

Office of Economic Development

Jill Nishi, Director

Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-8090

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

On the Web at: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/EconomicDevelopment/>

Department Description

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

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

Proposed Policy and Program Changes

The 2004 Proposed Budget reflects a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget of approximately \$585,000. Activity is reduced in OED's four program areas: Business Development, Community Development, Work Force Development and Management and Operations. Reductions are made to general administrative costs, as well as to contracting in supportive services.

In addition, resources are realigned to eliminate split funding positions between programs, and to simplify time tracking and reporting. This results in two programs, Business Development and Management and Operations, receiving a net increase in resource allocation. The other two programs receive the offsetting decreases in resource allocation.

OED's proposed budget does not include program activity from Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) sources. These funds are displayed in the CDBG section of the 2004 Proposed Budget. Approximately \$4.1 million in CDBG sources are used by OED for economic development activities, compared to \$3.6 million in the 2004 Endorsed Budget.

Economic Development

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level					
Business Development		848,411	830,836	822,927	1,028,702
Community Development		970,233	1,878,879	1,905,503	856,080
Management and Operations		851,932	709,525	713,004	1,318,601
Work Force Development		4,835,478	2,930,070	3,014,280	2,667,391
Office of Economic Development Budget Control Level	X1D00	7,506,054	6,349,310	6,455,714	5,870,774
Department Total		7,506,054	6,349,310	6,455,714	5,870,774
Department Full-time Equivalents Total*		38.50	23.75	23.00	23.00
<i>*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.</i>					
Resources					
General Subfund		7,506,054	6,349,310	6,455,714	5,870,774
Total		7,506,054	6,349,310	6,455,714	5,870,774

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 business assistance, and community and work force development services to businesses, community organizations, and residents so that Seattle has a strong economy, thriving neighborhoods, and broadly shared prosperity.

	2002	2003	2004	2004
Program Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Business Development	848,411	830,836	822,927	1,028,702
Community Development	970,233	1,878,879	1,905,503	856,080
Management and Operations	851,932	709,525	713,004	1,318,601
Work Force Development	4,835,478	2,930,070	3,014,280	2,667,391
TOTAL	7,506,054	6,349,310	6,455,714	5,870,774
Full-time Equivalents Total*	38.50	23.75	23.00	23.00

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

Economic Development

Office of Economic Development: Business Development

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Transfer \$185,000 in funding from the Community Development program to the Business Development program to eliminate split funding of positions between programs, and to simplify time tracking and reporting.

Increase budget by \$50,000 to support the retention of businesses in the manufacturing sector.

Reduce a total of \$22,000 in funding to the following five organizations: Manufacturing and Industrial Council, Seattle Convention and Visitor's Bureau, Seattle Sports Commission, Central Puget Sound Economic Development District, and Economic Development Council of Seattle and King County.

Reduce budget by \$6,000 for work in analyzing and creating growth strategies for key economic business sectors in Seattle.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$1,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$206,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Business Development	848,411	830,836	822,927	1,028,702
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.50

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

Economic Development

Office of Economic Development: Community Development

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Transfer \$614,000 in funding from the Community Development program to the Business Development and Management & Operations programs. This is done to eliminate split funding of positions between programs and to simplify time tracking and reporting.

Reduce budget by \$3,000 for work in real estate market analysis, and map and data research.

Reduce contracts to the Farmer's Market and the Downtown Seattle Association by a total of \$11,000.

Reduce funding to Community Development Corporations (CDCs) for predevelopment costs on real estate construction projects by \$420,000. The City contracts with Impact Capital which leverages these resources to generate additional revenue to support implementation of the CDCs' business plans. These CDCs include SouthEast Effective Development, Seattle Chinatown International District Public Development Authority, Central Area Development Association, Pioneer Square Community Association, HomeSight, Interim Community Development Association, and Delridge Neighborhoods Development Association. These organizations will receive an additional \$400,000 in CDBG funds in 2004. This is reflected in the CDBG section of the budget book.

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Community Development	970,233	1,878,879	1,905,503	856,080
Full-time Equivalents Total*	9.00	8.50	8.50	8.50

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

Economic Development

Office of Economic Development: Management and Operations

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Transfer \$752,000 the Community Development and Work Force Development programs to the Management and Operations program to eliminate split funding of positions between programs, and to simplify time tracking and reporting.

Reduce administrative costs by approximately \$86,000, including reducing expenses in website development, organizational development, computer hardware/software and general office costs.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$60,000, for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$606,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Management and Operations	851,932	709,525	713,004	1,318,601
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.75	7.75	7.75	7.75

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

Economic Development

Office of Economic Development: Work Force Development

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Transfer \$324,000 from the Work Force Development program to the Management & Operations program to eliminate split funding of positions between programs, and to simplify time tracking and reporting.

Reduce funding to three contracts supporting the department's work force development efforts by a total of \$23,000. These contracts include the Worker Center, Port Jobs and the Seattle Jobs Initiative.

The total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget is approximately \$347,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Work Force Development	4,835,478	2,930,070	3,014,280	2,667,391
Full-time Equivalents Total*	17.75	3.00	2.25	2.25

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

Office of Housing

Katie Hong, Director

Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-0348

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

On the Web at: <http://cityofseattle.net/housing/>

Department Description

The mission of the Office of Housing (OH) is to invest in and promote the development and preservation of affordable housing that offers the opportunity for the City to thrive. In order to accomplish this mission, OH has established four budget control levels, including 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 develops, rehabilitates, and maintains affordable multi-family rental housing facilities.

The Homeownership and Sustainability program provides services and resources for low-income Seattle residents so they can become homeowners. The program also provides home repair and energy conservation/weatherization measures to existing low-income homeowners, including seniors, to assist them in the preservation and improvement of their homes.

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

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

Proposed Policy and Program Changes

The 2004 Proposed Budget reflects an increase in lending activity in the Homeownership and Sustainability program while current levels of activity are maintained in the Multi-Family Production and Preservation program.

Although there is no net change in the Department's operational funding levels from the 2004 Endorsed Budget, operational dollars are shifted between programs as a result of a change in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) administration funding allocation.

OH's proposed budget does not include program activity from CDBG sources. These funds are displayed in the CDBG section of the 2004 Proposed Budget. Approximately \$4.6 million in CDBG resources are used by OH for housing production activities, including \$1.3 million in program delivery costs and \$3.3 million in capital costs for housing construction.

Housing

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing Fund 17820 Budget Control Level					
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 17820		334,712	450,000	250,000	0
Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing Fund 17820 Budget Control Level	XZ782	334,712	450,000	250,000	0
Housing Fund 33010 Budget Control Level	2XZ33	253,296	0	0	0
Housing Fund 33020 Budget Control Level	2XZ30	126,797	0	0	0
Low Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level					
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16400		4,974,198	6,683,602	6,276,051	7,311,757
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16400		16,850,627	24,920,332	26,672,773	27,141,861
Low Income Housing Fund 16400 Budget Control Level	XZ400	21,824,825	31,603,934	32,948,824	34,453,618
Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level					
Administration and Management - 16600		2,189,418	1,322,628	1,416,206	1,330,549
Community Development - 16600		795,361	274,622	190,588	62,647
Homeownership and Sustainability - 16600		823,391	626,035	650,562	868,718
Multi-Family Production and Preservation - 16600		981,536	889,389	921,760	917,202
Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600 Budget Control Level	XZ600	4,789,706	3,112,674	3,179,116	3,179,116

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Department Total		27,329,336	35,166,608	36,377,940	37,632,734
Department Full-time Equivalents Total*		57.25	43.50	42.50	42.50

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

Resources

General Subfund	1,817,224	0	0	0
Other Funds	25,512,112	35,166,608	36,377,940	37,632,734
Total	27,329,336	35,166,608	36,377,940	37,632,734

Selected Midyear Performance Measures

Provide funds to develop, rehabilitate, and maintain affordable multifamily rental housing to increase the supply and affordability of housing for Seattle residents.

Number of additional affordable units funded

2002 Year End Actuals:	334
2003 Midyear Actuals:	271
2003 Year End Projection:	355

Provide resources for Seattle residents to become homeowners and/or to preserve and improve their current home

Number of households that purchased homes in Seattle through the Employer Assisted Program

2002 Year End Actuals:	271
2003 Midyear Actuals:	118
2003 Year End Projection:	200

Number of homeowners receiving resources for minor home repairs

2002 Year End Actuals:	1,084 households 3,453 repairs
2003 Midyear Actuals:	349 households 777 repairs
2003 Year End Projection:	725 households 2,200 repairs

Number of first-time homebuyers receiving financial assistance to purchase homes

2002 Year End Actuals:	10
2003 Midyear Actuals:	15
2003 Year End Projection:	56

Housing

Number of additional units weatherized

2002 Year End Actuals: 1,148
2003 Midyear Actuals: 1,181
2003 Year End Projection: 1,206

Number of additional units rehabilitated

2002 Year End Actuals: 74
2003 Midyear Actuals: 22
2003 Year End Projection: 40

Provide strategic planning, program development, and services to promote the redevelopment of vacant and surplus public land and other key sites to increase housing opportunities for Seattle residents

Number of housing units beginning construction on surplus sites

2002 Year End Actuals: 86
2003 Midyear Actuals: 0
2003 Year End Projection: 50

Administration and Management

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce revenues by \$225,000 to reflect lower grant revenues. These reductions include \$94,000 in federal and local weatherization grants, \$12,000 in the Sound Families Gates Foundation grant award, \$95,000 in administration contribution from the Seattle Housing Authority, and \$24,000 in administration contribution from the 2002 Seattle Housing Levy.

Increase revenues by \$225,000 to reflect higher grant revenues and unused administration dollars from prior years. These increases include \$44,000 in higher grant awards from the federal HOME Program and the state's Matchmaker Program, \$56,000 from the South Lake Union project, and \$125,000 of unused administration dollars.

To comply with CDBG requirements, additional CDBG planning and administration dollars have been allocated to housing activities. This allows OH to redirect its operating funds from planning and administration to programmatic activities. Transfer \$86,000 from the Administration and Management program to the Homeownership and Sustainability Program.

The net decrease in the Administration and Management program from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget is approximately \$86,000.

	2002	2003	2004	2004
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600	2,189,418	1,322,628	1,416,206	1,330,549
TOTAL	2,189,418	1,322,628	1,416,206	1,330,549
Full-time Equivalents Total*	22.25	15.00	15.00	15.00

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

Housing

Community Development

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

To comply with CDBG requirements, additional CDBG planning and administration dollars have been allocated to housing activities. This allows OH to redirect its operating funds from planning and administration to programmatic activities. Transfer \$128,000 from the Community Development program to the Homeownership and Sustainability program.

The net decrease from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget is approximately \$128,000.

	2002	2003	2004	2004
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600	795,361	274,622	190,588	62,647
TOTAL	795,361	274,622	190,588	62,647
Full-time Equivalents Total*	9.00	6.00	5.00	5.00

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

Homeownership and Sustainability

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Homeownership and Sustainability program is to provide services and resources for low-income Seattle residents, including seniors, so they can become homeowners and/or to assist existing low-income homeowners in preserving and improving their homes.

Program Summary

Funding sources for housing production lending in this program are held in the Low Income Housing Fund 16400. Operating support for the Homeownership and Sustainability Program is held in the Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600.

Increase this program's capital budget by \$1,035,000 by carrying forward funds from prior years committed to new loans but not yet spent. An additional increase of \$340,000 in unanticipated loan program income is to be used in making loans through the Homewise Program. These increases are partially offset by \$339,000 in decreases in a projected weatherization grant award and revised projections of program loan repayments.

To comply with CDBG requirements, additional CDBG planning and administration dollars have been allocated to housing activities. This allows OH to redirect its operating funds from planning and administration to programmatic activities. Transfer in \$218,000 of operating funds from Fund 16600 to the Homeownership and Sustainability program from the Administration and Management program, the Community Development program, and the Multi-Family Production and Preservation program.

The net increase in operational funding from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget is approximately \$218,000. The net increase in capital funding from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget is approximately \$1,036,000.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE				
Low Income Housing Fund 16400	4,974,198	6,683,602	6,276,051	7,311,757
Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600	823,391	626,035	650,562	868,718
TOTAL	5,797,589	7,309,637	6,926,613	8,180,475
Full-time Equivalents Total*	15.00	11.00	11.00	11.00

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

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 multi-family rental housing so that the supply of housing for Seattle residents is increased and remains affordable.

Program Summary

Funding sources for housing production lending in this program are held in the Low Income Housing Fund 16400, the Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing Fund 17820, and the Housing Development Funds 33010 and 33020. Operating support for the Multi-Family Production and Preservation Program is held in the Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600.

Increase budget by \$469,000 in the Low Income Housing Fund to reflect the following changes: the establishment of \$1,851,000 in bridge lending authority; an increase of \$910,000 in investment earnings on cash balances; and an increase of \$390,000 in a federal HOME grant award. These increases are offset by a \$1,200,000 reduction in anticipated loan repayments; the elimination of \$880,000 of recording fee revenue from King County; and the shifting of \$602,000 in capital funds from the Multi-Family Program to the Homeowner and Sustainability Program in accordance with the Levy Administrative and Financial Plan passed in early 2003.

Reduce the Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing Fund 17820 budget by \$250,000 to reflect program income from multi-family loan repayments which was included in the 2004 Endorsed Budget, but was actually received in late 2002. Repayment occurred early due to lower interest rates making refinancing more attractive. The Department has already obtained expenditure authority for these funds.

Fund 33010 no longer receives program income from repaid multi-family housing loans. This fund is closed.

Fund 33020 receives program income from repaid multi-family housing loans.

To comply with CDBG requirements, additional CDBG planning and administration dollars have been allocated to housing activities. This allows OH to redirect its operating funds from planning and administration to programmatic activities. Transfer \$5,000 in Fund 16600 from the Multi-Family Production and Preservation program to the Housing and Sustainability program.

The net decrease in operational funding from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget is approximately \$5,000. The net increase in capital funding from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget is approximately \$219,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002	2003	2004	2004
	Actual	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing Fund 17820	334,712	450,000	250,000	0
Housing Fund 33010	253,296	0	0	0
Housing Fund 33020	126,797	0	0	0
Low Income Housing Fund 16400	16,850,627	24,920,332	26,672,773	27,141,861
Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600	981,536	889,389	921,760	917,202
TOTAL	18,546,968	26,259,721	27,844,533	28,059,063
Full-time Equivalents Total*	11.00	11.50	11.50	11.50

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

Department of Neighborhoods

Yvonne Sanchez, Director

Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-0464

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

On the Web at: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/neighborhoods/>

Department Description

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

The Department of Neighborhoods has five major operating functions:

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

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

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

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

The Research and Prevention Division includes the Community Mapping, Planning, and Data Analysis; Neighborhood Action Team; and Communities That Care (CTC) functions. Data Analysis and Neighborhood Action Team use data, technology, and structured problem-solving to address public safety issues and chronic nuisances affecting neighborhoods. CTC engages neighborhood-based community groups in reviewing data that reflects how their youth and families are doing and how connected they feel to their community, and in determining programs that can affect choices young people make about staying in school and out of trouble.

Proposed Policy and Program Changes

The Department's 2004 Proposed Budget reflects an overall department reorganization to ensure the Mayor's goal of neighborhood plan implementation is met despite cuts to staff and budgets in most programs. The Community Building Division has absorbed the Neighborhood Plan Implementation Program and this division now has overall responsibility for implementing neighborhood plans. The Major Institutions and Special Projects Program (called Major Institutions/Schools in the 2003 budget) also becomes part of the Community Building Division. The Historic Preservation Program becomes part of the newly named "Administration and

Neighborhoods

Historic Preservation" Division. A staff position added to this division focuses on the Department's work on race relations and social justice.

The Department received additional staff and budget to reflect increases in services or the Mayor's priorities:

The Children's Budget is reflected in funds added to the Data Analysis Program; these funds were transferred from other City departments as part of the Mayor's Children and Youth Strategy.

Staff are added to Historic Preservation to support work on the monorail; funds for these staff will be reimbursed to the Seattle Department of Transportation by the Seattle Popular Monorail Authority.

A new cable subscriber service center is added to the Central Area Neighborhood Service Center, supported by increased staffing for the Neighborhood Payment and Information Services Program. Funds for these staff will be reimbursed by area cable providers.

Staffing is reduced in the following programs: P-Patch, Historic Preservation, and Internal Operations/Administrative Services. The Department is also changing several contracts: contracts for the King County Dispute Resolution Center, Neighborhood Leadership Program, the Historic Resources Survey, and the Seattle Neighborhood Group are reduced or eliminated; and a contract with Historic Seattle to support the Wallingford Senior Center is transferred to the Human Services Department. Funding for Community Learning Centers in the Office for Education budget is shifted from the General Subfund to the Families and Education Levy.

An internal realignment of resources, to more accurately reflect spending and staffing in each program, is reflected in transfers to or from most programs in the Department. In addition, the Department made internal adjustments to reflect unbudgeted inflationary increases in health care and nonpersonnel operating costs. Funds added to some programs are offset by reductions elsewhere in the Department budget.

Neighborhoods

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Administration and Historic Preservation Budget Control Level					
Communications		109,485	128,455	131,789	123,168
Executive Leadership		202,737	182,688	187,423	312,375
Historic Preservation		581,992	536,509	551,145	426,296
Internal Operations/Administrative Services		1,385,093	1,505,901	1,541,496	1,527,596
Administration and Historic Preservation Budget Control Level	I3100	2,279,307	2,353,553	2,411,853	2,389,435
Community Building Budget Control Level					
Involving All Neighbors		56,603	73,545	75,398	52,336
Major Institutions and Project Management		0	0	0	176,883
Neighborhood District Coordinators		1,352,404	1,237,858	1,269,538	1,306,863
Neighborhood Leadership Program		34,124	29,919	31,303	0
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration		844,327	674,208	692,108	0
P-Patch		419,577	448,927	460,630	415,923
Community Building Budget Control Level	I3300	2,707,035	2,464,457	2,528,977	1,952,005
Customer Service Budget Control Level					
Citizens Service Bureau		389,755	386,598	396,737	411,993
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services		1,133,696	1,211,611	1,248,536	1,330,815
Public Toilet		82,013	0	0	0
Customer Service Budget Control Level	I3200	1,605,464	1,598,209	1,645,273	1,742,808
Neighborhood Preservation and Development Budget Control Level					
Major Institutions/Schools		169,925	219,713	224,319	0
Neighborhood Plan Implementation		956,180	495,496	506,168	0
Neighborhood Preservation and Development Budget Control Level	I3400	1,126,105	715,209	730,487	0
Office for Education Budget Control Level	I3700	0	558,954	573,443	325,647

Neighborhoods

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Research and Prevention Budget Control Level					
Data Analysis		0	265,000	269,720	257,119
Neighborhood Action Team		0	417,834	425,923	407,525
Research and Prevention Budget Control Level	I3600	0	682,834	695,643	664,644
Department Total		7,717,911	8,373,216	8,585,676	7,074,539
Department Full-time Equivalents Total*		89.25	92.13	92.13	87.50
<i>*FTE totals provided for information only (2002 FTE reflect adopted numbers). Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.</i>					
Resources					
General Subfund		7,717,911	8,373,216	8,585,676	7,074,539
Total		7,717,911	8,373,216	8,585,676	7,074,539

Selected Midyear Performance Measures

Committed to preserving and enhancing Seattle's diverse neighborhoods and bringing government closer to all people

Turnaround time goals for reviewing Certificates of Approval by the six Historic Preservation Boards and the Landmarks Board

- 2002 Year End Actuals: 2.7 days City review from receipt of Certificate of Approval application to owner notification as to whether application complete; 17.7 days from complete application to Board action
- 2003 Midyear Actuals: 1.96 days City review from receipt of Certificate of Approval application to notification to owner as to whether application is complete
16.6 days from complete application to Board action
- 2003 Year End Projection: 28 days of City review time from application date to determination of completeness; 45 days of City review time from complete application to Board action (timelines set by State legislation)

Total number of information calls, requests, or complaints handled by Citizen Service Bureau

- 2002 Year End Actuals: 61,495
- 2003 Midyear Actuals: 30,591
- 2003 Year End Projection: 64,000

Total amount of transactions processed by seven neighborhood payment and information sites

2002 Year End Actuals: 268,939
2003 Midyear Actuals: 127,635
2003 Year End Projection: 318,426

Committed to empowering Seattle residents to make positive contributions in their communities and promote a strong sense of community in neighborhoods through civic engagement, community partnership, and grassroots action

Total value of community resources leveraged through the NMF Program (Note: budget reductions to the NMF in 2003 and 2004 will impact mid-year results and year-end goals)

2002 Year End Actuals: \$6,323,118
2003 Midyear Actuals: \$2,601,255
2003 Year End Projection: \$5,000,000

Total number of Seattle residents involved in NMF projects (Note: budget reductions to the NMF in 2003 and 2004 will impact mid-year results and year-end goals)

2002 Year End Actuals: 7,422
2003 Midyear Actuals: 4,513
2003 Year End Projection: 8,000

Total number of NMF projects awarded funding (Note: budget reductions to the NMF in 2003 and 2004 will impact mid-year results and year-end goals)

2002 Year End Actuals: 301
2003 Midyear Actuals: 85
2003 Year End Projection: 275

Neighborhoods

Administration and Historic Preservation Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Program Expenditures				
Communications	109,485	128,455	131,789	123,168
Executive Leadership	202,737	182,688	187,423	312,375
Historic Preservation	581,992	536,509	551,145	426,296
Internal Operations/Administrative Services	1,385,093	1,505,901	1,541,496	1,527,596
TOTAL	2,279,307	2,353,553	2,411,853	2,389,435
Full-time Equivalents Total*	21.25	22.13	22.13	21.85

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

Administration and Historic Preservation: Communications

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Add approximately \$5,000 to this program in 2004 to reflect unbudgeted increases in health care and non-personnel operating expenses. The Department made reductions elsewhere in the budget to cover this cost.

Reduce program budget by approximately \$13,000 as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures. These funds were transferred to other programs to more accurately reflect the costs of running this program. Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$1,000 for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$9,000.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE				
Communications	109,485	128,455	131,789	123,168
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

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

Administration and Historic Preservation: Executive Leadership

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Add 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor II, and increase program budget by approximately \$99,000, to support the Department's Race Relations initiative.

Add approximately \$1,000 to this program to reflect unbudgeted increases in health care and non-personnel operating expenses. The Department made reductions elsewhere in the budget to cover this cost. Reduce training expenses by approximately \$3,000, which will result in fewer training opportunities for staff. As part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures, increase Executive Leadership budget by approximately \$30,000, via transfers from various programs. This increase more accurately reflects the costs of running this program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$2,000 for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$125,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Executive Leadership	202,737	182,688	187,423	312,375
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00

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

Neighborhoods

Administration and Historic Preservation: Historic Preservation

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

This program was formerly part of the Neighborhood Preservation and Development budget control level. In 2004, Historic Preservation is moved to the Administration budget control level, to reflect a departmental reorganization.

Reduce budget by \$26,000 to reflect a transfer of a contract with Historic Seattle to the Human Services Department. This contract subsidizes rent for the Wallingford Senior Center, housed in Historic Seattle's Good Shepherd Center.

Reduce budget by \$62,000 by eliminating the Historic Survey contract, designed to survey neighborhoods' historic assets. Four neighborhood surveys are currently underway. This reduction eliminates the funding for any future surveys.

Reduce a Community Development Specialist position from 1.0 to 0.5 FTE, for a savings of approximately \$35,000. This position currently staffs the Ballard Avenue Landmark District and Pike Place Market Historical Commission. Turnaround times for permit applicants in both the Ballard and the Pike Place Market are increased, and staff support to the volunteer Ballard Avenue Landmark District Board and the Pike Place Market Historical Commission is reduced.

Eliminate an Executive III position that is shared with the Neighborhood Plan Implementation and Major Institutions programs, and was shown entirely in the FTE count for the Neighborhood Plan Implementation Program to simplify position list maintenance. The Neighborhood Plan Implementation Program is eliminated in 2004. This staffing cut, along with related savings, reduces the Historic Preservation Program budget by approximately \$18,000.

Add approximately \$4,000 to this program to reflect unbudgeted increases in health care and non-personnel operating expenses. The Department made reductions in other programs to cover this cost. Increase program budget by adding approximately \$13,000 to this program via transfers from other programs, as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures. This increase more accurately reflects the costs of running this program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by approximately \$1,000 for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$125,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Historic Preservation	581,992	536,509	551,145	426,296
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.40	6.40	6.40	5.90

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

Administration and Historic Preservation: Internal Operations/Administrative Services

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce administrative and accounting staff by a total of 2.38 FTE, for a total savings of approximately \$72,000. These reductions include the following: reduction of a 1.0 FTE Accountant position to 0.5 FTE for a savings of approximately \$14,000; elimination of a 0.88 FTE Office/Maintenance Aide position, for a savings of approximately \$32,000, and elimination of a 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist 1 position. The Administrative Specialist position is shared with the P-Patch Program, and the full FTE reduction is shown here in the Internal Operations/Administrative Services Program to simplify position list maintenance. The Internal Operations/Administrative Services Program's share of this staffing cut, and associated savings, reduces the budget by approximately \$26,000.

Increase the Internal Operations/Administrative Services budget by transferring approximately \$27,000 and 1.6 FTE from various programs as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures and FTE. This transfer more accurately reflects the costs and staffing for this program. Add approximately \$49,000 to this program to reflect unbudgeted increases in health care and non-personnel operating expenses. The Department made reductions elsewhere in the budget to cover this cost.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$13,000, which, along with a \$5,000 reduction to the program's budget for office supplies, results in a decrease from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$14,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Internal Operations/Administrative Services	1,385,093	1,505,901	1,541,496	1,527,596
Full-time Equivalents Total*	11.85	12.73	12.73	11.95

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

Neighborhoods

Community Building Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Program Expenditures				
Involving All Neighbors	56,603	73,545	75,398	52,336
Major Institutions and Project Management	0	0	0	176,883
Neighborhood District Coordinators	1,352,404	1,237,858	1,269,538	1,306,863
Neighborhood Leadership Program	34,124	29,919	31,303	0
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration	844,327	674,208	692,108	0
P-Patch	419,577	448,927	460,630	415,923
TOTAL	2,707,035	2,464,457	2,528,977	1,952,005
Full-time Equivalents Total*	32.00	30.50	30.50	32.75

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

Community Building: Involving All Neighbors

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce program budget by approximately \$23,000 to reflect funds transferred to other programs as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures. This transfer more accurately reflects the costs of running this program.

Add approximately \$1,000 to the Involving All Neighbors Program to reflect unbudgeted increases in health care and non-personnel operating expenses. The Department made reductions elsewhere in the budget to cover this cost.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$1,000 for a net decrease from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$23,000.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE				
Involving All Neighbors	56,603	73,545	75,398	52,336
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

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

Community Building: Major Institutions and Project Management

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Transfer approximately \$177,000 and 2.0 FTE to this new program from the Major Institutions/Schools Program and Neighborhood Plan Implementation Program, both eliminated in 2004. Staff for this program provide support to major institutions, project management related to neighborhood plans and project management related to the Monorail. Funding for support to the Monorail is included in the Seattle Department of Transportation budget.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Major Institutions and Project Management	0	0	0	176,883
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00

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

Neighborhoods

Community Building: Neighborhood District Coordinators

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Add \$10,000 to this program to reflect increased operating costs for the new Beacon Hill and Capitol Hill Neighborhood Service Centers. The Neighborhood Service Centers (NSCs) are co-located with new libraries in these neighborhoods; additional operating costs have been agreed to in a Memorandum of Agreement with the Seattle Public Library. The Capitol Hill NSC opened in 2003; the Beacon Hill NSC is expected to open in 2004. The Department budget is reduced in other programs to offset these additional costs.

Eliminate a \$12,000 contract with the King County Dispute Resolution Center. This contract funded group facilitation and education and outreach to City staff and residents. Staff and residents can continue to access services from the Dispute Resolution Center on a sliding-fee scale.

Add approximately \$10,000 to this program to reflect unbudgeted increases in health care and non-personnel operating expenses. The Department budget is reduced in other programs to offset these additional costs.

Add approximately \$34,000 to the Neighborhood District Coordinators Program via transfers from various programs as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures. This budget increase more accurately reflects the costs of running this program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by approximately \$5,000 for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$37,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Neighborhood District Coordinators	1,352,404	1,237,858	1,269,538	1,306,863
Full-time Equivalents Total*	14.10	14.10	14.10	14.10

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

Community Building: Neighborhood Leadership Program

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood Leadership Program is to provide leadership training opportunities to Seattle community groups and residents so that leadership skills are enhanced and the level of civic engagement increases.

Program Summary

Eliminate contract for Neighborhood Leadership Program and reduce program budget by \$15,000. The Department will no longer be able to provide leadership training tailored to specific community groups. Transfer the remaining \$16,000 from this program to other programs, as part of a Department-wide budget realignment.

Expenditures/FTE	2002	2003	2004	2004
	Actual	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Neighborhood Leadership Program	34,124	29,919	31,303	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

Community Building: Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Transfer approximately \$685,000 from this program to the Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF). These funds reflect staffing costs for Neighborhood Matching Fund project managers and supervisors. These funds are transferred in order to display the full DON staffing costs in the NMF budget. A corresponding increase of approximately \$447,000 in the Neighborhood Matching Fund Management and Project Development Program reflects the fact that part of these funds have historically been part of the Department's base budget and the remainder, approximately \$237,000, are funds that have in the past been transferred from the NMF to the Department. The FTE for this program remain in the Department of Neighborhoods, and are reflected below.

Transfer remaining funds of approximately \$7,000 to other programs as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures, for a total reduction from this program of approximately \$692,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002	2003	2004	2004
	Actual	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Neighborhood Matching Fund Administration	844,327	674,208	692,108	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	11.10	9.10	9.10	9.10

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

Neighborhoods

Community Building: P-Patch

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce staffing costs by approximately \$84,000, reflecting a decrease in administrative staff support and a Community Garden Coordinator. The administrative staff position is shared with the Internal Operations/Administrative Services Program and the 1.0 FTE reduction is shown entirely in that program to simplify position list maintenance. This staffing cut reduces the P-Patch Program by approximately \$26,000. The Community Garden Coordinator position was temporary, so no FTE changes are reflected below; approximately \$58,000 is reduced from the P-Patch budget to reflect funding for this position. Staff and administrative support to the 70 P-Patch and Cultivating Communities gardens is reduced.

Increase program budget by \$10,000 to reflect higher utility costs at P-Patches and community gardens; this budget increase is offset by an increase in P-Patch fees.

Add approximately \$6,000 to this program to reflect unbudgeted increases in health care and non-personnel operating expenses; the Department budget is reduced in other programs to cover this cost.

Increase program budget by approximately \$25,000 and 0.25 FTE as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures. These funds and FTE are transferred from other programs, to more accurately reflect the costs of running the P-Patch program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$2,000 for a reduction from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$45,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
P-Patch	419,577	448,927	460,630	415,923
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.80	6.30	6.30	6.55

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

Customer Service Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Customer Service budget control level is to provide information, services, and coordination of services to community members in relation to their neighborhood issues.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Program Expenditures				
Citizens Service Bureau	389,755	386,598	396,737	411,993
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services	1,133,696	1,211,611	1,248,536	1,330,815
Public Toilet	82,013	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,605,464	1,598,209	1,645,273	1,742,808
Full-time Equivalents Total*	21.15	22.15	22.15	23.90

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

Customer Service: Citizens Service Bureau

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Add approximately \$3,000 to this program to reflect unbudgeted increases in health care and non-personnel operating expenses in 2004. The Department made reductions elsewhere in the budget to cover this cost. The 2004 budget also includes an increase of approximately \$13,000 to this program as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures. These funds were transferred from various programs, in order to more accurately reflect the costs of running this program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$1,000 for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed budget of approximately \$15,000.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE				
Citizens Service Bureau	389,755	386,598	396,737	411,993
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.40	6.40	6.40	6.40

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

Neighborhoods

Customer Service: Neighborhood Payment and Information Services

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Increase budget for this program by approximately \$30,000, to reflect unbudgeted inflationary increases for Neighborhood Service Center personnel, leases, and other operating costs. The credit card payment initiative is also funded, which allows ratepayers to pay their utility bills with credit cards. The budget for this program is based on a Memorandum of Understanding with Seattle City Light and Seattle Public Utilities; these increased costs are reimbursed by both utilities on a pro rata basis.

Add 1.25 FTE Customer Service Representative to reflect the addition of a cable subscriber services center at the Central Area Neighborhood Service Center. These funds were appropriated via Ordinance 121129 in 2003, and will be carried forward into 2004. Funding for the cable subscriber services center is reimbursed via a contract with Comcast and Millennium Digital Media Systems. This contract extends through May 2004, and may be renewed at that time.

Add 0.5 FTE Customer Service Representative to meet new federal requirements for processing passport applications. Funding for this temporary position was included in the 2004 Endorsed Budget; approximately \$9,000 is added to the Neighborhood Payment and Information Services Program to fund incremental benefits costs.

Add \$49,000 to this program via transfers from other programs as part of a Department-wide realignment of expenditures. This increase more accurately reflects the costs of running this program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$6,000 for a net increase from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed budget of approximately \$82,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Neighborhood Payment and Information Services	1,133,696	1,211,611	1,248,536	1,330,815
Full-time Equivalents Total*	14.75	15.75	15.75	17.50

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

Customer Service: Public Toilet

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Public Toilet program is to provide portable toilet units in under-served areas of the City so that persons without access to other toilet facilities are accommodated and City health and sanitation concerns are not compromised.

Program Summary

This program was transferred to Seattle Public Utilities in the 2003 Adopted Budget.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Public Toilet	82,013	0	0	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

Neighborhoods

Neighborhood Preservation and Development Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood Preservation and Development budget control level is to provide technical assistance, outreach, and education associated with the preservation of historic buildings; to ensure community involvement associated with the facility planning for schools and major institutions; and to facilitate, monitor, and coordinate the implementation of the adopted Neighborhood Plans so that Seattle neighborhoods are strengthened, important community buildings are preserved, and major institutions and schools are able to grow while being mindful of the neighborhoods in which they are located.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Program Expenditures				
Major Institutions/Schools	169,925	219,713	224,319	0
Neighborhood Plan Implementation	956,180	495,496	506,168	0
TOTAL	1,126,105	715,209	730,487	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	14.85	8.35	8.35	0.00

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

Neighborhood Preservation and Development: Major Institutions/Schools

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Major Institutions/Schools program is to ensure community involvement in the development, adoption, and implementation (as required by the land use code) of Major Institution Master Plans and development plans for public schools so that hospitals, universities, and public schools can operate, grow, and develop with a minimum of negative impacts and maximum benefit to the City and surrounding neighborhoods.

Program Summary

This program is eliminated in 2004. Approximately \$42,000 is transferred to the new Major Institutions/Project Management Program, which combines the functions of this program with the Neighborhood Plan Implementation Program, also eliminated in 2004. The rest of the program budget, approximately \$182,000 and 1.6 FTE are transferred to other programs in the Department, as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE				
Major Institutions/Schools	169,925	219,713	224,319	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	2.10	1.60	1.60	0.00

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

Neighborhood Preservation and Development: Neighborhood Plan Implementation

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhood Plan Implementation program is to facilitate, monitor, and coordinate City efforts to implement the neighborhood plans for the community so that high priority requests in the plans are implemented in the parts of the City anticipated to receive the most growth over the next 20 years.

Program Summary

This program is eliminated in 2004 and 5.0 FTE are abrogated: one Executive III position (which was shared with the Major Institutions/Schools Program and the Historic Preservation Program), three Strategic Advisor II positions, and one Administrative Specialist II position. The Department budget is reduced by approximately \$440,000 as a result of these staff reductions. Responsibilities for neighborhood plan implementation are absorbed by the Community Building Division. Funds for outreach are also reduced by \$15,000. Remaining funds of approximately \$51,000 and 2.25 FTE are transferred to other programs as part of a Department-wide realignment of expenditures.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Neighborhood Plan Implementation	956,180	495,496	506,168	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.75	6.75	6.75	0.00

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

Neighborhoods

Office for Education Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce General Fund support to this program by approximately \$266,000 to reflect use of Families and Education Levy fund balance to support the Middle School Support Project. The Community Learning Centers and the match paid to the Seattle School District for the City's portion of the cost of the Seattle School's Community Learning Center coordinator position is moved from General Subfund to the Families and Education Levy.

Add approximately \$19,000 to this program and abrogate 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures and staffing reorganization. These funds are transferred from various programs, in order to more accurately reflect the costs of running this program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$1,000 for a decrease from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$248,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Office for Education	0	558,954	573,443	325,647
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	5.00	5.00	4.00

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

Research and Prevention Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Research and Prevention budget control level is to provide a structured approach to planning programs and services by using data, technology, and analytic support to agencies and community groups so they can better address the needs of neighborhoods throughout the city.

	2002	2003	2004	2004
Program Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Data Analysis	0	265,000	269,720	257,119
Neighborhood Action Team	0	417,834	425,923	407,525
TOTAL	0	682,834	695,643	664,644
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	4.00	4.00	5.00

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

Neighborhoods

Research and Prevention: Data Analysis

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Add approximately \$37,000 to support the Communities That Care initiative and data analysis program. These funds reflect the Children's Budget, redistributed resources from other City departments, and will align the spending of certain City departments (Neighborhoods, Human Services, Public Health, Police, and Policy & Management) with the Mayor's Children and Youth Strategy. The CTC initiative is intended to reduce youth substance abuse, delinquency, juvenile violence, dropping out of school, and teen pregnancy.

Reduce program budget by approximately \$49,000 as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures. These funds were transferred to other programs to more accurately reflect the costs of running the Research and Prevention Planning Program.

Add 1.0 FTE Planning and Development Specialist II to support the Communities That Care initiative. This position was funded in the 2004 Endorsed budget; only position authority is added to the Department's budget.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by approximately \$1,000 for a decrease from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$13,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Data Analysis	0	265,000	269,720	257,119
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	3.00	3.00	4.00

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

Research and Prevention: Neighborhood Action Team

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce contract with Seattle Neighborhood Group (SNG) by \$10,000, or approximately 3%. SNG provides a variety of public safety organizing efforts around the city, and will raise funds to replace this reduction by charging fees for some of their training programs.

Reduce printing budget by approximately \$6,000. Reduce program budget by approximately \$1,000 via transfers to other programs as part of a department-wide realignment of expenditures. This reduction more accurately reflects the costs of running this program.

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$1,000 for a net decrease from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$18,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Neighborhood Action Team	0	417,834	425,923	407,525
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

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

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Description

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

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

Since 1997, the NMF has been divided into five categories: Large Projects (awards between \$15,000-\$100,000); Small & Simple Projects (awards of \$15,000 or less); Tree Fund (free trees to neighborhood groups to plant along residential planting strips or parks); Neighborhood Outreach (one-time awards up to \$750 for membership expansion or leadership development); and Management and Project Development (consultation and technical assistance to neighborhood groups, coordination of application and award process, and monitoring of funded projects). In 2004, a new category, Race Relations and Social Justice, provides awards of up to \$15,000 to improve awareness, understanding, and relations among different racial or ethnic groups and/or address issues of equity, fairness, and access related to education, health care, employment, job training, housing, public health, and the environment. A second new initiative, Targeted Infrastructure, provides capital funds for infrastructure projects in rapidly-growing neighborhood planning areas.

Proposed Policy and Program Changes

The 2004 Proposed Budget reflects a number of policy and funding changes to the Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF). The Large Projects Fund is reduced by approximately \$770,000; approximately \$370,000 of that reduction reflects lower-than-anticipated City revenues in 2004; the remaining amount is transferred to a new NMF fund - Race Relations and Social Justice. This new fund provides awards to support community-driven projects that improve awareness, understanding, and relations among different racial or ethnic groups and/or address issues of equity, fairness, and access. A pilot project in 2003 funded 21 community groups for a total of approximately \$258,000.

The Targeted Infrastructure initiative is funded by Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II funds, and supports infrastructure improvements such as pedestrian safety and open space development in rapidly-growing neighborhood planning areas. In 2004, four neighborhoods are designated to receive funds: 12th Avenue, Greenwood, Madison/Miller, and Pike/Pine. These neighborhoods have all exceeded their housing or job growth targets as outlined in Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. If this initiative continues beyond 2004, this list of targeted neighborhoods will likely change.

In addition to the new program areas described above, the 2004 Proposed Budget reflects a transfer of funds for staffing from the Department of Neighborhoods to the NMF. These funds have previously been reflected in both the NMF and the Department of Neighborhoods budget; transferring the funds to the NMF more accurately reflect the full costs of staffing the program. This transfer has no net effect on the General Subfund; accounting processes for the NMF and the Department of Neighborhoods are made less complex.

Slight funding reductions to the NMF impact staffing levels in the Department of Parks and Recreation, funds

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

available for the Tree Program, and other administrative costs. The overall change in support to the NMF from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed Budget is a net increase of approximately \$755,000.

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level					
Large Projects Fund		583,884	2,090,076	2,090,076	1,319,576
Management and Project Development		743,769	619,924	619,924	895,853
Neighborhood Outreach Fund		14,560	10,000	10,000	10,000
Race Relations and Social Justice Fund		0	0	0	400,000
Small and Simple Projects Fund		360,387	880,000	880,000	880,000
Tree Fund		85,873	100,000	100,000	50,000
Neighborhood Matching Fund	2IN00	1,788,473	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,555,429
Budget Control Level					
Department of Parks and Recreation - Targeted Infrastructure Budget Control Level*					
12th Avenue		0	0	0	300,000
Department of Parks and Recreation - Targeted Infrastructure Budget Control Level	TBD	0	0	0	300,000
Seattle Department of Transportation - Targeted Infrastructure Budget Control Level*					
Greenwood		0	0	0	200,000
Madison/Miller		0	0	0	210,000
Pike/Pine		0	0	0	190,000
Seattle Department of Transportation - Targeted Infrastructure Budget Control Level	TBD	0	0	0	600,000
Department Total		1,788,473	3,700,000	3,700,000	4,455,429
* Department of Parks and Recreation Targeted Infrastructure and Seattle Department of Transportation Targeted Infrastructure Budget Control Levels are not subject to transfer to any other budget control level under Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 5.08.					
Resources					
General Subfund		1,788,473	0	0	0
Other Funds		0	3,700,000	3,700,000	4,455,429
Total		1,788,473	3,700,000	3,700,000	4,455,429

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Neighborhood Matching Fund Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Program Expenditures				
Large Projects Fund	583,884	2,090,076	2,090,076	1,319,576
Management and Project Development	743,769	619,924	619,924	895,853
Neighborhood Outreach Fund	14,560	10,000	10,000	10,000
Race Relations and Social Justice Fund	0	0	0	400,000
Small and Simple Projects Fund	360,387	880,000	880,000	880,000
Tree Fund	85,873	100,000	100,000	50,000
TOTAL	1,788,473	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,555,429

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Large Projects Fund

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce funds available in the Large Projects Fund by approximately \$770,000. This reduction includes a transfer of \$400,000 from the Large Projects Fund to the new Race Relations and Social Justice Fund and a reduction of \$370,000 in response to lower-than-projected City revenues. With an average award amount of \$65,000, approximately twelve fewer Large Projects Fund awards are likely to be made in 2004.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures				
Large Projects Fund	583,884	2,090,076	2,090,076	1,319,576

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; coordinating the application, review, and award processes; and managing/monitoring funded projects to support high quality and successful completion of projects.

Program Summary

Reduce administrative costs by approximately \$170,000. This includes reduction of funds for staff in the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and the Seattle Department of Transportation who work on Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF) projects, as well as a reduction to administrative expenses in the Department of Neighborhoods. One staff position in DPR is abrogated. The NMF will continue to support a Planning & Development Specialist II in DPR; all other NMF staffing work performed by DPR will be charged directly to projects. This change in approach may reduce DPR's capacity to manage NMF projects and limit the number of park projects awarded in 2004. The Department of Neighborhoods and DPR, with the assistance of the Department of Finance, are drafting a Memorandum of Understanding to guide the staffing and project management of NMF projects in parks.

Add approximately \$446,000, transferred from the Department of Neighborhoods budget (Community Building budget control level), to fully reflect staffing costs for the NMF. These funds had been partially reflected in the Department of Neighborhoods budget; transferring the funds to the NMF more accurately reflects the full staffing costs. This transfer has no net effect on the General Subfund.

The total increase from the 2004 Endorsed to the 2004 Proposed budget is approximately \$276,000.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures				
Management and Project Development	743,769	619,924	619,924	895,853

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Neighborhood Outreach Fund

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

There are no significant changes to this program in 2004.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures				
Neighborhood Outreach Fund	14,560	10,000	10,000	10,000

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Race Relations and Social Justice Fund

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Race Relations and Social Justice Fund is to support community-driven projects that are designed to: improve awareness, understanding, and relations among different racial or ethnic groups and/or address issues of equity, fairness, and access related to education, health care, employment, job training, housing, public health, and the environment. Awards of \$15,000 or less are made for these projects.

Program Summary

Transfer \$400,000 from the Large Projects Fund to the new Race Relations and Social Justice Fund. Eligible projects are described in the program purpose statement above. A pilot project in 2003 awarded \$258,000 to 21 community groups for projects that supported outreach, training, education, and translation of materials focusing on issues of race relations and social justice. The 2004 level of funding should support approximately 30 projects.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures				
Race Relations and Social Justice Fund	0	0	0	400,000

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Small and Simple Projects Fund

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

There are no significant changes to this program in 2004. In mid-2003, the adopted budget for the Small and Simple Projects Fund was reduced by approximately \$450,000 to rebalance the budget. Two Small and Simple award cycles were eliminated.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures				
Small and Simple Projects Fund	360,387	880,000	880,000	880,000

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Neighborhood Matching Fund: Tree Fund

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Reduce budget by a total of \$50,000, which eliminates the use of this fund to purchase trees for City parks, but maintains support for street tree planting projects. Remaining funds are directed to tree planting projects in targeted neighborhoods in Central, South Seattle, Beacon Hill, South Delridge, and South Park.

Expenditures	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Tree Fund	85,873	100,000	100,000	50,000

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Department of Parks and Recreation - Targeted Infrastructure Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Department of Parks and Recreation Targeted Infrastructure Budget Control Level is to provide funds for open space infrastructure investments in rapidly-growing neighborhood planning areas which have exceeded their Comprehensive Plan housing or job growth targets.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Program Expenditures				
12th Avenue	0	0	0	300,000
TOTAL	0	0	0	300,000

Department of Parks and Recreation - Targeted Infrastructure: 12th Avenue

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this program is to fund infrastructure improvements in the 12th Avenue neighborhood.

Program Summary

Add approximately \$300,000 of Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II funds to this new program to fund development of open space in the 12th Avenue neighborhood. These funds are part of the "Targeted Infrastructure" program, a new Neighborhood Matching Fund initiative which funds infrastructure improvements in rapidly-growing neighborhood plan areas. Specific improvements will be determined based on community input. These open space improvements will be constructed by the Department of Parks and Recreation; more information can be found in the 2004-2009 Proposed Capital Improvement Program.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures				
12th Avenue	0	0	0	300,000

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Seattle Department of Transportation - Targeted Infrastructure Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Seattle Department of Transportation Targeted Infrastructure Budget Control Level is to provide funds for transportation infrastructure investments in rapidly-growing neighborhood planning areas which have exceeded their Comprehensive Plan housing or job growth targets.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Program Expenditures				
Greenwood	0	0	0	200,000
Madison/Miller	0	0	0	210,000
Pike/Pine	0	0	0	190,000
TOTAL	0	0	0	600,000

Seattle Department of Transportation - Targeted Infrastructure: Greenwood

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this program is to fund infrastructure improvements in the Greenwood neighborhood.

Program Summary

Add \$200,000 of Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II funds to this new program to fund pedestrian and street improvements in the Greenwood neighborhood. These funds are part of the "Targeted Infrastructure" program, a new Neighborhood Matching Fund initiative that funds infrastructure improvements in rapidly-growing neighborhood plan areas. Specific improvements will be determined based on community input. These improvements will be constructed by the Seattle Department of Transportation; more information can be found in the 2004-2009 Proposed Capital Improvement Program.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures				
Greenwood	0	0	0	200,000

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Seattle Department of Transportation - Targeted Infrastructure: Madison/Miller

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this program is to fund infrastructure improvements in the Madison/Miller neighborhood.

Program Summary

Add \$210,000 of Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II funds to this new program to fund pedestrian safety and street improvements in the Madison/Miller neighborhood. These funds are part of the "Targeted Infrastructure" program, a new Neighborhood Matching Fund initiative that funds infrastructure improvements in rapidly-growing neighborhood plan areas. Specific improvements will be determined based on community input. These improvements will be constructed by the Seattle Department of Transportation; more information can be found in the 2004-2009 Proposed Capital Improvement Program.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures				
Madison/Miller	0	0	0	210,000

Seattle Department of Transportation - Targeted Infrastructure: Pike/Pine

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this program is to fund infrastructure improvements in the Pike/Pine neighborhood.

Program Summary

Add \$190,000 of Cumulative Reserve Subfund - REET II funds to this new program to fund pedestrian safety improvements in the Pike/Pine neighborhood. These funds are part of the "Targeted Infrastructure" program, a new Neighborhood Matching Fund initiative that funds infrastructure improvements in rapidly-growing neighborhood plan areas. Specific improvements will be determined based on community input. These improvements will be constructed by the Seattle Department of Transportation; more information can be found in the 2004-2009 Proposed Capital Improvement Program.

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures				
Pike/Pine	0	0	0	190,000

Neighborhood Matching Subfund

2004 Estimated Revenues for the Neighborhood Matching Subfund

Summit Code	Source	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Revenues					
541900	Community Development Block Grant	\$ 186,566	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
587116	Operating Transfer In From REET II (00161)	-	-	-	900,000
587001	Operating Transfer In From General Fund (00100)	4,313,434	3,413,000	3,313,000	3,168,429
	Use of Fund Balance	-	287,000	387,000	387,000
	Total Resources	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 3,700,000	\$ 3,700,000	\$ 4,455,429
Expenditures					
741190	Large Projects Fund	\$ 2,581,224	\$ 2,090,076	\$ 2,090,076	\$ 1,319,576
741190	Management & Project Development *	717,700	619,924	619,924	895,853
741190	Neighborhood Outreach Fund	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
741190	Race Relations and Social Justice Fund	-	-	-	400,000
741190	Small and Simple Projects Fund	1,031,776	880,000	880,000	880,000
741190	Tree Fund	159,300	100,000	100,000	50,000
741190	Targeted Infrastructure	-	-	-	900,000
	Total Expenditures	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 3,700,000	\$ 3,700,000	\$ 4,455,429

* Note: These funds are distributed to the following City departments:

Parks and Recreation	188,000	214,691	214,691	80,119
Seattle Transportation	108,000	92,000	92,000	80,094

Department of Planning and Development

Diane Sugimura, Director

Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-8600

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

On the Web at: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/dclu/>

Department Description

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

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

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

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

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

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

Planning & Development

Proposed Policy and Program Changes

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

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

The Department also proposes converting nine long-term temporary positions to permanent positions. The conversions will comply with the City's temporary employee usage policy, will provide stable service, and in some cases will produce direct savings.

Planning & Development

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Annual Certification & Inspection Budget Control Level	U2450U	2,065,012	2,397,029	2,468,823	2,469,925
Code Compliance Budget Control Level	U2400U	2,755,050	3,256,136	3,281,391	3,197,542
Construction Inspections Budget Control Level					
Building Inspections Program		3,184,029	3,694,694	3,805,367	4,404,840
Electrical Inspections		1,946,692	2,628,352	2,695,961	2,747,265
Signs and Billboards		131,007	208,456	213,877	216,091
Site Review and Inspection		1,213,625	1,997,311	2,059,493	2,163,418
Construction Inspections Budget Control Level	U2350U	6,475,353	8,528,813	8,774,698	9,531,614
Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level					
Applicant Services Center		4,517,385	4,097,163	4,318,930	4,354,943
Construction Plans Administration		5,407,642	5,625,446	5,777,333	5,604,081
Operations Division Overhead		829,528	1,004,023	1,052,732	1,068,000
Public Resource Center		1,162,775	1,864,155	1,931,436	1,791,458
Construction Permit Services Budget Control Level	U2300U	11,917,330	12,590,787	13,080,431	12,818,482
Contingent Budget Authority Budget Control Level	U2600U	0	0	0	0
Department Strategy Budget Control Level					
Community Relations		329,640	392,948	409,409	408,380
Director's Office		725,614	872,332	896,810	897,808
Finance and Accounting Services		1,673,293	1,664,131	1,711,288	1,766,339
Human Resources		871,970	936,650	962,278	951,662
Information Technology Services		3,498,074	2,680,108	2,736,055	2,776,493
Department Strategy Budget Control Level	U2500U	7,098,591	6,546,169	6,715,840	6,800,682
Judgment and Claims Budget Control Level	CLU-TBD1	0	1,399,970	1,399,970	1,399,970
Land Use Services Budget Control Level	U2200U	3,234,646	4,729,716	4,890,932	5,070,935

Planning & Development

Appropriations	Summit Code	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Planning Budget Control Level					
Comprehensive and Regional Planning		299,314	480,717	487,201	633,333
Land Use Policy and Code Development		933,537	1,227,731	1,302,981	1,208,524
Planning Commission		0	176,934	188,923	187,049
Planning Division Overhead		105,714	166,786	171,414	170,907
Urban Design		618,559	681,197	703,191	1,306,007
Planning Budget Control Level	U2900U	1,957,124	2,733,365	2,853,710	3,505,820
Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level					
	U2800U	4,699,856	3,111,112	3,236,893	5,177,262
Department Total		40,202,962	45,293,097	46,702,688	49,972,232
Department Full-time Equivalents Total*		344.50	348.75	350.75	368.25
<i>*FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.</i>					
Resources					
General Subfund		6,764,502	9,525,186	9,781,970	9,754,482
Other Funds		33,438,460	35,767,911	36,920,718	40,217,750
Total		40,202,962	45,293,097	46,702,688	49,972,232

Selected Midyear Performance Measures

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

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

2002 Year End Actuals: 71%

2003 Midyear Actuals: 65%

2003 Year End Projection: Goal of reviewing 100% of simple building permits within 48 hours.

Percent of Master Use Permit (MUP) applications reviewed within 120 days.

2002 Year End Actuals: 72%

2003 Midyear Actuals: 82%

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

Planning & Development

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

2002 Year End Actuals: 42%

2003 Midyear Actuals: 54%

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

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

Percentage of cases resolved within designated timeframes

2002 Year End Actuals: 58% within 60 days; 68% within 90 days; 74% within 120 days

2003 Midyear Actuals: 54% within 60 days; 64% within 90 days; 72% within 120 days

2003 Year End Projection: 58% within 60 days; 70% within 90 days; 78% within 120 days

Number of service requests, inquiries, and complaint cases received

2002 Year End Actuals: 4,645 new cases

2003 Midyear Actuals: 2,250 new cases

2003 Year End Projection: 4,800 new cases

Planning & 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 to ensure that mechanical equipment is substantially maintained to applicable codes, legal requirements, and policies, and operated in a safe manner. The program also certifies that installers and mechanics are qualified by validation of work experience and testing of code knowledge to operate and maintain mechanical equipment.

Program Summary

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Annual Certification and Inspection	2,065,012	2,397,029	2,468,823	2,469,925
Full-time Equivalents Total*	22.82	21.47	22.47	22.47

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Code Compliance Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Code Compliance	2,755,050	3,256,136	3,281,391	3,197,542
Full-time Equivalents Total*	34.96	33.96	33.96	33.46

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & 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 help ensure substantial compliance with applicable City codes, ordinances, and approved plans.

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

*FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

Construction Inspections: Building Inspections Program

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

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

*FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

Planning & 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

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

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Electrical Inspections	1,946,692	2,628,352	2,695,961	2,747,265
Full-time Equivalents Total*	20.94	18.59	18.59	18.59

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & 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

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Signs and Billboards	131,007	208,456	213,877	216,091
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.71	1.29	1.29	1.29

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Construction Inspections: Site Review and Inspection

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Site Review and Inspection	1,213,625	1,997,311	2,059,493	2,163,418
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.05	18.91	18.91	18.91

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & 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.

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

Full-time Equivalents Total*	111.87	112.06	112.10	113.10
------------------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Construction Permit Services: Applicant Services Center

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Applicant Services Center	4,517,385	4,097,163	4,318,930	4,354,943
Full-time Equivalents Total*	49.62	50.45	50.40	50.40

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & 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

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

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Construction Plans Administration	5,407,642	5,625,446	5,777,333	5,604,081
Full-time Equivalents Total*	43.65	34.43	34.43	34.43

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Construction Permit Services: Operations Division Overhead

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Construction Permit Services: Public Resource Center

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Public Resource Center	1,162,775	1,864,155	1,931,436	1,791,458
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.96	18.73	18.82	19.82

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Contingent Budget Authority Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Contingent Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Department Strategy Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

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

*FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

Department Strategy: Community Relations

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

*FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

Planning & Development

Department Strategy: Director's Office

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Department Strategy: Finance and Accounting Services

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

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

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Department Strategy: Human Resources

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Department Strategy: Information Technology Services

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

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

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Judgment and Claims Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Judgment and Claims	0	1,399,970	1,399,970	1,399,970
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & 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 citizens. Land Use provides permit process information and regulatory expertise to inform pre-application project design. Land Use reviews proposed development plans and facilitates the public process associated with permit applications. These services are intended to ensure that development proposals are reviewed in a fair, reasonable, efficient, and predictable manner, and to ensure that the plans substantially comply with applicable codes, legal requirements, policies, and community design standards.

Program Summary

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

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002	2003	2004	2004
	Actual	Adopted	Endorsed	Proposed
Land Use Services	3,234,646	4,729,716	4,890,932	5,070,935
Full-time Equivalents Total*	36.23	33.46	33.42	34.42

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Planning Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Program Expenditures				
Comprehensive and Regional Planning	299,314	480,717	487,201	633,333
Land Use Policy and Code Development	933,537	1,227,731	1,302,981	1,208,524
Planning Commission	0	176,934	188,923	187,049
Planning Division Overhead	105,714	166,786	171,414	170,907
Urban Design	618,559	681,197	703,191	1,306,007
TOTAL	1,957,124	2,733,365	2,853,710	3,505,820
Full-time Equivalents Total*	21.24	25.48	25.48	27.48

*FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

Planning: Comprehensive and Regional Planning

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE				
Comprehensive and Regional Planning	299,314	480,717	487,201	633,333
Full-time Equivalents Total*	3.57	5.00	5.00	7.00

*FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.

Planning & Development

Planning: Land Use Policy and Code Development

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Land Use Policy and Code Development	933,537	1,227,731	1,302,981	1,208,524
Full-time Equivalents Total*	10.75	11.28	11.28	10.78

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Planning: Planning Commission

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Expenditures/FTE				
Planning Commission	0	176,934	188,923	187,049
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning: Planning Division Overhead

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

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

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

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Planning: Urban Design

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

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

Add \$49,000 to account for a shift of 0.50 FTE Land Use Planner III position from Land Use Policy & Code Development to Urban Design to provide staffing resources for special projects.

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

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Urban Design	618,559	681,197	703,191	1,306,007
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.80	6.20	6.20	6.70

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

Process Improvements and Technology Budget Control Level

Purpose Statement

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

Program Summary

Increase the program budget by \$1,961,000 for the phased implementation of Hansen Information Systems modules for construction and land use permitting. This will allow DPD to replace aging, unstable systems and increase customer service. Implement the next phase of the Hansen project using 5.00 FTE Information Technology Professional A positions and 3.00 FTE Information Technology Professional B positions.

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

Citywide adjustments to inflation assumptions reduce the budget by \$7,000, for a total reduction from the 2004 Endorsed Budget to the 2004 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1,941,000.

Expenditures/FTE	2002 Actual	2003 Adopted	2004 Endorsed	2004 Proposed
Process Improvements and Technology	4,699,856	3,111,112	3,236,893	5,177,262
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.53	13.75	14.75	24.75

**FTE totals provided for information only. Authorized positions are listed in Appendix A.*

Planning & Development

2004 Revenues for the Planning and Development Fund

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

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

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

Note:

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

Planning & Development

2004 Contingent Authority - Revenue & Expenditure Tables

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

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	\$ 800,000	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	\$ 1,440,000	5.0

Planning & Development

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

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

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