating regular positions and discretionary costs, and abrogating nearly all term-limited and contingent positions that were added to address peak construction volumes. In developing the 2011 Adopted Budget, the City of Seattle's General Fund was facing a \$67 million shortfall for 2011. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget includes reductions for all General Fund-dependent functions, including DPD.

In the first quarter of 2010, DPD again reduced its planned ongoing expenditures reflected in the 2010 Adopted Budget by realigning spending with anticipated revenues. Together, changes from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget have resulted in the elimination or unfunding of 94 positions, or 24% of the Department's total FTE count.

DPD continues to actively evaluate span of control of managers and supervisors. Since January 2010, including the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget process, span of control evaluations have resulted in the elimination of four manager and eight supervisor positions. In addition, three senior positions in the Executive and Manager classifications have been reduced to lower level classifications. A number of these management-level position reductions are outlined in the discussion below.

#### Development Fees - Construction:

The impacts of the recession, both regionally and nationally, have been deeper and longer than anticipated, particularly in construction-related activity, resulting in the need for additional reductions in DPD in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget. As of August, 2010, the volume of incoming building permits is approximately 30% lower than the peak of development activity in 2007. Meanwhile, permit values - which drive revenues - are approximately 50% lower.

Since 2007, DPD building and land use revenues are down 49%, and revenues are anticipated to be relatively flat moving forward. DPD has implemented another round of mid-year budget cuts, effective in October, 2010, to bring expenses in line with projected revenues and account for reserves that will soon be depleted. These additional reductions are reflected in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget and impacts an additional 42 positions: 19 positions in Construction Permit Services, 12 positions in Land Use Services, 5 positions in Construction Inspections, 4 positions in Department Leadership, and 2 positions in Planning Services - all of which are proposed to be abrogated or unfunded.

Staffing reductions in DPD's operational divisions - including land use services, permit and construction services, and various inspection services - reduce the department's capacity to provide optimal service delivery to applicants, other customers, and the general public. Examples of anticipated impact on service levels include: longer waits for intake appointments; reduced hours of operation for the Applicant Services Center (ASC); delays in processing applications; longer plan and permit review times; discontinuance of many "free" services, such as

## Planning and Development

coaching; and possible delays in meeting the City's goals for inspecting within 24 hours of request and for minimum length of time from permit intake to issuance. The severity of the impacts will be directly related to the amount of permit activity, but in all cases DPD will continue to strive to minimize disruption of service levels and effects on service quality.

### General Fund - Planning:

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns the Planning program functions and reduces Planning resources to help balance the General Fund budget. The Planning Division is supported primarily by the General Fund, and includes Planning Commission and Design Commission dedicated staff. The Planning Division is reorganized in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget to streamline the Division's management, improve span of control, and provide more integrated urban design support for planning efforts across the city. This reorganization results in the abrogation of the City Design Manager position, which also served as the Executive Director of the Seattle Design Commission. The work performed by this position will be fulfilled by other staff dedicated to the Design Commission.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget for the Planning Division also assumes the continuation of reductions taken in mid-year 2010. These changes include the abrogation of a part-time Administrative Specialist I position that supported the Planning Commission; reduction of two planners from full-time to part-time, the elimination of an Administrative Specialist III position that supported the urban design programs in the Department; and the elimination of a Graphic Arts Designer position, which supported the graphic production needs of the Planning Division. The impact of these position changes is reduced administrative support to the Planning Director and to the Design Commission, less planning support to address work program priorities, and less capacity for public information and outreach. In addition, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget for the Planning Division reduces planned consultant expenditures associated with the Shoreline Master Program. DPD will still be able to effectively implement this Program; however, the remaining staff will be limited in their ability to perform additional technical research or analysis without the availability of consultant resources.

As part of the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget, the City will proceed with the community outreach work for the next round of Neighborhood Plan Updates in Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake and Rainier Beach, starting with a coordinated infrastructure planning initiative focusing on these neighborhoods in particular. In early 2011, this work will be followed by an analysis of GIS data to identify current needs, demands from anticipated future growth, and to identify the best opportunities for cross-departmental coordination to complete projects more efficiently in these neighborhoods. As a result of General Fund budget reductions in the Planning Division, along with this modified approach to neighborhood planning in 2011, DPD's 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget abrogates one Land Use Planner position and reduces funding for urban design consultant services and Planning Outreach Liaisons (POL) to a level considered to be sufficient for continuing the POL outreach model in 2011. The Adopted Budget also reallocates one Land Use Planner position to a Strategic Advisor II position to identify and resolve cross departmental capital infrastructure policy issues in conjunction with neighborhood planning efforts and develop financing strategies, in coordination with the City Budget Office, that consider a range of public and private sector approaches, and better inform the neighborhood planning process. This position will fill a critical gap in the Planning Division by developing strategies to effectively finance infrastructure and related needs.

### General Fund - Code Compliance:

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget also reduces staff in the Code Compliance program, which is primarily funded by General Fund. The Budget reduces two Housing/Zoning Inspectors and reduces one of two Housing/Zoning Inspector Supervisor positions, resulting in an increased span of control for the remaining

## Planning and Development

supervisor. In order to maintain manageable caseloads and preserve acceptable case timeframes, remaining code enforcement inspectors will prioritize complaints primarily based on public safety and hazardous conditions.

In addition, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget reflects the continuation of the mid-year reduction of a part-time Housing Ordinance Specialist and a reduction to part-time of a Code Compliance Analyst. As a result of this reduction, the Department will maintain adequate service levels at current levels of demand for matters within DPD's enforcement authority, but will provide less public assistance on matters not within DPD's authority to enforce but for which the Department receives many requests for assistance, such as state landlord/tenant law. The Adopted Budget also reduces an Administrative Specialist I position which will cause work to be distributed to other remaining support or Housing/Zoning Technician positions.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget adds a part-time Housing/Zoning Inspector to perform administrative and enforcement duties associated with rental housing inspector testing and registration. Finally, as a result of the positions reduced in Code Compliance, five vehicles are removed from DPD's fleet, resulting in savings in the Adopted Budget.

### Other Issues:

Direct and front-line services have been prioritized in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget. To achieve this goal, every department was asked to critically evaluate funding needs for departmental travel and training expenditures to determine which items were essential to include and those that could be forgone. As a result of this evaluation, DPD reduced travel and training expenditures. This reduction is captured within the administrative efficiencies descriptions detailed in the following pages.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget also recognizes two new revenues to offset General Fund contributions. In 2011 and the first half of 2012, DPD will receive funding from the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA) to fund half of a full-time Planning and Development Specialist position assisting in the redevelopment of the Yesler Terrace property. Similarly, in 2011 only, DPD will transfer 25% of the personnel costs for a position within DPD's Green Building Program from the General Fund to funding provided by the US Department of Energy through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program.

### City Council Provisos

There are no Council provisos.

## Planning and Development

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
<b>Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level</b>					
Annual Certification & Inspection Overhead Allocations		990,601	1,008,523	1,187,558	1,212,107
Annual Certification and Inspection		2,675,389	2,472,566	2,780,608	2,837,417
<b>Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U24A0</b>	<b>3,665,990</b>	<b>3,481,088</b>	<b>3,968,165</b>	<b>4,049,524</b>
<b>Code Compliance Budget Control Level</b>					
Code Compliance		3,287,529	3,734,539	3,422,417	3,484,086
Code Compliance Overhead Allocations		1,043,581	1,141,755	1,199,730	1,226,583
<b>Code Compliance Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2400</b>	<b>4,331,110</b>	<b>4,876,294</b>	<b>4,622,147</b>	<b>4,710,669</b>
<b>Construction Inspections Budget Control Level</b>					
Building Inspections Program		3,865,522	3,475,621	2,821,722	2,874,664
Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations		0	3,975,754	3,483,029	3,565,666
Construction Inspections Unallocated CBA		0	1,798,947	1,798,947	1,798,947
Electrical Inspections		3,548,030	3,527,130	3,317,017	3,382,920
Signs and Billboards		279,207	252,275	144,613	147,704
Site Review and Inspection		2,220,170	2,448,564	1,742,487	1,774,726
<b>Construction Inspections Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U23A0</b>	<b>9,912,928</b>	<b>15,478,292</b>	<b>13,307,815</b>	<b>13,544,628</b>
<b>Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level</b>					
Applicant Services Center		6,783,772	6,299,051	5,233,865	5,332,372
Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations		3,562,061	3,096,514	3,309,311	3,376,579
Construction Permit Services Unallocated CBA		3,628,153	3,150,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
Construction Plans Administration		5,512,657	4,761,626	2,969,837	3,018,275
Operations Division Management		1,249,303	1,824,856	678,662	686,194
Public Resource Center		1,090,269	1,615,111	1,059,685	1,078,219
<b>Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2300</b>	<b>21,826,215</b>	<b>20,747,158</b>	<b>17,151,360</b>	<b>17,391,640</b>

## Planning and Development

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
<b>Department Leadership Budget Control Level</b>					
Community Relations		360,591	428,938	435,016	442,136
Department Leadership Overhead Allocations		(12,424,066)	(12,452,208)	(12,083,156)	(12,354,445)
Director's Office		634,093	699,104	746,582	758,534
Finance and Accounting Services		5,708,037	5,587,921	5,834,133	5,999,923
Human Resources		468,009	504,207	322,470	327,682
Information Technology Services		5,253,335	5,232,037	4,744,955	4,826,169
<b>Department Leadership Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Land Use Services Budget Control Level</b>					
Land Use Services		4,363,788	3,886,512	2,220,354	2,256,550
Land Use Services Overhead Allocations		1,608,637	1,641,294	1,007,223	1,035,812
Land Use Services Unallocated CBA		0	500,000	500,000	500,000
<b>Land Use Services Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2200</b>	<b>5,972,425</b>	<b>6,027,805</b>	<b>3,727,576</b>	<b>3,792,362</b>
<b>Planning Budget Control Level</b>					
Design Commission		265,195	273,743	235,189	237,793
Planning Commission		435,693	407,296	390,968	397,164
Planning Overhead Allocations		1,591,033	1,588,368	1,896,305	1,937,696
Planning Services		5,277,939	4,641,209	4,201,656	4,193,329
<b>Planning Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2900</b>	<b>7,569,859</b>	<b>6,910,618</b>	<b>6,724,118</b>	<b>6,765,982</b>
<b>Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level</b>	<b>U2800</b>	<b>2,255,965</b>	<b>3,036,445</b>	<b>776,261</b>	<b>791,388</b>
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>55,534,492</b>	<b>60,557,700</b>	<b>50,277,443</b>	<b>51,046,192</b>
<b>Department Full-time Equivalents Total*</b>		<b>409.00</b>	<b>409.00</b>	<b>397.75</b>	<b>397.75</b>
<i>* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.</i>					
		<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Resources</b>		<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
General Subfund		9,752,507	9,990,982	9,120,445	9,300,870
Other		45,781,985	50,566,718	41,156,997	41,745,322
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>55,534,492</b>	<b>60,557,700</b>	<b>50,277,443</b>	<b>51,046,192</b>

# Planning and Development

## Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

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

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Annual Certification & Inspection Overhead Allocations	990,601	1,008,523	1,187,558	1,212,107
Annual Certification and Inspection	2,675,389	2,472,566	2,780,608	2,837,417
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,665,990</b>	<b>3,481,088</b>	<b>3,968,165</b>	<b>4,049,524</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	20.72	20.72	23.49	23.49

*\*FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

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

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Increase budget by approximately \$179,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Annual Certification & Inspection Overhead Allocations	990,601	1,008,523	1,187,558	1,212,107

# Planning and Development

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

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

## Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$7,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$21,000 in savings.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$337,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$308,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Annual Certification and Inspection	2,675,389	2,472,566	2,780,608	2,837,417
Full-time Equivalents Total*	20.72	20.72	23.49	23.49

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*



# Planning and Development

## Code Compliance Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Expenditures

	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Code Compliance	3,287,529	3,734,539	3,422,417	3,484,086
Code Compliance Overhead Allocations	1,043,581	1,141,755	1,199,730	1,226,583
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,331,110</b>	<b>4,876,294</b>	<b>4,622,147</b>	<b>4,710,669</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	32.28	32.28	28.53	28.53

*\*FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Code Compliance: Code Compliance

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce General Fund allocation by approximately \$173,000 and abrogate 1.87 FTE Housing/Zoning Inspector positions. These two positions support the Code Compliance program by responding to code violation complaints and performing standard enforcement actions. In order to maintain manageable caseloads and preserve acceptable case timeframes, remaining code enforcement inspectors will prioritize complaints by first responding to violations where a hazardous condition is reported. For example, weeds and vegetation will have the lowest priority and generally will result in a response of mailing information to the property at issue, unless a public safety hazard is indicated or the property is vacant. In those instances, additional steps will be taken to address the violation conditions, including site visits when a hazard is reported, and research to identify a responsible party in cases of vacant property.

Reduce General Fund allocation by approximately \$106,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Housing/Zoning Inspector, Supervisor position. With fewer inspectors as described above, the responsibilities of this position will be taken on by the remaining Housing/Zoning Inspector, Supervisor and the Housing and Zoning Inspector, Sr. positions.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$45,000, and abrogate 0.5 FTE Housing Ordinance Specialist position.

Reduce General Fund allocation by approximately \$59,000 and abrogate 0.87 FTE Administrative Specialist II. The work performed by this position will be redistributed among remaining administrative support positions.

Reduce General Fund allocation by \$22,000 and reduce a 1.0 FTE Code Compliance Analyst to 0.75 FTE. This position provides support for DPD code violation enforcement cases and responds to claims and Public Disclosure Act requests.

Add approximately \$49,000 and 0.5 FTE Housing/Zoning Inspector to oversee the City's new rental housing inspection certification program requiring rental units to meet local housing code standards. This fee-supported position will staff the inspector certification program and perform associated enforcement duties.

Reduce budget authority by \$29,000 and remove five sedans from the DPD vehicle fleet as a result of the Citywide vehicle review intended to make the City's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient, and as a result of the positions being reduced in this program.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$2,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

## Planning and Development

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$23,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$5,000 is saved in the Code Compliance Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$104,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$312,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Code Compliance	3,287,529	3,734,539	3,422,417	3,484,086
Full-time Equivalents Total*	32.28	32.28	28.53	28.53

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

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

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

### **Program Summary**

Increase budget by approximately \$58,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Code Compliance Overhead Allocations	1,043,581	1,141,755	1,199,730	1,226,583

# Planning and Development

## Construction Inspections Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

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

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Building Inspections Program	3,865,522	3,475,621	2,821,722	2,874,664
Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations	0	3,975,754	3,483,029	3,565,666
Construction Inspections Unallocated CBA	0	1,798,947	1,798,947	1,798,947
Electrical Inspections	3,548,030	3,527,130	3,317,017	3,382,920
Signs and Billboards	279,207	252,275	144,613	147,704
Site Review and Inspection	2,220,170	2,448,564	1,742,487	1,774,726
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,912,928</b>	<b>15,478,292</b>	<b>13,307,815</b>	<b>13,544,628</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	86.04	86.04	75.84	75.84

*\*FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Inspections: Building Inspections Program

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by approximately \$556,000 to reflect reductions in five positions supporting the Building Inspections program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes include retaining position authority but unfunding five regular positions, including 3.0 FTE Building Inspector, Senior, 1.0 FTE Building Inspector, Journey, and 1.0 FTE Manager II.

Increase budget authority by approximately \$9,000 to reflect changes in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget containing the use of contingent budget authority (CBA). Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$1.6 million in contingent budget authority for building inspections could be accessed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget intends to access none of this authority, however, so the full balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$22,000 in savings.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$85,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$654,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Building Inspections Program	3,865,522	3,475,621	2,821,722	2,874,664
Full-time Equivalents Total*	31.33	31.33	30.32	30.32

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Inspections: Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by approximately \$493,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Construction Inspections Overhead Allocations	0	3,975,754	3,483,029	3,565,666

## Construction Inspections: Construction Inspections Unallocated CBA

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

In 2011, a total of \$1.8 million in contingent authority in the Construction Inspections BCL will not be accessed, including \$1.6 million for construction inspections in the Building Inspections program, and \$199,000 for electrical inspections with plan review from the Electrical Inspections program. The unallocated authority has been transferred into this program to facilitate oversight and monitoring.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Construction Inspections Unallocated CBA	0	1,798,947	1,798,947	1,798,947

# Planning and Development

## Construction Inspections: Electrical Inspections

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by approximately \$103,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Electrical Inspector, Sr. position supporting the Electrical Inspections program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload.

Increase budget authority by \$7,000 to reflect an increase in expenditures for travel and training expenses within this program.

Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget containing the use of contingent budget authority (CBA). Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$620,000 in contingent budget authority for electrical inspection with plan review could be accessed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget intends to access \$421,000 of this authority, and the remaining balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$27,000 in savings.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$88,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$210,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Electrical Inspections	3,548,030	3,527,130	3,317,017	3,382,920
Full-time Equivalents Total*	29.49	29.49	26.09	26.09

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction 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

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$108,000 from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Signs and Billboards	279,207	252,275	144,613	147,704
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.14	2.14	1.25	1.25

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*



# Planning and Development

## Construction Inspections: Site Review and Inspection

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$355,000 to reflect reductions in three positions supporting the Site Review and Inspection program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes include retaining position authority but unfunding 2.0 FTE Site Review Inspectors and 1.0 FTE Site Review Engineer, Supervisor.

Increase budget authority by approximately \$2,000 to reflect changes in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$14,000 in savings.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$339,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$706,000.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Site Review and Inspection	2,220,170	2,448,564	1,742,487	1,774,726
Full-time Equivalents Total*	23.09	23.09	18.18	18.18

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

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

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Applicant Services Center	6,783,772	6,299,051	5,233,865	5,332,372
Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations	3,562,061	3,096,514	3,309,311	3,376,579
Construction Permit Services Unallocated CBA	3,628,153	3,150,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
Construction Plans Administration	5,512,657	4,761,626	2,969,837	3,018,275
Operations Division Management	1,249,303	1,824,856	678,662	686,194
Public Resource Center	1,090,269	1,615,111	1,059,685	1,078,219
<b>Total</b>	<b>21,826,215</b>	<b>20,747,158</b>	<b>17,151,360</b>	<b>17,391,640</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	140.85	140.85	147.02	147.02

*\*FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services: Applicant Services Center

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$700,000 to reflect reductions in six positions supporting the Applicant Services Center program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes are as follows:

- Retain position authority but unfund five regular positions, including 3.0 FTE Land Use Planner II, 1.0 FTE Permit Technician and 1.0 FTE Permit Specialist II.
- Retain position authority but reduce 1.0 FTE Permit Specialist II position to 0.5 FTE.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$1,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget containing the use of contingent budget authority (CBA). Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$500,000 in contingent budget authority for construction plan review could be accessed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget intends to access none of this authority, so the full balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$42,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$7,000 is saved in the Applicant Service Center Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$315,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1.07 million.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Applicant Services Center	6,783,772	6,299,051	5,233,865	5,332,372
Full-time Equivalents Total*	72.86	72.86	77.98	77.98

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services: Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Increase budget by approximately \$213,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Construction Permit Services Overhead Allocations	3,562,061	3,096,514	3,309,311	3,376,579

## Construction Permit Services: Construction Permit Services Unallocated CBA

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

In 2011, a total of \$3.9 million in contingent authority in the Construction Permit Services BCL will not be accessed, including \$1.9 million for construction plan review and \$1.5 million for peer review contracts from the Construction Plans Administration program and \$500,000 for construction plan review from the Applicant Services Center. The unallocated authority has been transferred into this program to facilitate oversight and monitoring.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Construction Permit Services Unallocated CBA	3,628,153	3,150,000	3,900,000	3,900,000

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services: Construction Plans Administration

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$729,000 to reflect reductions in five positions supporting the Construction Plans Administration program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes include retaining position authority but unfund 5.0 FTE Structural Plans Engineers.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$71,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

Transfer \$750,000 to the Construction Permit Services Unallocated Contingent Budget Authority (CBA) program. Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget containing the use of contingent budget authority. Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$1.9 million in contingent budget authority for construction plan review and \$1.5 million for peer review contracts could be accessed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget intends to access none of this authority, however, so the full balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$25,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$17,000 is saved in the Construction Plans Administration Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$950,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1.79 million.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Construction Plans Administration	5,512,657	4,761,626	2,969,837	3,018,275
Full-time Equivalents Total*	32.78	32.78	34.17	34.17

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services: Operations Division Management

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$427,000 to reflect reductions in three positions supporting the Operations Division Management program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes are as follows:

- Retain position authority but unfund two regular positions, including 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II, and 1.0 FTE Management Systems Analyst, Senior.
- Retain position authority but reduce 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Engineering & Plans Review position to 0.5 FTE.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$11,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$5,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$8,000 is saved in the Operations Division Management Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$696,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1.15 million.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Operations Division Management	1,249,303	1,824,856	678,662	686,194
Full-time Equivalents Total*	19.58	19.58	19.59	19.59

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Construction Permit Services: Public Resource Center

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$140,000 to reflect reductions in three positions supporting the Public Resource Center program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes include retaining position authority but unfunding three regular positions, including 1.0 FTE Permit Technician, 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II, and 1.0 FTE Office Assistant.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$50,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including consulting resources, supplies, and travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$6,000 in savings.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$359,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$555,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Public Resource Center	1,090,269	1,615,111	1,059,685	1,078,219
Full-time Equivalents Total*	15.63	15.63	15.28	15.28

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Expenditures

	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Community Relations	360,591	428,938	435,016	442,136
Department Leadership Overhead Allocations	-12,424,066	-12,452,208	-12,083,156	-12,354,445
Director's Office	634,093	699,104	746,582	758,534
Finance and Accounting Services	5,708,037	5,587,921	5,834,133	5,999,923
Human Resources	468,009	504,207	322,470	327,682
Information Technology Services	5,253,335	5,232,037	4,744,955	4,826,169
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	46.31	46.31	49.79	49.79

*\*FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

## Department Leadership: Community Relations

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$6,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$6,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Community Relations	360,591	428,938	435,016	442,136
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.00	3.00	3.12	3.12

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*



# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership: Department Leadership Overhead Allocations Purpose Statement

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

## Program Summary

Increase budget by approximately \$369,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Department Leadership Overhead Allocations	-12,424,066	-12,452,208	-12,083,156	-12,354,445

# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership: Director's Office

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Transfer in \$69,000 and 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II from the Planning Services Program to the Director's Office to align current business practice and assist with department-wide support services.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$10,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$6,000 in savings.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$10,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including consulting resources, supplies, and travel and training expenses.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$9,000 is saved in the Director's Office Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$4,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$47,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Director's Office	634,093	699,104	746,582	758,534
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.18	4.18	5.34	5.34

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership: Finance and Accounting Services

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$2,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$12,000 in savings.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$281,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$260,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Finance and Accounting Services	5,708,037	5,587,921	5,834,133	5,999,923
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.25	13.25	16.51	16.51

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership: Human Resources

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Retain position authority, but reduce budget by \$84,000 and unfund 1.0 FTE vacant Personnel Specialist, Supervisor position to assist in balancing DPD's budget. The unfunding of this position will result in a reduction of performance development and workforce analysis services to department staff and supervisors. Crucial Human Resource duties will be absorbed by the Administration Division Director.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$97,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$182,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Human Resources	468,009	504,207	322,470	327,682
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.14

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Department Leadership: Information Technology Services

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$382,000 to reflect reductions in one position supporting the Building Inspections program, including \$85,000 in savings for consultant services. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes include retaining position authority but unfunding 1.0 FTE Information Technology Systems Analyst.

Reduce budget authority by \$73,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Information Technology Technical Support position. The elimination of this position will discontinue the Department's development of SharePoint sites. Remaining staff in the IT Services group will absorb additional workloads.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$19,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$21,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$51,000 is saved in the Information Technology Services Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$58,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$487,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Information Technology Services	5,253,335	5,232,037	4,744,955	4,826,169
Full-time Equivalents Total*	20.88	20.88	20.68	20.68

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Land Use Services Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Expenditures

	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Land Use Services	4,363,788	3,886,512	2,220,354	2,256,550
Land Use Services Overhead Allocations	1,608,637	1,641,294	1,007,223	1,035,812
Land Use Services Unallocated CBA	0	500,000	500,000	500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,972,425</b>	<b>6,027,805</b>	<b>3,727,576</b>	<b>3,792,362</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	35.84	35.84	34.63	34.63

*\*FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Land Use Services: Land Use Services

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$1.22 million to reflect reductions in 12 positions supporting the Land Use Services program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes are as follows:

- Retain position authority but unfund 9.08 FTE Land Use Planner II positions and 1.0 FTE Manager III, Engineering & Plans Review position.
- Reduce one 1.0 FTE Land Use Planner II, 1.0 FTE Land Use Planner III, and 1.0 FTE Planning and Development Specialist, Senior to 0.5 FTE.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$4,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

Consistent with Resolution 30347, the Department prepares a budget containing the use of contingent budget authority (CBA). Contingent authority of budget and positions may be granted when actual or revised revenue forecasts exceed the original revenue forecasts. In this program, up to \$500,000 in contingent budget authority for land use could be accessed if required by demand-driven revenue levels. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget intends to access none of this authority, however, so the full balance is displayed in the appropriate program for unallocated CBA.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$18,000 in savings.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$423,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1.67 million.

## Planning and Development

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Land Use Services	4,363,788	3,886,512	2,220,354	2,256,550
Full-time Equivalents Total*	35.84	35.84	34.63	34.63

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

### Land Use Services: Land Use Services Overhead Allocations

#### Purpose Statement

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

#### Program Summary

Reduce budget by approximately \$634,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Land Use Services Overhead Allocations	1,608,637	1,641,294	1,007,223	1,035,812

### Land Use Services: Land Use Services Unallocated CBA

#### Purpose Statement

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

#### Program Summary

In 2011, a total of \$500,000 in contingent authority in the Land Use Services BCL will not be accessed. The unallocated authority has been transferred into this program to facilitate oversight and monitoring.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Land Use Services Unallocated CBA	0	500,000	500,000	500,000



# Planning and Development

## Planning Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Expenditures

	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Design Commission	265,195	273,743	235,189	237,793
Planning Commission	435,693	407,296	390,968	397,164
Planning Overhead Allocations	1,591,033	1,588,368	1,896,305	1,937,696
Planning Services	5,277,939	4,641,209	4,201,656	4,193,329
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,569,859</b>	<b>6,910,618</b>	<b>6,724,118</b>	<b>6,765,982</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	40.25	40.25	33.03	33.03

*\*FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

## Planning: Design Commission

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$2,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$36,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$38,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Design Commission	265,195	273,743	235,189	237,793
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.00	2.00	1.87	1.87

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Planning: Planning Commission

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$39,000 and abrogate 0.5 FTE Administrative Specialist II. Remaining staff will absorb essential administrative duties.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$6,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including reducing funding to purchase data from external sources to describe rental affordability trends, and reducing travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$29,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$16,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Planning Commission	435,693	407,296	390,968	397,164
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.50	3.50	2.62	2.62

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

## Planning: Planning Overhead Allocations

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Increase budget by approximately \$308,000 to reflect the reapportionment of departmental overhead allocations based on staffing levels across the Department's budget control levels.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Planning Overhead Allocations	1,591,033	1,588,368	1,896,305	1,937,696

# Planning and Development

## Planning: Planning Services

### Purpose Statement

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

### Program Summary

Increase budget by \$2,000 to reflect reductions in one position supporting the Planning Services program. The construction industry in Seattle and throughout the region continues to experience a slowdown. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget realigns fee-supported budget and position authority with anticipated revenues and workload. In this program, the position changes include retaining position authority but unfunding 1.0 FTE Management Systems Analyst, Senior.

Reduce General Fund allocation by approximately \$173,000 to realign resources with a modified approach to updating Neighborhood Plans. Beginning in late 2010, DPD led an initial phase of coordinated infrastructure planning beginning that precedes community outreach work in the two new Neighborhood Plan areas, Broadview/Bitterlake/Haller Lake, and Rainier Beach. The coordinated infrastructure planning initiative identifies and coordinates infrastructure improvements where possible in these neighborhoods to better inform and support the neighborhood planning process. This reduction abrogates 1.0 FTE Planning & Development Specialist II, and reallocates 1.0 Land Use Planner III position to a Strategic Advisor II position, to identify funding for capital projects to address neighborhood infrastructure deficiencies, and reduces consultant resources associated with the Neighborhood Planning Program by approximately \$93,000.

Reduce General Fund allocation by approximately \$129,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager 3. The work performed by this position is fulfilled by other staff dedicated to the Design Commission.

Reduce General Fund allocation by approximately \$122,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist III and 1.0 FTE Graphic Arts Designer. Additional workloads are shifted to remaining administrative staff support for the Planning Division.

Reduce General Fund allocation by approximately \$103,000 and reduce 1.0 FTE Land Use Planner IV position to 0.5 FTE and 1.0 FTE Planning & Development Specialist, Senior position to 0.5 FTE.

Transfer out \$69,000 and 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II from the Planning Services Program to the Director's Office to align the placement of the position with current business practices, and assist with department-wide support services.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$44,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for consultant resources associated with the Shoreline Master Program Update. This reduction limits DPD's ability to acquire additional technical or scientific information needed outside of the dept, however DPD will effectively implement the Shoreline Master Program update required by the State of Washington.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$6,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies, including travel and training expenses.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

## Planning and Development

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$33,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$24,000 is saved in the Planning Services Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$261,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$440,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Planning Services	5,277,939	4,641,209	4,201,656	4,193,329
Full-time Equivalents Total*	34.75	34.75	28.54	28.54

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

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

### Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$207,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for maintenance contracts, computer materials and supplies, and consultant resources. These reductions reflect the scaling-back of the Process Improvements and Technology program to a level that can be supported by projected permit fee revenues.

FTE counts shown below may reflect position changes, or re-allocations, made outside of the budget process.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$6,000 in savings.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$2.05 million for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$2.26 million.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Process Improvements and Technology	2,255,965	3,036,445	776,261	791,388
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.71	6.71	5.42	5.42

*\* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.*

# Planning and Development

## 2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Planning and Development Fund

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
422111	Building Development	17,920,503	19,869,257	14,969,975	16,945,042	18,646,334
422115	Land Use	4,768,983	4,998,214	3,660,658	3,664,138	3,700,780
422130	Electrical	4,277,520	4,102,880	3,729,135	4,464,226	4,508,868
422150	Boiler	1,152,482	1,142,410	1,189,573	1,211,356	1,223,470
422160	Elevator	2,713,999	2,707,467	2,588,996	2,588,996	2,614,886
437010	Grant Revenues	380,199	319,898	222,980	280,880	162,489
443694	Site Review & Development	1,055,472	1,259,423	1,170,742	1,259,601	1,272,197
461110	Interest	271,465	250,000	119,884	100,000	100,000
469990	Contingent Revenues - Unaccessed	0	5,448,979	(200,000)	6,198,979	6,198,979
469990	Other Revenues	1,327,788	1,411,623	1,344,781	1,180,755	1,192,562
587001	General Subfund Support	9,753,005	9,990,985	9,727,578	9,120,445	9,300,870
587116	Cumulative Reserve Fund-REET I - TRAO	131,345	113,000	70,802	150,000	154,500
587116	Cumulative Reserve Fund-Unrestricted - Design Commission	377,450	374,000	353,047	370,383	374,087
587116	Cumulative Reserve Fund-Unrestricted - TRAO	0	74,000	40,000	74,172	76,397
587900	Green Building Team - SPU & SCL	635,613	587,780	538,981	587,780	593,658
587900	SPU MOA for Side Sewer & Drainage	1,517,332	1,630,343	1,133,102	1,350,000	1,363,500
<b>Total Revenues</b>		<b>46,283,156</b>	<b>54,280,259</b>	<b>40,660,233</b>	<b>49,546,755</b>	<b>51,483,577</b>
379100	Use of (Contribution To) Fund Balance	9,251,337	6,277,441	3,741,046	730,688	(437,385)
<b>Total Resources</b>		<b>55,534,492</b>	<b>60,557,700</b>	<b>44,401,279</b>	<b>50,277,443</b>	<b>51,046,192</b>

# Planning and Development

## 2011- 2012 DPD Contingent Budget Authority

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

DPD's contingent budget authority is displayed fully in Budget Control Levels (BCLs) in the City's Adopted Budget. The authority is associated with various categories of work, such as Construction Plan Review, and triggered by unanticipated levels of various fee revenues, such as Building Development fees. Although all of DPD's contingent authority is displayed in the BCLs in this budget document, not all of it is planned to be accessed in 2011. Table 1 below, details total contingent budget authority, as well as amounts anticipated to be accessed in 2011. The remaining authority will not be accessed without approval, which would be based on an analysis of revenue deviations from the budget forecast, as described in Table 2 below. Beginning with the 2010 Adopted Budget, the unaccessed contingent authority is displayed in each BCL in a separate program created for this purpose.

**Table 1: Total and Accessed Contingent Budget Authority, 2011 Adopted**

BCL	Contingent Authority Category	Revenue Source	2010 Adopted Authority	2010 Adopted Accessed	2011 Adopted Authority	2011 Adopted Accessed
Const Insp	Const Inspection	Bldg Dvlpmt	1,600,000	-	1,600,000	-
Const Insp	Elec Insp w/Plan Review	Electrical	620,000	421,053	620,000	421,053
Cons Permit Svcs	Cons Plan Review	Bldg Dvlpmt	2,400,000	-	2,400,000	-
Cons Permit Svcs	Peer Review Contracts	Bldg Dvlpmt	1,500,000	750,000	1,500,000	-
Land Use	Land Use	Land Use	500,000	-	500,000	-
<b>Total Contingent Budget Authority</b>			<b>6,620,000</b>	<b>1,171,053</b>	<b>6,620,000</b>	<b>421,053</b>

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

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

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

## Planning and Development

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

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

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



## Planning and Development

### Planning and Development Fund

	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>21,894,615</b>	<b>13,373,538</b>	<b>9,678,507</b>	<b>5,737,461</b>	<b>5,006,773</b>
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	(2,964,772)	0	0	0	0
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	46,283,156	54,280,259	40,660,233	49,546,755	51,483,577
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	55,534,492	60,557,700	44,601,279	50,277,443	51,046,192
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>9,678,507</b>	<b>7,096,097</b>	<b>5,737,461</b>	<b>5,006,773</b>	<b>5,444,158</b>
Core Staffing, Process Improvements and Technology	3,418,313	1,911,259	1,234,417	852,395	758,158
<b>Total Reserves</b>	<b>3,418,313</b>	<b>1,911,259</b>	<b>1,234,417</b>	<b>852,395</b>	<b>758,158</b>
<b>Ending Unreserved Fund Balance</b>	<b>6,260,194</b>	<b>5,184,838</b>	<b>4,503,044</b>	<b>4,154,378</b>	<b>4,686,000</b>