

NEIGHBORHOODS & DEVELOPMENT

Office of Economic Development

Stephen H. Johnson, Director

Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-8090

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

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

Department Description

The mission of the Office of Economic Development (OED) is to help create a vibrant economy by promoting access to economic opportunities for all of Seattle's diverse communities. OED supports economic development that is financially, environmentally, and socially sustainable. The core services OED provides capitalize on Seattle's established economic activity, particularly in the areas of manufacturing and maritime industries, film and music, healthcare, and clean technology. To accomplish this mission, the Office delivers services designed to:

- Support the establishment of new businesses, retention and growth of existing businesses, and attraction of new businesses;
- Increase the number of low-income adults who obtain the skills necessary to meet industry's needs for qualified workers; and
- Advance policies, practices, and partnerships that lead to sustainable economic growth with shared prosperity.

Policy and Program Changes

In 2009, OED engaged in a strategic planning review of the services provided by the Office in relation to other City departments and local economic development entities. As a result of this process, the Office was restructured in the 2010 Adopted Budget. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget continues to reflect the new operating structure and strategic planning agenda. In 2011-2012, the Office will focus on a number of important policy initiatives to accomplish these outcomes, including the active retention of Seattle businesses; distribution of \$70 million in business financing; realignment of work force investments to increase the number of low-income, low-skilled Seattle residents who obtain a degree or credential beyond high school to meet industry's needs for qualified workers; and execution of the Mayor's Seattle Jobs Plan released in 2010.

In developing the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget, the City of Seattle was facing a \$67 million shortfall. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget includes reductions for all General Fund-dependent functions. In identifying reductions, OED focused on strategies that would realize reductions while prioritizing work force development programs that provide education and training for low-income job-seekers that lead to good-paying jobs in demand by employers. In addition, OED has identified ways in which current programs can be restructured to be more cost effective and outcome oriented.

Program Expense Reductions:

The budget identifies savings to the General Fund by reducing program expenses in a number of areas. OED proposes creating 'Only in Seattle', a new Neighborhood Business Revitalization program by combining the elements of the existing Neighborhood Business District (NBD), Commercial District Revitalization (CDR), and Farmers Market Alliance (FMA) programs. Only in Seattle will be funded at \$150,000 less than the combined 2010 level of General Fund support in order to realize savings. However, this reduction will be mitigated by providing an integrated approach that will leverage partnerships between neighborhood business associations and

Economic Development

neighborhood businesses. The new focus formally adopts the structure of the current CDR program as the framework for all OED investments in neighborhood commercial districts. This framework emphasizes and funds strategies for marketing and promotion of neighborhood commercial districts, diversifying the current mix of businesses, maintaining a clean and safe environment, improving physical attractiveness, and building the organizational capacity of the community to execute neighborhood-based economic development strategies. OED has engaged neighborhood business district leaders to identify the best timing and approach for transitioning from the current structure to the new framework. Part of this engagement included collaboration with neighborhood business leaders to set specific targets for improving commercial districts and to align shared investments and efforts to achieve those targets.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget mitigates the impact to work force development activities to the extent possible. However, to address the General Fund shortfall, the budget reduces funding for work force investment activities by approximately \$253,000. This reduces funding available to OED's work force development contracts with PortJobs, Worker's Center, and the Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI). It is anticipated that this change will not result in a significant change to the outcomes related to these work force development contracts. OED will continue to collaborate with community-based organizations, community colleges, and employers to improve the results of their collective investments in education, training, and career advancement of low-skilled adults.

The Mayor's Small Business Award program is also restructured to assist with balancing the General Fund, and will continue to recognize small businesses using existing events and staff resources. In an effort to be more efficient with their funding, OED creates a dynamic, year-long program to recognize Seattle's businesses through a variety of methods, including featuring businesses as part of their monthly networking event, "Business Casual." This approach will require no General Subfund operating support above the allocation of staff time.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget reduces funding to the Seattle Convention and Visitors Bureau (SCVB) to assist with balancing the General Fund. The reduction is taken in order to preserve higher priority investments in work force development as described above. In addition, the budget maintains the approach taken in the 2010 Adopted Budget and does not provide inflationary adjustments to any professional service contracts within the OED budget.

The budget also seeks to create efficiencies between the Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) and OED by consolidating the Seattle Climate Partnership program within OED. This budget transfers in one position to OED to add capacity to OED's ability to support Seattle businesses. Specifically, the position will help deliver environmental technical assistance and energy efficiency incentive programs for targeted business, such as independent grocery stores and restaurants, in low-income neighborhoods.

Internal/Administrative Efficiencies:

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget identifies operational efficiencies to discretionary spending, including reducing expenditures for communications, organizational development, copying, and computer hardware replacement. Savings are also realized through the elimination of inflationary increases for contracted services, and reclassification of a senior-level position to an administrative support position. To further realize administrative savings, all non-represented staff members in OED will take a seven-day furlough and no market rate salary adjustment is provided for OED staff that are non-represented employees in the City's discretionary pay plans.

Economic Development

Revenue Changes:

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget makes changes to respond to new revenues to the City that will be administered by OED. The Budget recognizes New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) fees as revenues to the General

Fund that will support expenses associated with managing the NMTC program. This adjustment recognizes new resources to the General Fund, but does not change the overall appropriation authority in OED's budget. The Budget also adds one term-limited position in OED to support a \$1.4 million grant the City received from Public Health - Seattle & King County outside of the budget process in 2010. The grant is part of a two-year \$25.5 million federal stimulus grant that Public Health received to address obesity and tobacco use. OED will use this grant to develop and implement the "Business Incentive Program to Improve Access to Healthy Food" which will increase healthy food options in targeted low-income Seattle communities.

Technical Change:

As part of a technical adjustment, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget restores \$624,000 in funding for workforce development investments in 2011 to support workforce education, training, and career advancement as intended through prior budget actions. This additional funding maintains workforce development investments and outcomes at a level in 2011 that is generally consistent with 2010 funding levels.

City Council Provisos

There are no Council provisos.

Economic Development

	Summit Code	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Appropriations					
CDBG - Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level					
Community Development		3,509,402	5,003,675	5,003,675	5,003,675
CDBG - Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level	6XD10	3,509,402	5,003,675	5,003,675	5,003,675
Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level					
Business Development		1,478,563	0	0	0
Business Services		0	4,902,051	5,102,316	4,603,112
Community Development		1,124,856	0	0	0
Economic Development Leadership		0	568,769	576,385	593,469
Finance and Operations		1,144,730	707,937	660,119	678,587
Work Force Development		2,963,002	0	0	0
Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level	X1D00	6,711,151	6,178,757	6,338,820	5,875,168
Department Total		10,220,552	11,182,432	11,342,495	10,878,843
Department Full-time Equivalents Total*		20.00	20.00	22.00	22.00
<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>					
Resources					
General Subfund		6,711,151	6,178,757	6,338,820	5,875,168
Other		3,509,402	5,003,675	5,003,675	5,003,675
Department Total		10,220,552	11,182,432	11,342,495	10,878,843

Economic Development

CDBG - Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) - Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level is to help create and maintain healthy businesses, thriving neighborhoods, and community organizations to contribute to a robust economy that will benefit all Seattle residents and future generations. The federal CDBG program provides a major source of funding for community development programs affecting Seattle's low- and moderate-income households and neighborhoods. The City of Seattle makes these investments so all families and individuals can meet their basic needs, share in economic prosperity, and participate in building a safe, healthy, educated, just, and caring community. Policies and priorities for distributing CDBG funds to community-based organizations are set out in the City's 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development, which is coordinated by the Human Services Department.

Summary

The 2011-2012 Budget estimates the amount of CDBG dollars the City anticipates to be available, anticipates appropriations of these funds, and makes specific CDBG proposals for certain City programs in the Human Services Department, Office of Economic Development, and Office of Housing. Final CDBG program allocations are subject to the appropriation levels set by the U.S. Congress and implemented by HUD.

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

Expenditures

	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Community Development	3,509,402	5,003,675	5,003,675	5,003,675

Economic Development

Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level is to provide vital services to individual businesses and economic development leadership to support a strong local economy, thriving neighborhood business districts, and broadly-shared prosperity.

Program Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Business Development	1,478,563	0	0	0
Business Services	0	4,902,051	5,102,316	4,603,112
Community Development	1,124,856	0	0	0
Economic Development Leadership	0	568,769	576,385	593,469
Finance and Operations	1,144,730	707,937	660,119	678,587
Work Force Development	2,963,002	0	0	0
Total	6,711,151	6,178,757	6,338,820	5,875,168
Full-time Equivalents Total *	20.00	20.00	22.00	22.00

**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.*

Office of Economic Development: Business Development

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Business Development Program is to develop, manage, and support initiatives building on Seattle's economic foundations to maintain Seattle's competitiveness, promote business growth, and connect residents to good jobs. Business development activities are focused on the creation and implementation of strategies to promote growth in Seattle's key industry sectors and to support the development and sustainability of the City's small businesses. The Business Development Program works closely with industry leaders and other City departments to maintain Seattle's positive business climate, to encourage growth of a diverse and vibrant local economy, and to help businesses understand and navigate processes, regulations, and policies.

Program Summary

As part of the 2010 Adopted Budget, a departmental reorganization resulted in the transfer of all funding and positions from the Business Development program to other programs within OED. As a result, there are no resources allocated in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget for this program.

Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Business Development	1,478,563	0	0	0

Economic Development

Office of Economic Development: Business Services

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Business Services Program is to provide direct services to businesses and to support a healthy business environment that empowers businesses to develop, grow and succeed. The three key service areas include providing assistance navigating government services, facilitating access to capital and building management expertise, and investing in workforce development services focused on building skills that benefit individual job-seekers and support employers in key industry sectors.

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$150,000 and integrate OED's existing Neighborhood Business District (NBD) and Commercial District Revitalization programs into a new program called 'Only in Seattle'. The integrated approach will leverage partnerships between neighborhood business associations and neighborhood businesses, and enable the City to invest more resources over several years in targeted neighborhood business districts.

Transfer in \$150,000 and 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, General Government position from the Office of Sustainability and Environment to OED. This shift represents the consolidation of the Seattle Climate Partnership program within OED, and enhances OED's ability to provide technical assistance to Seattle businesses.

Reduce budget by \$177,000 in funding to the Seattle Convention & Visitors Bureau. This reduction maintains \$50,000 in OED to support Seattle tourism.

Reduce budget by \$64,000 to reflect the elimination of inflationary increases for all contracted services in OED.

Reduce budget by \$48,000 and reallocate 1.0 Executive 2 position to a 1.0 FTE Administrative Staff Assistant position. This change realigns the position title with the current responsibilities of the position, and results in no FTE change.

Reduce budget by \$28,000 in recognition of a seven-day furlough that non-represented OED staff members will take in 2011. This furlough is in addition to the salary freeze for employees in the Strategic Advisor, Manager, Executive, and non-represented IT Professional classifications.

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.

Increase budget by approximately \$28,000 as part of a set of internal transfers throughout the Office, which net to zero. The purpose of this redistribution is to reflect a more accurate application of budgeted expenditures by program.

Increase workforce development funding by \$371,000. This change is the net result of increasing the budget by \$624,000 in one-time funding in 2011 to correct an accounting error from a previous year, and reducing the overall workforce development budget by \$253,000 to assist in balancing the General Fund.

As a result of the City receiving a \$1.4 million grant from Public Health - Seattle & King County accepted through legislation outside of the budget process, add a 1.0 FTE Community Development Specialist position. This position is term-limited and will sunset upon conclusion of the grant.

Economic Development

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$124,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$200,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Business Services	0	4,902,051	5,102,316	4,603,112
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.00	13.00	15.00	15.00

** 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.*

Office of Economic Development: Community Development

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

As part of the 2010 Adopted Budget, a departmental reorganization transferred all funding and positions from the Community Development program to other programs within OED. As a result, there are no resources allocated in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget for this program.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Community Development	1,124,856	0	0	0

Economic Development

Office of Economic Development: Economic Development Leadership Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Economic Development Leadership Program is to play a leadership role in the creation of the City of Seattle's economic agenda through analysis of timely opportunities and development of targeted areas of focus for OED and relevant City and community partners. This program supports OED in serving as the convener of a broad range of the business community, reflecting the knowledge and networks needed to make informed decisions on economic policies and strengthen alignment of city, regional, state, and federal economic development activities.

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$10,000 in recognition of a seven-day furlough that non-represented OED staff members will take in 2011. This furlough is in addition to the salary freeze for employees in the Strategic Advisor, Manager, Executive, and non-represented IT Professional classifications.

Reduce budget by approximately \$20,000 as part of a set of internal transfers throughout the Office, which net to zero. The purpose of this redistribution is to reflect a more accurate application of budgeted expenditures by program.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by approximately \$38,000, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$8,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Economic Development Leadership	0	568,769	576,385	593,469
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

** 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.*

Economic Development

Office of Economic Development: Finance and Operations

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Finance and Operations Program is to provide leadership and financial, administrative, and human resources to effectively accomplish OED's mission and goals. This program was restructured in the 2010 Adopted Budget from the Management and Operations Program to the Finance and Operations Program.

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$16,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for communications activities, staff and organizational development, copying, and computer hardware replacement.

Reduce budget by \$10,000 as part of redefining the delivery of the Mayor's Small Business Awards Program.

Reduce budget by approximately \$8,000 as part of a set of internal transfers throughout the Office, which net to zero. The purpose of this redistribution is to reflect a more accurate application of budgeted expenditures by program.

Reduce budget by approximately \$2,000 in recognition of a seven-day furlough that non-represented OED staff members will take in 2011. This furlough is in addition to the salary freeze for employees in the Strategic Advisor, Manager, Executive, and non-represented IT Professional classifications.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$12,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$48,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Finance and Operations	1,144,730	707,937	660,119	678,587
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00

** 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.*

Economic Development

Office of Economic Development: Work Force Development

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Work Force Development Program is to provide work force development services to businesses, community organizations, residents, the Mayor, the City Council, and other public decision makers, so employers meet their need for qualified workers, and all residents, particularly those who are disadvantaged, secure and retain family-wage jobs. The work of this program remains a priority for the Office, however, OED believes that better services will be provided to businesses and job seekers in Seattle if it is aligned within the goals of the Business Services program.

Program Summary

As part of the 2010 Adopted Budget, a departmental reorganization transferred all funding and positions from the Work Force Development program to other programs within OED. As a result, there are no resources allocated in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget for this program.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Work Force Development	2,963,002	0	0	0

Economic Development

2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Community Development Block Grant Fund

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
431010	Federal Grant and Other Income	3,509,402	5,003,675	5,003,675	5,003,675	5,003,675
Total Revenues		3,509,402	5,003,675	5,003,675	5,003,675	5,003,675

Office of Housing

Richard Hooper, Acting Director

Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-0721

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

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

Department Description

The mission of the Office of Housing (OH) is to invest in and promote the development and preservation of housing so that all Seattle residents have access to safe, decent, and affordable housing. To accomplish this mission, OH has four programs reflected in the budget as the Multi-Family Production and Preservation Program; Homeownership and Sustainability Program; Community Development Program; and the Administration and Management Program.

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

The Homeownership and Sustainability Program provides funding, including loans and grants, to low-income and low-to-moderate income Seattle residents. These include loans to first-time homebuyers, home repair loans to address health and safety and code repairs, and grants to make low-income housing more energy efficient.

The Community Development Program provides strategic planning, program development, and disposition of vacant land for redevelopment purposes to increase housing opportunities for Seattle residents. In particular, this program is shifting focus in 2011-2012 to more sustainable community building strategies and partnership building activities.

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

In 2010, OH began implementing the voter-approved 2009 Housing Levy, totaling \$145 million for 2010 - 2016. The 2011 Adopted Budget is consistent with the Administration and Financial Plan approved by the City Council in Ordinance 123281. The renewed Housing Levy is expected to produce or preserve 1,850 affordable homes and assist 3,420 households. In addition, other key funding sources to support low income housing activities through the Office of Housing are federal grants, developer incentive program revenues, local and state weatherization grants, investment earnings, and loan repayment income.

Policy and Program Changes

The Office of Housing budget includes both the Office of Housing Operating Fund (16600) and the Low-Income Housing Capital Fund (16400). Each year, the Office of Housing budget reflects the anticipated funding amounts to be received from local, state, and federal sources for direct housing activities in Fund 16400, and recognizes the allowable portion of these funds for administration in Fund 16600. In addition, the Housing Operating Fund 16600 relies in part on the General Fund to complete the funding necessary to maintain operations for the department. Beginning in 2011, the budget associated with the Community Development

Block Grant funds (CDBG) supporting housing programs are shown within the OH budget, although the funding authority will continue to reside with the CDBG Fund (17810). There are no substantive changes to the CDBG budget in 2011-2012. The following provides a summary of the changes to the Office of Housing Operating Fund (16600) and the Low-Income Housing Capital Fund (16400).

Low-Income Housing Capital Fund (16400):

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget for the Low-Income Housing Capital Fund (16400) reflects an overall decrease of approximately \$5 million, or 12%, of total resources in comparison to the 2010 Adopted Budget. The most significant change is the reduction of \$4 million in contingent Bonus Program appropriations. Bonus Program funds appropriated in prior years continue to be spent down in 2011, and a sustained level of appropriation authority is not needed in 2011. In addition, the Budget for the Low-Income Housing Capital Fund (16400) realigns funding for Levy-funded activities with the 2009 Housing Levy Administration and Financial Plan. As part of this realignment, funding is increased for single-family homebuyer activities and multi-family production and preservation activities, primarily for down payment assistance loans for first-time homebuyers and for the construction and renovation of rental housing for low-income families. Levy funding is decreased in comparison to 2010 for the operations and maintenance activities associated with OH's existing Housing portfolio. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget also reflects increases in state and federal grant awards to make low-income housing more energy efficient. These increases in funding are anticipated to be partially offset by reductions in appropriations from the federal HOME grant, anticipated reductions in investment earnings on fund balances, and reductions in program income.

Office of Housing Operating Fund (16600):

In developing the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget, the City of Seattle's General Fund was facing a \$67 million shortfall. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget includes reductions for all General Fund-dependent functions. OH has identified General Fund savings to help close the General Fund gap by abrogating two full-time positions, reclassifying and identifying salary savings associated with ongoing positions, and identifying internal and administrative efficiencies. These changes are described below.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget eliminates a Sr. Community Development Specialist position in the Office. This change will reduce the overall capacity of the Office to staff existing work program items or new initiatives. However, the Office will work to redistribute work assignments among existing staff to reduce the overall impact on the Office to the extent possible.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget eliminates an Information Technology Specialist position. This position has provided technical and graphical support to create communication tools for the Office. The elimination of this position will result in a reduced level of administrative resources to develop and disseminate information to constituents and policy makers on affordable housing opportunities, issues, and strategies. To accommodate this reduction, OH's Communications Director will take on as many of the functions performed by this staff person as possible.

In addition, the Budget reflects salary savings related to an existing Strategic Advisor 3 position working part-time at 0.85 FTE, instead of full-time as provided for in the 2010 Adopted Budget. The Budget also reclassifies a Manager 3 position to a Senior Community Development Specialist position. The Office of Housing will re-arrange duties within the Office to be consistent with this change in classification.

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 to

determine which items were essential to include and those that could be forgone. As a result of this evaluation, OH reduced travel and training by approximately \$5,000. This amount is captured within the administrative efficiencies descriptions detailed in the following pages.

In addition, OH is achieving internal and administrative savings by significantly reducing its General Fund budget for other non-personnel operating expenses, including consultant contracting, communications, office supplies, copying and printing, and tuition/registration fees. The remaining non-personnel expenses are considered to be the minimum required to maintain operations for the department.

Finally, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget provides no market rate salary adjustment for OH staff that are non-represented employees in the City's discretionary pay plans.

City Council Provisos

There are no Council provisos.

Housing

Appropriations	Summit Code	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
CDBG - Office of Housing Budget Control Level					
HomeWise and Homeownership		1,116,276	1,420,897	1,420,897	1,420,897
Multi-Family Production and Preservation		292,280	1,294,622	1,294,622	1,294,622
Strategic Planning, Resource, and Program Development		408,053	46,774	46,774	46,774
CDBG - Office of Housing Budget Control Level	6XZ10	1,816,610	2,762,293	2,762,293	2,762,293
Low-Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level					
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400		7,755,097	6,635,836	7,725,501	8,124,394
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400		15,531,531	33,591,236	27,425,181	26,004,691
Low-Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level	XZ-R1	23,286,628	40,227,072	35,150,682	34,129,085
Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level					
Administration and Management - 16600		1,532,328	1,622,017	1,636,968	1,679,944
Community Development - 16600		507,841	499,241	478,132	490,075
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600		760,519	1,182,759	1,261,131	1,299,179
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600		1,347,688	1,354,391	1,211,916	1,242,200
Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level	XZ600	4,148,376	4,658,408	4,588,146	4,711,398
Department Total		29,251,614	47,647,773	42,501,121	41,602,776
Department Full-time Equivalents Total*		41.00	40.50	38.50	38.50
<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>					
		2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Resources					
General Subfund		2,831,214	671,577	520,000	628,649
Other		26,420,400	46,976,196	41,981,071	40,974,127
Department Total		29,251,614	47,647,773	42,501,121	41,602,776

CDBG - Office of Housing Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) - Office of Housing Budget Control Level is to provide opportunities for residents to thrive by investing in and promoting the development and preservation of affordable housing. The federal CDBG program provides a major source of funding for community development programs affecting Seattle's low- and moderate-income households and neighborhoods. The City of Seattle makes these investments so all families and individuals can meet their basic needs, share in economic prosperity, and participate in building a safe, healthy, educated, just, and caring community. Policies and priorities for distributing CDBG funds to community-based organizations are set out in the City's 2009-2012 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development, which is coordinated by the Human Services Department.

Summary

The Budget estimates the amount of CDBG dollars the City anticipates to be available, anticipates appropriations of these funds, and makes specific CDBG proposals for certain City programs in the Human Services Department, Office of Economic Development, and Office of Housing. Final CDBG program allocations are subject to the appropriation levels set by the U.S. Congress and implemented by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Program Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
HomeWise and Homeownership	1,116,276	1,420,897	1,420,897	1,420,897
Multi-Family Production and Preservation	292,280	1,294,622	1,294,622	1,294,622
Strategic Planning, Resource, and Program Development	408,053	46,774	46,774	46,774
Total	1,816,610	2,762,293	2,762,293	2,762,293

CDBG - Office of Housing: HomeWise and Homeownership

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the HomeWise and Homeownership Program is to provide resources for low- and moderate-income Seattle residents, including seniors, to become homeowners and/or to preserve and improve their current homes.

CDBG funds support minor home repairs for low-income elderly or disabled homeowners, home rehabilitation revolving loans to low-income households, technical assistance for program clients, and administrative costs for the City of Seattle's Office of Housing.

Program Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
HomeWise and Homeownership	1,116,276	1,420,897	1,420,897	1,420,897

CDBG - Office of Housing: Multi-Family Production and Preservation

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Multi-Family Production and Preservation Program is to acquire, develop, rehabilitate, and maintain affordable multifamily rental housing so the supply of housing for Seattle residents increases and affordability remains sustainable.

Program Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Multi-Family Production and Preservation	292,280	1,294,622	1,294,622	1,294,622

CDBG - Office of Housing: Strategic Planning, Resource, and Program

Development

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Strategic Planning, Resource, and Program Development Program is to provide policy review/revisions, new and revised housing programs, and vacant land redevelopment services to increase housing opportunities for Seattle residents.

Program Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Strategic Planning, Resource, and Program Development	408,053	46,774	46,774	46,774

Low-Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Low-Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level is to fund multi-family housing production, and to support homeownership and sustainability.

Program Expenditures

	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400	7,755,097	6,635,836	7,725,501	8,124,394
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400	15,531,531	33,591,236	27,425,181	26,004,691
Total	23,286,628	40,227,072	35,150,682	34,129,085

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

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Homeownership and Sustainability -16400 Program is to provide three types of loans and grants to low-income Seattle residents: loans for first-time home buyers, home repair loans to address health and safety and code repairs, and grants to make low-income housing more energy efficient.

Program Summary

Increase budget by \$196,000 for single-family homebuyer activities consistent with the 2010 - 2011 Administrative and Financial Plan for 2009 Housing Levy Programs, approved by Ordinance 123281.

Decrease budget by \$52,000 for single-family homebuyer activities consistent with an anticipated reduction in the 2011 appropriations for the federal HOME grant.

Decrease budget by approximately \$475,000 due to anticipated reductions in investment earnings on fund balances and reductions in program income generated by the Homeownership and Sustainability Program.

Increase budget by \$750,000 to reflect an increase in the state low-income weatherization grant awarded to the City.

Increase budget by approximately \$627,000 in anticipated federal low-income weatherization grant awards in 2011.

Increase budget by approximately \$45,000 to account for an inflationary adjustment in local weatherization grant funding from Seattle City Light.

These changes result in a net program increase of \$1.09 million from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400	7,755,097	6,635,836	7,725,501	8,124,394

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

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400 Program is to invest in the community by making long-term, low-interest loans to developers to develop or preserve affordable multi-family rental housing. OH monitors the affordable housing portfolio to ensure the units remain affordable, serve the intended residents, and the buildings remain in good condition.

Program Summary

Increase budget by \$196,000 in multi-family housing activities consistent with the 2010 - 2011 Administrative and Financial Plan for 2009 Housing Levy Programs, approved by Ordinance 123281.

Decrease budget by \$391,000 in housing portfolio operations and maintenance activities consistent with the 2010-2011 Administrative and Financial Plan for 2009 Housing Levy Programs, approved by Ordinance 123281. The Levy funding plan intentionally provided for a larger allocation to this program in 2010, because it was the first year of the Levy.

Decrease budget by \$4 million in contingent Bonus Program appropriations. Bonus Program funds appropriated in prior years continue to be spent down in 2011, and a sustained level of appropriation authority is not needed in 2011.

Decrease budget by \$155,000 for multi-family housing activities due to an anticipated reduction in the City's 2011 appropriations for the federal HOME grant.

Decrease budget by \$1.82 million due to anticipated reductions in investment earnings on fund balances and reductions in program income generated by the Multi-Family Production and Preservation Program.

These changes result in a net program decrease of approximately \$6.17 million from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400	15,531,531	33,591,236	27,425,181	26,004,691

Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

Program Expenditures

	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Administration and Management - 16600	1,532,328	1,622,017	1,636,968	1,679,944
Community Development - 16600	507,841	499,241	478,132	490,075
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600	760,519	1,182,759	1,261,131	1,299,179
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600	1,347,688	1,354,391	1,211,916	1,242,200
Total	4,148,376	4,658,408	4,588,146	4,711,398
Full-time Equivalents Total *	41.00	40.50	38.50	38.50

**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.*

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

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Administration and Management - 16600 Program is to provide centralized leadership, coordination, technology, contracting, and financial management support services to OH programs and capital projects to facilitate the production of affordable housing for Seattle residents.

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$85,000 and abrogate a 1.0 FTE Information Technology Specialist position. To accommodate this reduction, OH's Communications Director will take on as many of the functions performed by this staff person as possible.

Reduce budget by approximately \$69,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies including travel and training, office supplies, professional services, and printing.

Reduce budget by approximately \$19,000, thereby reducing the overall funding to support the Deputy Director position in the future.

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 \$10,000 in savings.

Increase budget by approximately \$97,000 due to a cost neutral internal realignment of expenses within this budget control level. This includes the transfer out of a 0.5 FTE Administrative Specialist I position to the Multi-Family Production and Preservation Program. The position's responsibilities have evolved from general administrative support to exclusively supporting the Asset Management Unit. This also includes the transfer in of

1.0 FTE Executive 2 position from the Multi-Family Production and Preservation Program. Both positions are transferred to better reflect the Office's organizational staffing makeup.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$101,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$15,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Administration and Management - 16600	1,532,328	1,622,017	1,636,968	1,679,944
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.50	13.50	13.00	13.00

** 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.*

Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600: Community Development - 16600

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Community Development -16600 Program is to provide strategic planning, program development, and vacant land redevelopment services to increase housing opportunities for Seattle residents.

Program Summary

Reduce budget by approximately \$111,000 and abrogate a 1.0 FTE Sr. Community Development Specialist position. The abrogation of this position will limit the Office's capacity to take on new initiatives, and will require existing staff to absorb this position's workload, particularly in relation to housing incentive programs and Fort Lawton Redevelopment.

Reduce budget by \$36,000 and reclass a Manager 3 position to a Community Development Specialist, Senior position.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$4,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies including travel and training, office supplies, professional services, and printing.

Reduce salary budget by \$16,000 to align budget with actual salary needs for a Strategic Advisor 3. This Position is working part-time at 0.85 FTE, instead of full-time at 1.0 FTE as provided for in the 2010 Adopted Budget.

Increase budget by approximately \$124,000 due to a cost neutral internal realignment of expenses within this budget control level. This includes the transfer in of a 1.0 FTE Community Development Specialist position from the Multi-Family Production and Preservation Program to better align this staff person with the currently assigned responsibilities.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$22,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$21,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Community Development - 16600	507,841	499,241	478,132	490,075
Full-time Equivalents Total*	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

** 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.*

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

Purpose Statement

The Homeownership and Sustainability -16600 Program provides three types of loans and grants to low-income Seattle residents: loans for first-time home-buyers, home repair loans to address health and safety and code repairs, and grants to make low-income housing more energy efficient.

Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$5,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies including travel and training, office supplies, professional services, and printing.

Increase budget by \$39,000 to fund Section 106 review services provided by the Department of Neighborhoods for the Homewise program. Starting in 2010, the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) began charging other City departments for federally-mandated historic preservation reviews performed by DON staff. This appropriation authority is supported by revenues in the Homewise Program.

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 \$7,000 in savings.

Decrease budget by approximately \$14,000 due to a cost neutral internal realignment of expenses within this budget control level.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$65,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$78,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600	760,519	1,182,759	1,261,131	1,299,179
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.50	12.00	12.00	12.00

** 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.*

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

Purpose Statement

The Multi-Family Production and Preservation -16600 Program invests in the community by making long-term, low-interest loans to developers to develop or preserve affordable multi-family rental housing. OH monitors the affordable housing portfolio to ensure the units remain affordable and serve the intended residents, and the buildings remain in good condition.

Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$10,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies including travel and training, office supplies, professional services, and printing.

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 agreement with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$8,000 in savings.

Reclass a Strategic Advisor 2 position to a Community Development Specialist position to better align the title of the position with the responsibilities.

Decrease budget by approximately \$206,000 due to a cost neutral internal realignment of expenses within this budget control level. This includes the transfer in of a 0.5 FTE Administrative Specialist I position from the Administrative and Management Program to reflect the change in position responsibilities from general administrative to supporting the Asset Management Unit; the transfer out of a 1.0 FTE Community Development Specialist position to the Community Development Program to better align this staff person with the currently assigned responsibilities; and the transfer out of 1.0 FTE Executive 2 position to the Administration and Management Program to better reflect the Office's organizational staffing makeup.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$81,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$142,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600	1,347,688	1,354,391	1,211,916	1,242,200
Full-time Equivalents Total*	11.00	11.00	9.50	9.50

** 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.*

Housing

2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Community Development Block Grant Fund

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
431010	Federal Grants and Other Income	1,816,610	2,762,293	2,762,293	2,762,293	2,762,293
Total Revenues		1,816,610	2,762,293	2,762,293	2,762,293	2,762,293

Housing

2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Housing Operating Fund

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
433010	Federal Grants-Weatherization	0	531,720	531,720	599,087	613,447
434010	State Grants-Weatherization	0	182,896	182,896	185,000	185,000
462900	Other Rents and use charges	41,000	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000
469990	MacArthur Foundation Grant	150,000	17,500	17,500	13,500	0
541490	2010 Non-GF COLA Rollback	0	0	0	(22,171)	(22,616)
541490	City Light Administration	631,588	654,731	654,731	672,517	689,949
541490	Contingent Bonus/TDR Administration	114,000	150,000	150,000	250,000	250,000
541490	HOME Administration	411,276	461,551	459,445	438,473	438,473
541490	Interest Earnings	30,000	26,300	22,700	4,000	3,000
541490	Levy Administration	746,917	1,730,212	1,730,212	1,775,351	1,820,496
541490	Prior Year Savings	88,000	109,957	109,957	121,339	75,000
541490	Program Income	50,000	94,964	70,150	4,000	3,000
587001	General Subfund Support	1,823,437	671,577	671,577	520,050	628,649
Total Revenues		4,086,218	4,658,408	4,627,888	4,588,146	4,711,398

Housing

2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Low-Income Housing Fund

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
411100	Property Tax Levy	11,660,719	18,820,000	18,820,000	18,820,667	17,971,667
433010	Federal Grants - Weatherization	2,656,378	1,623,484	1,623,484	2,250,000	2,500,000
434010	State Grants - Weatherization	0	0	0	750,000	750,000
439090	Bonus Program/TDR Authority; UWKC Bridge Loan Program	4,727,981	4,000,000	4,000,000	0	0
461110	Investment Earnings	1,152,938	2,868,200	816,756	1,425,000	876,900
469930	Program Income	1,746,258	7,270,000	2,722,185	6,422,583	6,502,000
471010	Federal Grants-HOME Program	2,250,581	4,153,961	4,153,961	3,946,263	3,946,263
541490	Local Grants - Weatherization	1,212,060	1,491,427	1,491,427	1,536,170	1,582,255
Total Revenues		25,406,915	40,227,072	33,627,813	35,150,683	34,129,085

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Department Description

The purpose of the Neighborhood Matching Subfund (NMF) is to provide resources for Seattle's communities to preserve and enhance the City's diverse neighborhoods, and to empower people to make positive contributions to their communities.

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

The NMF is divided into four categories, which include: Large Projects (awards up to \$100,000); Small and Simple Projects (awards up to \$20,000); Small Sparks Fund (awards up to \$1,000); and Management and Project Development (consultation and technical assistance to neighborhood groups, coordination of the application and award process, and monitoring of funded projects). The NMF is housed in, and primarily staffed by, the Department of Neighborhoods. NMF also receives support from staff located in the Department of Parks and Recreation and the Seattle Department of Transportation.

Policy and Program Changes

In developing the 2011 Adopted Budget, the City of Seattle's General Fund was facing a \$67 million shortfall for 2011. As a result, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget includes reductions for all General Fund-dependent functions. The Neighborhood Matching Fund's 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget reflects \$548,000 in reductions in order to help close the General Fund gap. As a result of this shortfall, the Department of Neighborhoods, which manages the Neighborhood Matching Subfund, utilized the following strategies to prioritize services and programs:

Funding for Large Projects is reduced to help offset the shortfall in the General Fund and address reduced staffing capacity. In 2009, the NMF program sustained labor reductions without commensurate reductions to project funds resulting in project management workload problems and service impacts to awarded projects. This reduction helps realign project funds with current staffing capacity, and improves administrative balance in the program. The total number of Large Projects awarded each year ranges from 20-30 projects, which is approximately 2-4 fewer projects in 2011. This strategy achieves significant General Fund savings without creating disproportionate impacts to the community.

As part of the above strategy to realign project funds with staffing levels, NMF also reduces the Small and Simple project funds. The total number of Small and Simple funds awarded each year ranges from 75-85 projects, and this reduction results in approximately 10-15 fewer projects in 2011. Similar to the Large Projects reduction, this reduction helps realign project funds with staffing capacity without creating disproportionate impacts to the community.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget also reduces funding for project management staff in the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) and the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). To mitigate the impacts of this reduction, these departments will redefine their technical needs required of individual NMF projects and coordinate with existing staff in SDOT and DPR, absorbing this work in concert with NMF staff to ensure that essential technical services remain available to the community.

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

As part of the overall reduction to the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI) budget, which resides in the Department of Neighborhoods, NMF project funds earmarked for SYVPI projects are reduced to achieve General Fund savings. This reduction is not anticipated to have significant community impacts.

The Budget also transfers funds from the Neighborhood Matching Fund to the Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) for Seattle ReLeaf, the City's urban forestry outreach and incentive program. OSE will be evaluating options to determine how best to administer, coordinate, and perhaps further consolidate the City's tree planting and education programs. OSE will coordinate this work with affected City departments.

City Council Provisos

There are no Council provisos.

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Appropriations	Summit Code	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level					
Large Projects Fund		1,763,725	1,332,643	1,181,954	1,197,504
Management and Project Development		1,064,921	912,869	743,597	768,782
Small and Simple Projects Fund		1,100,764	1,381,241	1,308,425	1,327,878
Small Sparks Fund		24,550	14,788	14,784	15,020
Tree Fund		58,498	50,687	0	0
Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level	2IN00	4,012,458	3,692,228	3,248,759	3,309,185
Department Total		4,012,458	3,692,228	3,248,759	3,309,185
		2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Resources					
General Subfund		3,314,344	3,353,881	2,939,396	2,995,194
Other		698,114	338,347	309,362	313,991
Department Total		4,012,458	3,692,228	3,248,759	3,309,185

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

Program Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Large Projects Fund	1,763,725	1,332,643	1,181,954	1,197,504
Management and Project Development	1,064,921	912,869	743,597	768,782
Small and Simple Projects Fund	1,100,764	1,381,241	1,308,425	1,327,878
Small Sparks Fund	24,550	14,788	14,784	15,020
Tree Fund	58,498	50,687	0	0
Total	4,012,458	3,692,228	3,248,759	3,309,185

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Large Projects Fund

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Large Projects Fund Program is to provide technical assistance and funding to neighborhood organizations initiating local improvement projects that require up to 12 months to complete and up to \$100,000 in Neighborhood Matching Funds.

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$157,000 to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund budget and to better align program staffing with project funds.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$6,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$151,000.

Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Large Projects Fund	1,763,725	1,332,643	1,181,954	1,197,504

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Management and Project Development

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$167,000 for funding NMF staff and administrative costs in the Seattle Department of Transportation and the Department of Parks and Recreation. Positions are funded, but not budgeted, in NMF. Position authority resides within the respective departments.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$2,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$169,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Management and Project Development	1,064,921	912,869	743,597	768,782

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Small and Simple Projects Fund

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Small and Simple Projects Fund Program is to provide technical assistance and funding for local improvement projects initiated by neighborhood organizations that can be completed in 12 months or less and require up to \$20,000 in funding.

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$75,000 to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund budget and to better align program staffing with project funds.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$2,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$73,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Small and Simple Projects Fund	1,100,764	1,381,241	1,308,425	1,327,878

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Small Sparks Fund

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Small Sparks Fund Program is to provide one-time awards of up to \$1,000 for small community building projects initiated by neighborhood organizations. Awards are available to neighborhood organizations with annual operating budgets under \$25,000.

Program Summary

There are no substantive changes from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Small Sparks Fund	24,550	14,788	14,784	15,020

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Tree Fund

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Tree Fund Program is to provide trees to neighborhood groups to plant along residential planting strips in exchange for ongoing care and maintenance. Increasing the number of street trees in the city is a central goal of the Urban Forest Management Plan, and supports climate protection.

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$25,000 in the NMF Tree program and transfer the remaining funding into one combined program to be temporarily housed within the Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) until a longer term administrative option is developed. The new program will consolidate tree funds from NMF, OSE, Seattle Public Utilities (SPU), and Seattle City Light (SCL) into one program to create administrative efficiencies and achieve budget savings. The related budget proviso describing this action is reflected on the budget pages for OSE, SPU, and SCL.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Tree Fund	58,498	50,687	0	0

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
587001	OPER TR IN-FR GENERAL FUND	3,314,343	3,353,881	3,253,265	2,939,396	2,995,194
Total Revenues		3,314,343	3,353,881	3,253,265	2,939,396	2,995,194
379100	Use of Fund Balance	515,349	338,347	338,347	309,362	313,991
Total Resources		3,829,692	3,692,228	3,591,612	3,248,758	3,309,185

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Beginning Fund Balance	4,896,032	4,380,683	4,197,917	3,859,570	3,550,207
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	0	0	0	0	0
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	3,314,343	3,353,881	3,253,265	2,939,396	2,995,194
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	4,012,458	3,692,228	3,591,612	3,248,759	3,309,185
Ending Fund Balance	4,197,917	4,042,336	3,859,570	3,550,207	3,236,216
Continuing Appropriations	4,132,367	4,042,336	3,550,208	3,236,218	3,129,985
Total Reserves	4,132,367	4,042,336	3,550,208	3,236,218	3,129,985
Ending Unreserved Fund Balance	65,550	0	309,362	313,989	106,231

Department of Neighborhoods

Bernie Matsuno, Interim Director

Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-0464

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

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

Department Description

The Department of Neighborhoods (DON) works to bring government closer to the residents of Seattle by engaging them in civic participation, helping them become empowered to make positive contributions to their communities, and involving more of Seattle's residents, including communities of color and immigrants, in civic discussions, processes, and opportunities. DON has five Budget Control Levels (BCLs):

- 1) The Director's Office provides executive leadership, communications, and operational support for the entire Department. The Director's Office also includes Historic Preservation, which provides technical assistance, outreach, and education to the general public, owners of historic properties, government agencies, and elected officials to identify, protect, rehabilitate, and re-use historic properties.
- 2) The Community Building Division includes the P-Patch Community Gardens, Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF) Administration, Neighborhood District Coordinators, Major Institutions and Schools, South Park Action Agenda, and Neighborhood Planning.
- 3) The Customer Service and Operations Division includes: Neighborhood Payment and Information Services; Finance, Budget, and Accounting; Human Resources; Facilities and Office Management; and Information Technology functions.
- 4) The Office for Education (OFE) builds linkages between the City of Seattle and the Seattle Public School District. It administers the Families and Education Levy, provides policy direction to help children succeed in school, strengthens school-community connections, and increases access to high-quality early learning and out-of-school time programs.
- 5) The Youth Violence Prevention BCL includes funding for a variety of citywide youth violence prevention initiatives administered through several departments including active outreach, counseling, referrals to job training, and individual and group programming. The Office for Education oversees this initiative.

Policy and Program Changes

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. As a result of this shortfall, the Department of Neighborhoods made reductions based on criteria which attempted to keep the highest-priority community services whole.

DON operates thirteen Neighborhood Service Centers (NSCs) geographically dispersed throughout the City. All thirteen NSCs provide information about City services, liaise with Neighborhood District Councils, and support the community in resolving a range of issues related to public safety, human services, and housing. In addition, seven of the NSCs also function as payment and information centers, offering residents a location to pay City Light and Seattle Public Utility bills, obtain pet licenses, pay traffic tickets, apply for U.S. passports, or to find information about city services and jobs. All thirteen NSCs are staffed by a Neighborhood District Coordinator, with the payment sites also maintaining customer service representatives. From a financial standpoint, the

Neighborhoods

payment and information centers generate enough revenue to cover approximately 70% of their operating costs. Meanwhile, the six non-payment sites do not generate any revenues and are supported entirely by the General Fund.

To achieve budget savings in the Department, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget reflects the closure of all six non-payment Neighborhood Service Centers. These sites were selected for closure because they offer a more limited range of services than do the payment sites. The remaining seven payment site locations (West Seattle, Delridge, University District, Central District, Lake City, Southeast, and Ballard), which are geographically spread throughout the City, will continue to provide access to City services for residents in the neighborhoods in which they live and work, allowing them to avoid a trip to the City's downtown campus.

The staffing impacts of the facility closures include the abrogation of three Neighborhood District Coordinators. The staffing reductions create cost savings for the Department and facilitate a reorganization of the District Coordinators organizing the ten NDCs into three teams. Each team will have responsibility for working with geographic areas in the north, central and south parts of the city, similar to the geographic service boundaries of other City departments, such as the Department of Parks and Recreation. This change creates an efficient management model that will ensure that core services are still provided to the public and that each area of the city will have back-up support from NDCs that are familiar with their issues. These core services include the continued role of the Neighborhood District Coordinators acting as liaisons between neighborhoods and City departments. The thirteen neighborhood district councils remain in place and will be assisted by the NDC teams.

Funding for historic preservation consultants is also reduced to achieve budget savings. This reduction reflects the elimination of funds for both citywide and downtown survey and inventory work. The Historic Preservation work includes general historic preservation citywide work, and a discrete project involving the survey and inventory of properties in the downtown area. The downtown project began in 2006, with staff and consulting funds added in the budget to cover costs for this multi-year project from start to completion. The project is 90% complete, and the timeline has been extended due to the reduction in consultant funds.

The citywide survey and inventory program began in 2001 and, to date, the department has completed surveys and inventories in the majority of the City's neighborhoods including Belltown, Cascade, Central, Columbia City, Denny Triangle, Downtown, Georgetown, Mount Baker, North Beacon Hill, North Rainier, Pioneer Square, Queen Anne, South Lake Union, South Park, South Seattle, University, Wallingford, Waterfront, as well as city-owned properties, pre-1906 residential buildings, and neighborhood commercial buildings throughout the City. The reduction in consultant funds for citywide historic preservation activities may slow or temporarily suspend any additional work until funds become available.

The Department reduces funding for the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI) to achieve budget savings. This reduction lowers funding for street outreach, anger management, and recreation components of the program, however, the impacts are expected to be minimal in relation to the program as a whole. By encouraging efficiencies in the provision of these services, the intent is to not reduce the level of direct services. In fact, the anger management program still retains enough funds to allow 72 youth to be served in six groups, two in each of the three networks. Finally, the reduction in contracted recreation services in the three network youth centers will be mitigated by encouraging SYVPI Neighborhood Matching Fund Small and Simple Grant awardees to conduct their programs in the centers and to encourage youth center program coordinators and network coordinators to apply for service grants.

Neighborhoods

Due to more and larger community gardens added to the P-Patch program and increased water rates, there is an anticipated water budget shortfall for 2011. This budget shortfall is expected to continue to grow as new and expanded gardens are added to the P-Patch program. The Department will increase the P-Patch plot fees accordingly to assist with this budget shortfall.

The 2011 Adopted Budget for DON includes several policy-driven position changes related to Food Policy, the Immigrant and Refugee Initiative, and the Seattle Youth Commission. The Department will eliminate the vacant Strategic Advisor position intended to assist the Director with citywide Food Policy work and other related projects. This position was reclassified from the NMF and P-Patch Program Manager position in 2010 to provide additional capacity within the department to support policy driven projects related to food policy and program evaluations.

The Department also transfers the Immigrant and Refugee Initiative work to the Office of Civil Rights, to better align the initiative with Race and Social Justice goals. This change also includes the transfer of the Translation and Interpretation Fund, currently managed by the Department of Neighborhoods. This fund was established in 2009 to provide resources to small departments for translation services. The transfer of the Immigrant and Refugee Initiative and elimination of the position providing staffing will result in the Seattle Office of Civil Rights adding a part-time position to staff the work, which will not result in significant impacts to the program. Rather this change is anticipated to better integrate the work with broader citywide Race and Social Justice Initiative strategies.

The work of the Seattle Youth Commission is transferred to the Mayor's Office to help offset other staffing reductions in the Department. The related position working on the Seattle Youth Commission is eliminated to achieve budget savings and the Mayor's Office, using existing staff, will support the work of the Commission.

In an effort to achieve internal savings in order to preserve funding for direct services, every City department was asked to critically evaluate discretionary funding needs for departmental travel and training to determine which items were essential to include and those that could be forgone. As a result of this evaluation, the Department of Neighborhoods reduced its travel and training budget to achieve savings. This amount is captured within the administrative efficiencies descriptions detailed in the following pages.

As part of the citywide effort to achieve span of control efficiencies, the Department will identify reductions in management/supervisory support functions in 2011. As part of this effort, the Department will reevaluate its organization to find efficiencies in the current management structure.

As a part of citywide focus on constituent services, the Customer Service Bureau (CSB), which was administratively a part of the Department of Neighborhoods, has been transferred to a new Department of Finance and Administration Services. The transfer of CSB represents an internal administrative change and does not impact the level of services provided to the public.

City Council Provisos

There are no Council provisos.

Neighborhoods

Appropriations	Summit Code	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Community Building Budget Control Level					
Major Institutions and Schools		209,941	215,137	198,822	208,624
Neighborhood District Coordinators		2,220,052	2,260,485	1,334,875	1,408,908
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration		72,539	0	0	0
Neighborhood Planning		0	0	244,001	250,578
P-Patch Community Gardens		710,743	666,490	650,752	686,592
South Park Action Agenda		0	0	141,186	144,944
Community Building Budget Control Level	I3300	3,213,275	3,142,113	2,569,636	2,699,646
Customer Service and Operations Budget Control Level					
Internal Operations/Administrative Services		1,522,602	1,477,126	1,499,384	1,507,388
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services		1,789,429	1,799,483	1,895,363	1,960,579
Customer Service and Operations Budget Control Level	I3200	3,312,031	3,276,609	3,394,747	3,467,967
Customer Service Bureau Budget Control Level	I3800	667,427	686,631	0	0
Director's Office Budget Control Level					
Communications		154,615	117,795	139,550	142,453
Executive Leadership		300,465	298,180	215,697	201,346
Historic Preservation		865,349	937,619	742,403	777,203
Director's Office Budget Control Level	I3100	1,320,428	1,353,594	1,097,650	1,121,003
Office for Education Budget Control Level	I3700	111,898	0	0	0
Youth Violence Prevention Budget Control Level	I4100	176,082	3,305,007	3,104,955	3,121,996
Department Total		8,801,141	11,763,953	10,166,989	10,410,612
Department Full-time Equivalents Total*		86.50	86.50	74.75	74.75
<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>					
		2009	2010	2011	2012
Resources		Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
General Subfund		8,801,141	11,763,953	10,166,989	10,410,612
Department Total		8,801,141	11,763,953	10,166,989	10,410,612

Neighborhoods

Community Building Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Community Building Budget Control Level (BCL) is to deliver technical assistance, support services, and programs in neighborhoods to strengthen local communities, engage residents in neighborhood improvement, leverage resources, and complete neighborhood-initiated projects.

Program Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Major Institutions and Schools	209,941	215,137	198,822	208,624
Neighborhood District Coordinators	2,220,052	2,260,485	1,334,875	1,408,908
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration	72,539	0	0	0
Neighborhood Planning	0	0	244,001	250,578
P-Patch Community Gardens	710,743	666,490	650,752	686,592
South Park Action Agenda	0	0	141,186	144,944
Total	3,213,275	3,142,113	2,569,636	2,699,646
Full-time Equivalents Total *	35.00	35.00	29.50	29.50

**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.*

Community Building: Major Institutions and Schools

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Major Institutions and Schools Program is to coordinate community involvement in the development, adoption, and implementation of Major Institution Master Plans, and to facilitate community involvement in school re-use and development.

Program Summary

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$16,000 from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Major Institutions and Schools	209,941	215,137	198,822	208,624
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50

** 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.*

Community Building: Neighborhood District Coordinators

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$506,000 to reflect the closure of six non-payment Neighborhood Service Centers. The six non-payment sites subject to closure are Capitol Hill, Downtown, Fremont, Greater Duwamish/Beacon Hill, Greenwood, and Queen Anne/Magnolia. This reduction also captures the corresponding salary savings from abrogating 3.0 FTE Neighborhood District Coordinators in this BCL.

Decrease budget by \$97,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 1 position due to the transfer of the Immigrant and Refugee Initiative to the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) to better align the work with the Race and Social Justice Initiative. A corresponding 0.5 FTE Planning and Development Specialist is added to OCR's budget to manage this work.

Decrease budget by \$18,000 to reflect the transfer of the Translation and Interpretation Fund for small departments to the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) to better align the work with the Race and Social Justice Initiative.

Decrease budget by \$48,000 and abrogate 0.5 FTE Planning and Development Specialist 1 position to reflect the transfer of the Seattle Youth Commission program work to the Mayor's Office. The work associated with this change will be absorbed by existing staff in the Mayor's Office.

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 \$9,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$6,000 is saved in Neighborhood District Coordinators Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Decrease budget by \$338,000 to reflect the transfer of funds to the new Neighborhood Planning Program and the new South Park Action Agenda program, both of which are added in 2011 to better align actual expenditures associated with the Department's work in these areas. This adjustment also includes the transfer of 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 1 and 0.5 FTE Planning and Development Specialist II to the Neighborhood Planning Program and 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2 to the South Park Action Agenda program. The corresponding adjustments are detailed in the respective programs. This technical transfer has zero net impact on the budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$96,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$926,000.

Neighborhoods

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Neighborhood District Coordinators	2,220,052	2,260,485	1,334,875	1,408,908
Full-time Equivalents Total*	19.50	19.50	12.50	12.50

** 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.*

Community Building: Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF) Administration Program is to manage the NMF, work with other City departments and agencies involved in NMF projects, and support diverse neighborhood groups engaged in local improvement efforts to leverage private resources, assist neighborhood organizations to become more self-reliant, build effective partnerships between City government and neighborhoods, and complete neighborhood-initiated improvements. Costs for NMF administration are included in the NMF budget, although position authority is displayed here for Department of Neighborhoods' staff who administer the NMF program.

Program Summary

The 2011 Adopted Budget reflects the abrogation of a vacant 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2 position responsible for food policy work. This position was reallocated from the 1.0 FTE Manager 2 position responsible for NMF program management in 2010. However, the budget was not updated correctly to reflect the subsequent transfer of this position from the NMF Administration program to the Executive Leadership program. As such, the FTE reduction displays in this program.

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration	72,539	0	0	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.00	7.00	6.00	6.00

** 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.*

Community Building: Neighborhood Planning Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood Planning Program is to lead the inclusive outreach and engagement activities of Neighborhood Planning efforts across the City by working with communities to revise Neighborhood Plans to reflect changes and opportunities presented by new development and major transportation investments, including Light Rail.

Program Summary

This is a new Program added in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget to better align actual expenditures associated with the Department's work on Neighborhood Planning projects. This adjustment also includes the transfer of 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 1 and 0.5 FTE Planning and Development Specialist II from the Neighborhood District Coordinator program. It reflects a shift of Neighborhood Planning funds from the Department of Planning and Development budget and existing staff within the Department of Neighborhoods budget, and does not reflect new resources being allocated to this body of work.

	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Expenditures/FTE				
Neighborhood Planning	0	0	244,001	250,578
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	1.50	1.50

** 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.*

Community Building: P-Patch Community Gardens Purpose Statement

The purpose of the P-Patch Community Gardens Program is to provide community gardens, gardening space, and related support to Seattle residents while preserving open space for productive purposes, particularly in high-density communities. The goals of the program are to increase self-reliance among gardeners, and for P-Patch Community Gardens to be focal points for community involvement.

Program Summary

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 \$9,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$16,000.

	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Expenditures/FTE				
P-Patch Community Gardens	710,743	666,490	650,752	686,592
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00

** 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.*

Community Building: South Park Action Agenda

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the South Park Action Agenda Program is to manage the City's community-driven partnership with the South Park neighborhood to achieve targeted environmental, public safety, transportation, economic development, and youth and family service improvements.

Program Summary

This is a new program added in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget to better align actual expenditures associated with the Department's work on the South Park Action Agenda. The program includes the cost of 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2 position transferred from the Neighborhood District Coordinator program. It reflects a shift of South Park Action Agenda funds from the 2010 Mayor's Office budget and a transfer of existing staff. This budget neutral technical adjustment does not reflect new resources allocated to this body of work.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
South Park Action Agenda	0	0	141,186	144,944
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00

** 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.*

Customer Service and Operations Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Customer Service and Operations Budget Control Level is to provide information, referral services, and coordination of City services to community members, and to provide financial, human resources, facilities, office management, and information technology services to the Department's employees to serve customers efficiently and effectively.

Program Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Internal Operations/Administrative Services	1,522,602	1,477,126	1,499,384	1,507,388
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services	1,789,429	1,799,483	1,895,363	1,960,579
Total	3,312,031	3,276,609	3,394,747	3,467,967
Full-time Equivalents Total *	27.50	27.50	27.50	27.50

**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.*

Customer Service and Operations: Internal Operations/Administrative Services

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Internal Operations/Administrative Services Program is to manage financial, human resources, facility, administrative, and information technology services to enable department employees to serve customers efficiently and effectively.

Program Summary

Decrease budget by \$9,000 to reduce funding of 1.0 FTE IT Systems Analyst position by 10% to assist in balancing the overall General Subfund.

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 \$7,000 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 Internal Operations/Administrative 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 \$43,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$22,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Internal Operations/Administrative Services	1,522,602	1,477,126	1,499,384	1,507,388
Full-time Equivalents Total*	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00

** 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.*

Neighborhoods

Customer Service and Operations: Neighborhood Payment and Information Services

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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 \$13,000 in savings.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$109,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$96,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services	1,789,429	1,799,483	1,895,363	1,960,579
Full-time Equivalents Total*	17.50	17.50	17.50	17.50

** 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.*

Customer Service Bureau Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Customer Service Bureau is to assist Seattle residents in accessing services, to resolve complaints, and to provide appropriate and timely responses from City government.

Summary

The Customer Service Bureau transfers to the Department of Finance and Administrative Services in 2011.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Customer Service Bureau	667,427	686,631	0	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.25	6.25	0.00	0.00

** 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.*

Neighborhoods

Director's Office Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Director's Office Budget Control Level is to provide executive leadership, communications, and operational support for the entire department. The Director's Office also includes Historic Preservation, which provides technical assistance, outreach, and education to the general public, owners of historic properties, government agencies, and elected officials to identify, protect, rehabilitate, and re-use historic properties.

Program Expenditures

	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Communications	154,615	117,795	139,550	142,453
Executive Leadership	300,465	298,180	215,697	201,346
Historic Preservation	865,349	937,619	742,403	777,203
Total	1,320,428	1,353,594	1,097,650	1,121,003
Full-time Equivalents Total *	10.25	10.25	10.25	10.25

**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.*

Director's Office: Communications

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Communications Program is to provide printed and electronic information on programs and services offered by the Department, as well as to publicize other opportunities to increase civic participation.

Program Summary

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$22,000 from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Communications	154,615	117,795	139,550	142,453
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

** 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.*

Director's Office: Executive Leadership

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce budget by \$120,000 to reflect the abrogation of a vacant 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2 position responsible for Food Policy work and other related policy driven projects. The corresponding FTE reduction is displayed in the Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration program in the Community Building Budget Control Level.

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

Reduce budget by \$8,000 to reflect a decrease in travel and training expenses.

The Department plans to reduce \$75,000 in management-related costs that may include executives, managers, strategic advisors, or supervisory level positions. This reduction is part of an effort to achieve additional management efficiencies among larger city departments.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$126,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$82,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Executive Leadership	300,465	298,180	215,697	201,346
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

** 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.*

Director's Office: Historic Preservation

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Historic Preservation Program is to provide technical assistance, outreach, and education to the general public, owners of historic properties, government agencies, and elected officials to identify, protect, rehabilitate, and re-use historic properties.

Program Summary

Eliminate one time funding of \$127,000 for survey and inventory work in Southeast Seattle. The project was covered with mitigation funding from the Mercer Avenue project over a two year period from 2009 to 2010. The project was not completed in 2010 and will be discontinued until alternative funding becomes available.

Reduce budget by \$58,000 in consultant funding for the Downtown survey and inventory project. The project is 90% complete, and this reduction extends the estimated completion to 2014.

Reduce budget by \$37,000 in consultant funding for citywide survey and inventory work. This program began in 2001 and nearly every Seattle neighborhood has been surveyed. The reduction in funding for the program will result in the postponement of work in remaining neighborhoods until at least 2013.

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 increase the budget by \$32,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$195,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Historic Preservation	865,349	937,619	742,403	777,203
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.25	7.25	7.25	7.25

** 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.*

Office for Education Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Office for Education (OFE) Budget Control Level is to build linkages and a strong relationship between the City of Seattle and the Seattle Public School District, administer the Families and Education Levy, provide policy direction to help children succeed in school, strengthen school-community connections, and help achieve the vision of every Seattle child entering school ready to learn, having access to high-quality early care and out-of-school-time programs, and achieving academically and graduating prepared for post secondary success.

Summary

This program includes position authority for staff administering the Families and Education Levy. It was zeroed out in 2010, as all educational costs are now funded by the Families and Education Levy.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Office for Education	111,898	0	0	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50

** 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.*

Youth Violence Prevention Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Youth Violence Prevention Budget Control Level is to reduce juvenile violent crimes.

Summary

Reduce budget by \$138,000 in Anger Management Services, allowing 72 youth to be served in six groups, two in each of the three networks.

Reduce budget by \$30,000 in Recreation Services in the three network youth centers. The effects of this reduction will be mitigated by encouraging SYVPI Neighborhood Matching Fund Small and Simple Grant awardees to conduct their programs in the centers and to encourage youth center program coordinators and network coordinators to apply for service grants.

Reduce budget by \$35,000 for street outreach services. In addition to eliminating inflation for the community-based organization that contracts for this service, operational efficiencies will be encouraged when this contract is put out for bid in 2011.

Reduce budget by \$2,000 in salary expenses in accordance with Executive Order 2010-01, which directed departments to withhold base salary increases for City officers and employees in certain classifications. This Executive Order will continue in 2011 creating additional sustainable salary savings, and those reductions are also reflected in this adopted budget.

Reduce budget by \$52,000 for the elimination of inflation in contracted services to community-based agencies. This measure reflects the approximate 2010 budget levels and is similar to action taken in City department budgets for non-personnel costs in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$56,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$201,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Youth Violence Prevention	176,082	3,305,007	3,104,955	3,121,996
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

** 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.*

Pike Place Market Levy

Ben Franz-Knight, Executive Director

Contact Information

Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority

PDA Information Line: (206) 682-7453

On the Web at: <http://www.pikeplacemarket.org>

Department Description

The Pike Place Market Levy, approved by voters in November 2008, collects up to \$73 million in additional property taxes over six years for major repairs, infrastructure, and accessibility upgrades to buildings owned by the Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority (PDA). The PDA is a nonprofit, public corporation chartered by the City of Seattle. As part of its mission, the PDA is required to preserve, rehabilitate, and protect the Market's buildings.

The PDA manages the renovation project. The City receives levy proceeds in the Pike Place Market Renovation Fund established through Ordinance 122737 and provides cash to finance the project according to the PDA's construction schedule, including issuing limited-tax general obligation bonds to meet cash flow needs. The City collects \$12.5 million per year in levy proceeds through 2013, and up to \$10.5 million in 2014.

Policy and Program Changes

The PDA completed Phase I of the renovation project, which included infrastructure upgrades to the Hillclimb, Leland, and Fairley buildings, in June 2010. The PDA began construction on Phase II, which includes major infrastructure repairs and seismic updates to the Corner, Sanitary, Triangle, and First and Pine buildings, in July 2010 and expects to complete it by July 2011. Construction on Phase III, which includes the Economy, Soames Dunn, and Stewart buildings, is expected to begin in August 2011 and be completed in October 2012. Based on the PDA's revised cash flow projections, the City intends to issue \$11 million of debt in 2011 to meet the project's cash flow needs. Debt service on these bonds is paid from levy proceeds. Borrowing for 2012 will be determined next year.

Pike Place Market Levy

Appropriations	Summit Code	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Pike Place Market Renovation Budget Control Level					
Bond Proceeds		6,824,777	0	10,681,691	0
Levy Proceeds		10,103,525	9,246,000	6,086,309	0
Pike Place Market Renovation Budget Control Level	PKLVYBC L-01	16,928,302	9,246,000	16,768,000	0
Pike Place Market Renovation Debt Service Budget Control Level	PKLVYBC L-02	296,820	2,574,692	3,892,431	4,155,564
Department Total		17,225,122	11,820,692	20,660,431	4,155,564
		2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Resources					
Other		17,225,122	11,820,692	20,660,431	4,155,564
Department Total		17,225,122	11,820,692	20,660,431	4,155,564

Pike Place Market Levy

Pike Place Market Renovation Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Pike Place Market Renovation Budget Control Level is to provide appropriation authority for the City's disbursement of funds to the Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority (PDA) in compliance with the "Agreement regarding Levy Proceeds by and between the City of Seattle and the Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority" related to renovation and improvements to the Pike Place Market.

Program Expenditures

	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Bond Proceeds	6,824,777	0	10,681,691	0
Levy Proceeds	10,103,525	9,246,000	6,086,309	0
Total	16,928,302	9,246,000	16,768,000	0

Pike Place Market Renovation: Bond Proceeds

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Bond Proceeds Program is to allow spending of bond proceeds and bond interest earnings to be tracked separately from spending of other revenues in the Pike Place Market Renovation Fund.

Program Summary

The City received \$12 million in proceeds from the 2009 Limited Tax General Obligation (LTGO) Bond issue and \$4.8 million from the 2010 LTGO Bond issue for the Pike Place Market renovation. The City intends to issue an additional \$11 million in 3-year LTGO Bonds in early 2011. Bond proceeds are used to reimburse levy-related expenses incurred by the PDA in the renovation of Pike Place Market.

Add \$10.7 million to cover the remaining phases of the Pike Place Market Renovation project. Bond proceeds are used to cover the PDA's cash flow needs for the Pike Place Market Renovation project. Bond proceeds will be paid by levy proceeds in future years.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Bond Proceeds	6,824,777	0	10,681,691	0

Pike Place Market Levy

Pike Place Market Renovation: Levy Proceeds

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Levy Proceeds Program is to allow spending of levy proceeds and levy interest earnings to be tracked separately from bond proceeds in the Pike Place Market Renovation Fund.

Program Summary

Add \$6.1 million to cover the remaining phases of the Pike Place Market Renovation project. Levy proceeds are used to cover the PDA's levy-related Pike Place Market renovation expenses.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Levy Proceeds	10,103,525	9,246,000	6,086,309	0

Pike Place Market Levy

Pike Place Market Renovation Debt Service Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Pike Place Market Renovation Debt Service Budget Control Level is to provide appropriation authority for the City's payment of debt service for debt issued in support of the Pike Place Market Renovation funded by levy proceeds.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Pike Place Market Renovation Debt Service Program	296,820	2,574,692	3,892,431	4,155,564

Pike Place Market Levy

2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Pike Place Levy

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
411100	REAL & PERSONAL PROPERTY TAXES	12,370,921	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
461110	INV EARN-RESIDUAL CASH	18,514	55,000	37,000	(7,000)	8,000
461320	UNREALD GNS/LOSSES-INV GASB31	34,075	0	0	0	0
587355	PIKE PLACE MARKET RENOVATION BOND FUNDS	12,000,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	10,681,691	4,369,000
Total Revenues		24,423,510	17,355,000	17,337,000	23,174,691	16,877,000
379100	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	0	0	0	(2,514,260)	(12,721,436)
Total Resources		24,423,510	17,355,000	17,337,000	20,660,431	4,155,564

Pike Place Market Levy

Pike Place Levy

	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Beginning Fund Balance	0	(777,150)	7,164,363	(12,977,026)	(10,462,766)
Accounting and Technical Adjustments	(34,025)	0	0	0	0
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	24,423,510	17,355,000	17,337,000	23,174,691	16,877,000
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	17,225,122	11,820,692	37,478,389	20,660,431	4,155,564
Ending Fund Balance	7,164,363	4,757,158	(12,977,026)	(10,462,766)	2,258,670
Reserve for Pike Place Market Renovations		4,757,158			
Total Reserves	0	4,757,158	0	0	0
Ending Unreserved Fund Balance	7,164,363	0	(12,977,026)	(10,462,766)	2,258,670

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

Appropriations	Summit Code	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level					
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
Annual Certification and Inspection Budget Control Level	U24A0	3,665,990	3,481,088	3,968,165	4,049,524
Code Compliance Budget Control Level					
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
Code Compliance Budget Control Level	U2400	4,331,110	4,876,294	4,622,147	4,710,669
Construction Inspections Budget Control Level					
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
Construction Inspections Budget Control Level	U23A0	9,912,928	15,478,292	13,307,815	13,544,628
Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level					
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
Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level	U2300	21,826,215	20,747,158	17,151,360	17,391,640

Planning and Development

Appropriations	Summit Code	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Department Leadership Budget Control Level					
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
Department Leadership Budget Control Level	U2500	0	0	0	0
Land Use Services Budget Control Level					
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
Land Use Services Budget Control Level	U2200	5,972,425	6,027,805	3,727,576	3,792,362
Planning Budget Control Level					
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
Planning Budget Control Level	U2900	7,569,859	6,910,618	6,724,118	6,765,982
Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level	U2800	2,255,965	3,036,445	776,261	791,388
Department Total		55,534,492	60,557,700	50,277,443	51,046,192
Department Full-time Equivalents Total*		409.00	409.00	397.75	397.75
<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>					
		2009	2010	2011	2012
Resources		Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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
Department Total		55,534,492	60,557,700	50,277,443	51,046,192

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.

Program Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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
Total	3,665,990	3,481,088	3,968,165	4,049,524
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.

Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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
Total	4,331,110	4,876,294	4,622,147	4,710,669
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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.

Expenditures	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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.

Program Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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
Total	9,912,928	15,478,292	13,307,815	13,544,628
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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.

Program Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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
Total	21,826,215	20,747,158	17,151,360	17,391,640
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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
Total	0	0	0	0
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.

Expenditures	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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
Total	5,972,425	6,027,805	3,727,576	3,792,362
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

Expenditures/FTE	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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.

Expenditures	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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.

Expenditures	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
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
Total	7,569,859	6,910,618	6,724,118	6,765,982
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.

	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
Expenditures/FTE				
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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.

Expenditures/FTE	2009 Actual	2010 Adopted	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
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
Total Revenues		46,283,156	54,280,259	40,660,233	49,546,755	51,483,577
379100	Use of (Contribution To) Fund Balance	9,251,337	6,277,441	3,741,046	730,688	(437,385)
Total Resources		55,534,492	60,557,700	44,401,279	50,277,443	51,046,192

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	-
Total Contingent Budget Authority			6,620,000	1,171,053	6,620,000	421,053

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

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

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

Peer Review Contracts		
Unanticipated Revenue	Contingent Budget	Contingent FTE
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
Beginning Fund Balance	21,894,615	13,373,538	9,678,507	5,737,461	5,006,773
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
Ending Fund Balance	9,678,507	7,096,097	5,737,461	5,006,773	5,444,158
Core Staffing, Process Improvements and Technology	3,418,313	1,911,259	1,234,417	852,395	758,158
Total Reserves	3,418,313	1,911,259	1,234,417	852,395	758,158
Ending Unreserved Fund Balance	6,260,194	5,184,838	4,503,044	4,154,378	4,686,000

