

# Seattle Public Utilities

## Ray Hoffman, Director

### Contact Information

Department Information Line: (206) 684-3000

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

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

### Department Description

The Seattle Public Utility's (SPU's) mission is to provide reliable, efficient, and environmentally conscious utility services to enhance the quality of life and livability in all communities SPU serves.

SPU is composed of three major direct-service providing utilities: the Water Utility, the Drainage & Wastewater Utility, and the Solid Waste Utility. All three utilities strive to operate in a cost-effective, innovative, and environmentally responsible manner.

The Water Utility provides more than 1.3 million people with a reliable supply of clean and safe water for drinking and other uses. The system extends from Edmonds to Des Moines and from Puget Sound to Lake Joy near Duvall. SPU retails water in Seattle and adjacent areas, and sells water wholesale to 21 suburban water utilities and two interlocal associations for distribution of water to their customers. The Water Utility includes 1,800 miles of pipeline, 30 pump stations, 15 treated water reservoirs, three wells, and 104,000 acres in two watersheds.

The Drainage and Wastewater Utility collects and conveys sewage and stormwater. The drainage and wastewater system includes approximately 448 miles of sanitary sewers, 968 miles of combined sewers, 460 miles of storm drains, 68 pump stations, 90 permitted combined sewer overflow outfalls, 342 storm drain outfalls, 130 stormwater quality treatment facilities, 145 flow control facilities, and 38 combined sewer overflow control detention tanks/pipes. In addition to structural infrastructure, SPU regulates, plans, builds and maintains green stormwater infrastructure, an increasingly important option for managing stormwater. Appropriate approaches to managing sewage and stormwater that can carry pollutants into the region's lakes, rivers and Puget Sound are vital to preserve public health and environmental quality.

The Solid Waste Utility collects and processes recycling, compostables, and residential and commercial garbage. To fulfill this responsibility the City owns two recycling and disposal stations, two household hazardous waste facilities, and a fleet of trucks and heavy equipment. In addition, SPU administers contracts with private contractors who collect household refuse, compostables, and recyclables and deliver the materials to the recycling and composting facilities, and disposal stations for its ultimate processing or disposal. The Solid Waste Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) supports post-closure projects on two landfills previously used by the City.

SPU operations and capital programs are funded almost entirely by fees and charges paid by ratepayers who use SPU's solid waste, drainage, wastewater, and drinking water systems. SPU also actively seeks grants to support system maintenance and improvements, and receives reimbursements from other City departments and funds for services provided to those agencies. Water rates are adopted for the period 2009-2011 and inform the 2011 budget included in this document. Rates for solid waste, drainage, and wastewater had been established through the period 2009-2010. New rates have now been adopted for 2011-2012 to support the operating and capital service levels included in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget.

## Policy and Program Changes

Like other departments in the City of Seattle, and like governmental agencies throughout the nation, SPU is facing financial challenges. Revenues in all three lines of business have been impacted by the economic slowdown, which has led residents and businesses to create fewer tons of garbage and use less water than assumed in previous forecasts. The recession has heightened existing trends toward lower consumption and more efficient use of utility resources in Seattle. Total water demand has decreased by roughly 25% since peaking in the 1980s, for example, and is projected to continue decreasing by roughly 1% a year over the next few years. The trends support the City's conservation goals; however, they have reduced the revenue SPU is expected to receive to cover the fixed portion of the costs of delivering these services.

The financial position of SPU's funds has been further stretched to meet federal and state regulatory requirements, including requirements associated with the City's two National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, one for stormwater and one for combined sewer system. The City is required, for example, to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in the combined sewer/stormwater system over the next several years to control the number of combined sewer overflows (CSOs) into receiving bodies of water, including Lake Washington and Puget Sound. The City also must meet many permit requirements designed to improve stormwater quality, reduce the impacts of excessive runoff on nearby waters, and reduce sewage backups and flooding. One such example is a new requirement to regularly inspect most or all food service establishments to reduce the fats, oils, and greases that enter and possibly clog the sewer system. All of these requirements put upward pressure on SPU rates.

Compounding the financial challenges is the age of the system. The majority of the utility infrastructure was built between 1900 and 1940, with additional growth during the period 1945 to 1970. SPU invests millions of dollars annually in assessing, rehabilitating, and reconstructing crucial pipes, pumps, and facilities. These investments are essential to ensure a continued supply of safe drinking water, reliable sewage and drainage services for residential and business properties, and sufficient disposal options at transfer stations for city business owners' and residents' garbage, recycling, and compostable waste.

### BUDGETARY ADJUSTMENTS TO RESPOND TO FINANCIAL CHALLENGES

In the face of these pressures, SPU has taken several steps in recent years and in the current budget to ensure financial stability, contain rates, and meet financial targets. Financial targets are used by bond holders to assess SPU's creditworthiness, and favorable ratings help SPU sell revenue bonds to fund infrastructure investments at the lowest costs possible. This benefits the utilities and the rate payers they serve.

In the 2010 Adopted Budget, reductions in SPU's operations and maintenance functions and the Capital Improvement Program removed \$52.6 million and 37 positions. These reductions were a necessary response to the revenue reductions caused by the economic downturn. They also allowed SPU's drainage and wastewater rates to grow several percentage points more slowly than initially forecast in the 2010 Endorsed Budget. As a result, however, more than 30 capital projects were eliminated or deferred that would have supported drainage and wastewater improvements, and significant reductions were made in operating programs supporting customer education, the development of markets for hard to recycle materials such as carpeting, and technical assistance to the business community for recycling and composting.

During 2010, as part of the City's mid-year budget review, SPU reduced an additional 10 positions, including three managers and three strategic advisors.

In the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget, the Mayor and Council have approved a package that includes significant operations and maintenance (O&M) expenditure reductions, a limited number of new projects and programs, and moderate rate increases to fund core services and respond to regulatory requirements. In 2011-2012, SPU will continue to:

- Build, operate and maintain the City's utility infrastructure for drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater to ensure system reliability and public health and safety for the region's residents and businesses.
- Collect and dispose of solid waste from residents and businesses in Seattle to support public health and safety, and continue policies that promote recycling, composting, and other waste diversion, to help the City of Seattle meet its goal of diverting 60% of all waste from landfills by 2012.
- Protect the environment in the Tolt and Cedar Watersheds, as well as the Duwamish, Elliot Bay, Puget Sound and the greater Seattle area, by collecting, treating, and managing wastewater and stormwater run-off, restoring habitat, and providing remediation at historic landfill sites.
- Pursue leadership in cost-effective conservation and sustainable community living, through infrastructure projects, education, innovation, financial incentives, and rebate programs.

More detail about 2011-2012 budget actions is provided after a discussion of budget and rate highlights in each SPU fund.

#### BUDGET AND RATE HIGHLIGHTS BY FUND

**Water Fund.** The Water Fund is transitioning from a period of major infrastructure investments in reservoirs, treatment plants, a water quality lab, and hatchery improvements, to a period focused on the maintenance of physical infrastructure. Large investments are coming to a close in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget and 2011-2016 Adopted CIP. These investments helped secure the supply of safe drinking water and Provide appropriate stewardship of the watersheds consistent with federal and state requirements. Moving forward, in contrast, the Water Utility's investments will be somewhat smaller and will emphasize infrastructure renewal and replacement, guided by asset management business practices.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget includes continued funding for the Water Utility's reservoir undergrounding program, specifically for the completion of the West Seattle and Maple Leaf Reservoir projects that began construction in 2008 and 2009, respectively. The Morse Lake Pump Plant project is funded through 2011, and is expected to be fully funded in future budgets after crucial design decisions have been made. This project will ensure that water stored in Chester Morse Lake can be reliably released into the Cedar River to maintain the supply of fresh drinking water in the region and sustain fish habitats. Funding is also approved for construction of the Cedar Sockeye Hatchery, along with investments in water system improvements related to the Bridging the Gap program, the Alaskan Way Viaduct/Seawall project, and the Mercer Corridor project.

The budget for the installation of new water taps has been reduced to reflect the slowdown in building construction. Other significant reductions include the Integrated Control Monitoring Program, Heavy Equipment Purchases, Cedar River Non-HCP Road Improvements, and Cedar Bridges. Overall, SPU has reduced the 2011 Water Fund CIP by approximately \$8.4 million from the spending planned for 2011 in the 2010-2016 CIP.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget assumes the effect, as of December 31, 2010, of eliminating the temporary tax rate increase and water rate surcharge enacted in February 2009 to respond to the court decision in *Lane v. City of Seattle*. This change has reduced the net increase in water rates between 2010 and 2011 to approximately 3.5%. The budget and CIP are supported by the adopted 2009-2011 water rates, with further rate increases assumed for 2012.

**Drainage and Wastewater Fund.** While the Water Fund is entering a period of lower investment levels focused on system maintenance, the Drainage and Wastewater Fund is experiencing growth driven by regulatory pressures. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget restores some of the reductions made in 2010 and adds a small number of new programs directly related to compliance with the City's NPDES stormwater and CSO permits.

The City of Seattle's most recent NPDES permit for stormwater, granted by the State government in 2007, introduced more prescriptive requirements to help to protect local waterways and Puget Sound from damaging pollutants and excessive runoff. Some of these include business inspections, private stormwater detention facility inspections, detection of illicit connections, and inspections and cleaning of catch basins. These heightened NPDES requirements affect many City departments, and SPU is leading the coordination effort. In addition, SPU must comply with findings from a 2008 US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) audit of SPU's wastewater and combined sewer system.

SPU's 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget includes new funding for inspection and outreach to businesses that discharge pollutants and fats, oils, and greases. Other measures include more condition assessment of the wastewater system to document the appropriate level of system improvement, maintenance, and rehabilitation. To comply with the City's CSO permit, the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP continues investments in the combined sewer overflow program, including the Long Term Control Plan (LTCP) and the Windermere, Henderson, and Genesee control projects. The CSO investments total more than \$43 million over the 2011-2012 biennium alone.

SPU's Adopted Budget and CIP also address major drainage issues throughout the city, including localized flooding problems in Madison Valley, and South Park storm drainage and water quality issues. The CIP provides funding for utility work related to the City's voter-approved Bridging the Gap transportation investments, the Alaskan Way Viaduct/Seawall project, and the Mercer Corridor project.

Several of SPU's approaches to stormwater management have received national attention. Seattle is pioneering green stormwater infrastructure projects, including swales, and relying on this cost-effective approach to reduce overflows from the combined sewer system and to improve the water quality of stormwater runoff. The Adopted Budget and CIP also fund an innovative street sweeping for water quality program, based on analysis that shows street sweeping is one of the most cost-effective means to keep pollutants from entering receiving waters (compared, for example, with building and maintaining detention and treatment facilities).

Despite operating efficiencies that generated savings of roughly \$1.9 million and 8.5 FTE in the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget, the Drainage and Wastewater Fund's budget is approximately 8.4% higher than the 2010 Adopted Budget. The growth is driven by regulatory requirements, and because the Drainage and Wastewater Fund is now absorbing a higher share of overall SPU overhead costs, given the offsetting decline in the size of the Water Utility's CIP. The budget and CIP are supported by rates that assume increases for the average residential customer in 2011 of 13.1% or \$2.25 a month in Drainage and 4.1% or \$1.92 a month in Wastewater rates, before the effect of King County treatment rate increases that are passed through to Seattle customers. With the effect of King County rate increases, average residential Drainage rates increased by 14.0% or \$2.40 a month, while Wastewater rates increased by 14.5% or \$6.76 a month.

**Solid Waste Fund.** The Solid Waste Utility's 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget and 2011-2016 Adopted CIP provide funding to rebuild the south and north transfer stations which were built in the 1960s and are now nearing the end of their useful lives. Both of the existing stations will be replaced with new recycling and disposal stations that will modernize solid waste operations, enhance worker safety, and allow for greater recycling opportunities and more reuse of construction materials.

The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget includes funding for collection, processing and disposal of the region's waste including recyclables and compostables. By 2009, Seattle's recycling rate had reached an all-time high of 51.1% due largely to the success of the City's program to collect compostable waste and food scraps from all single-family homes. Continued policy innovation will be required to meet the City's goal of recycling 60% of the solid waste it generates by 2012. SPU will work with the Mayor and Council in the coming biennium to meet these goals.

The Solid Waste Fund has been under financial stress as a result of the economic downturn, which curbed the volume of waste and recyclables, and caused prices for recyclable materials to dip considerably for several months. To respond to the downturn, several reductions were implemented in the 2010 budget, impacting customer education, community waste prevention grants, and enforcement for recycling requirements. The 2011 O&M budget contains significant savings strategies, based on an identification of operating efficiencies, as described below. The 2011 capital allocations are \$10.1 million lower than amounts planned for 2011 in the 2010-2015 CIP, due largely to schedule changes that have pushed construction expenses for the transfer stations into future years.

The budget and CIP assume solid waste rate increases for the average residential customer of 6.3% or \$2.05 per month in 2011. Rate increases are required to respond to declining volumes and to build replacements for the City's two transfer stations, both of which are nearing the end of their useful lives.

#### SUMMARY OF 2011-2012 BUDGET CHANGES

The specific strategies used in SPU's 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget to ensure financial stability, contain rates, and meet financial targets are described on the following pages.

**Operational Efficiencies.** In response to Executive and Council priorities to keep rate increases low and ensure appropriate spans of control, SPU engaged in a thorough review of its operations to find efficiencies. The Utility identified several reductions and developed plans to mitigate service level impacts by reallocating work across remaining employees and in some cases, through restructuring. As a result, without eliminating any programs and with modest impact on customers, SPU's budget provides roughly \$4 million in O&M savings and abrogates more than 35 FTE, including 15.5 managers and strategic advisors, with the following strategies across all SPU funds:

- Reductions in support services including human resources staffing, information technology staffing, administrative support staffing, and light and heavy vehicles. Impacts on SPU's internal and external customers will be mitigated by careful redeployment of remaining resources.
- Reduced staffing in the Joint Utility Call Center, consistent with the Council's 2010 Budget Guidance Statement 10-1-A-1. This action is expected to have minimal impact on services levels for customers because of efficiencies and performance improvements that are under way as part of the Customer Response Revitalization Project.
- Rollback of salary increases for senior employees, consistent with Executive Order 2010-01, which directed executives, managers, and strategic advisors to forgo cost of living increases in 2010. This rollback will be continued in 2011, generating additional savings.

- Reductions in several lines of business, including project delivery, watershed management, drainage and wastewater quality, water system planning, and solid waste field inspections. Most service level impacts will be mitigated by redeploying work across remaining staff. However, a reduction in staffing at the Cedar River Watershed may impact public services at the Education Center.

- Annualization of the 10 vacant position reductions from the 2010 MidYear Review, including three managers and three strategic advisors, and four water pipe worker positions that will be unfunded until construction activity in the region recovers enough to generate further workload for the installation of new taps. Because these positions are vacant, work has already been absorbed by other staff and no erosion to the 2010 level of service is anticipated in 2011-2012 as a result of this action.

General Fund Reductions. SPU receives about \$1.5 million a year in General Fund resources to support programs and services that benefit the city overall. These services include staffing a hotline and resolving abandoned vehicle complaints; education and outreach dedicated to keeping local water bodies free of pollutants (Restore our Waters); managing and maintaining the City's geographic database (Geographic Information Systems or GIS) resources; and providing a variety of engineering services including maintaining survey records, replacing survey monuments and markers in roadways, and keeping the City's standard plans for construction work in the right-of-way up to date. In developing the 2011 Adopted Budget, the City of Seattle's General Fund was facing a \$67 million shortfall for 2011. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget includes reductions for all General fund-dependent functions. SPU's 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget reflects reductions in order to close the General Fund gap, including:

- Decreased funding for replacement of missing survey monuments and benchmarks in city streets. Monuments are used by City and private sector surveyors as they survey property lines, and the reduction will result in an increased backlog of missing survey monuments and benchmarks. This impact will be mitigated but not eliminated by continuing to work with public and private contractors, ensuring that they correctly replace monuments that they impact in their construction projects.

- Elimination of resources that would have provided additional staffing in the Engineering Records Center. Customers will continue to experience wait times when viewing the official Public Works records of their property or the adjacent rights of way.

- Decreased funding for training, updates, and enhancements to the City's GIS database that will impact City employees' ability to efficiently deliver City services.

Restoration of Previous Reductions and New Programs Related to Regulatory Requirements. SPU's 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget restores a handful of investments in the Drainage and Wastewater Fund that were removed in previous years. These investments primarily respond to regulatory requirements, and include:

- Resuming payment of annual dues during 2011-2012 to the Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 9 Management Committee as part of an Interlocal Agreement to implement the Chinook Salmon Habitat Plan for the WRIA 9 Green/Duwamish and Central Puget Sound Watershed for 2007-2015. Due to 2010 budget constraints, SPU did not pay the 2010 dues and instead negotiated a temporary agreement to provide equivalent in-kind staffing that will not be renewed.

- Restoring funding for two Source Control inspector positions that were created in the 2009-2010 Adopted Budget and unfunded in the 2010 Adopted Budget. These positions are needed to comply with the NPDES stormwater permit, which requires the City to inspect approximately 3,400 industrial businesses that discharge into the separated drainage system and to inspect and gather data from 1,480 privately-owned stormwater facilities.



- Creating two new positions to provide education, outreach, and inspection of the 4,600 food service establishments in Seattle, consistent with the anticipated Compliance Order by Consent that is currently under negotiation between SPU and the federal Environmental Protection Agency. The positions will focus on preventing the discharge of fats, oils, and greases into sewage systems, to reduce sewer backups and overflows in compliance with the Clean Water Act.

In addition, the 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget in the Drainage and Wastewater Fund proposes a street sweeping for water quality program intended to help meet Seattle's NPDES permit requirements. Street sweeping is more cost-effective at removing the stormwater pollutant load than either typical roadway or regional scale structural treatment facilities. By using newer "regenerative air" street sweeping vehicles to sweep about 9,500 miles of curbed arterials per year, City crews will remove approximately 80,000 kilograms of total suspended solids from roadways that drain through the stormwater system directly to receiving waters. Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) crews will perform the street sweeping with reimbursement from SPU.

Enhanced Funding Related to Grants and Policy Priorities. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget recognizes grant funding in the Drainage and Wastewater Fund to establish a flow control plan for Piper's Creek watershed stormwater using hydrologic modeling and green stormwater infrastructure (GSI) techniques.

The budget also proposes a small amount of funding from the Water and Drainage and Wastewater Funds to include data about utility infrastructure capacity in City planning initiatives led by the Department of Planning and Development. A focus will be the City's neighborhood planning process. Cost-effective, well-coordinated capital planning is an integral part of a sustainable Seattle - a walkable, bikable, livable urban environment that is home to diverse communities and businesses. Utility infrastructure will be impacted by increasing growth and density so adequate, cost-effective planning is a benefit to the utility as well.

Two engineering positions are approved in the Drainage and Wastewater Fund to prioritize and implement projects that will reduce the impacts of urban flooding and sanitary sewer overflows on public safety, private property, and public infrastructure. Project locations will be prioritized by taking into account economic, social, and environmental metrics. The vulnerability of particular neighborhoods to major flooding and sanitary sewer overflow impacts will be assessed based on such factors as income, age, race, ethnicity, and unemployment.

SPU will direct \$80,000 of existing Drainage and Wastewater Fund resources toward a new still-to-be-defined citywide program for public outreach and education activities related to tree planting. In 2011, the Office of Sustainability and the Environment will work with other City departments to bring recommendations creating the new program to the City Council for consideration. The program is intended to help the City reach its goal of increasing tree canopy to 30% citywide and to 33% in single family areas by offering support to City residents. Single family residential properties make up two-thirds of Seattle's land area and represent the majority of tree retention and planting potential.

The budget includes additional resources in the Solid Waste Fund to implement a pilot program to assess whether every-other-week garbage collection may help advance City recycling goals, save money, and maintain customer satisfaction levels. With less frequent garbage pick-up, customers may be motivated to divert more organic waste (which has weekly pick-up) and recyclables from their garbage. The pilot program will be conducted in a sample of neighborhoods that reflect the diversity of Seattle and will provide data to help the City evaluate this type of garbage collection for contract periods beginning in 2013.

To advance the City's zero-waste goals, the budget provides additional funding in the Solid Waste Fund to create a single City-sponsored opt-out registry that would allow residents to opt out of receiving yellow pages phone books. An estimated 1.4 million yellow pages telephone books are delivered each year in Seattle comprising 2,300 tons of paper that must be recycled through the City's solid waste system. Many people now find

businesses through the internet and no longer want paper phone books, and the City has received feedback from residents that their efforts to contact phone book publishers and opt-out of receiving the phone books have not, in the past, been successful. The budget also establishes a recovery fee to pay City costs for the opt-out registry and recycling of yellow pages books.

This budget introduces universal food and yard waste collection subscription for multi-family dwellings starting in the fall of 2011, to help the City meet its solid waste diversion goals. Similar to the organics service for single-family customers, owners of multi-family buildings would be required to purchase some level of organics service but disposal of organic waste in the garbage would not be prohibited.

Consistent with the 2010 City Auditor's Report on graffiti control in the city, resources are added to provide enhanced graffiti control and outreach, funded by a 19 cent per ton increase in tonnage taxes, from \$8.50 per ton to \$8.69 per ton.

Finally, the budget restores modest funding for matching grants provided by SPU to community organizations and schools for waste reduction and recycling activities.

Miscellaneous Investments. All SPU funds are contributing to the costs of upgrading SPU computers to the Windows 7 Operating System.

The Water Fund and the Drainage and Wastewater Fund are contributing a one-time sum to address a backlog of repaving work on road surfaces that have a temporary patch. The temporary patches were applied after the road pavement was cut to allow SPU to install or maintain underground pipes and infrastructure. SDOT crews are responsible for repaving the streets and receive reimbursement for this service from SPU. With this funding an additional 946 street openings will be repaved in 2010 and 2011.

Baseline Adjustments. The 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget includes a variety of technical changes to ensure appropriations are sufficient to cover the costs of delivering current services. These baseline changes are not the result of new policy choices, but instead represent the funding necessary to continue policies and programs that are already in place. Included are adjustments to the City's existing contracts with King County for sewage treatment and with private providers who provide regular garbage and recycling collection services for City residents. Other baseline changes include modifications to the distribution of SPU's overhead costs across capital and O&M budgets, and between funds, based on technical analysis of labor distribution across lines of business.

As with prior budgets, program description statements for operating programs compare adopted 2011 amounts to the 2010 Adopted Budget, while statements for capital budget control levels compare the 2011 allocations in the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP with the same-year allocations in the prior CIP.

## City Council Provisos

None of the money appropriated in the 2011 budget for Seattle Public Utilities' Customer Service BCL may be spent for expanded graffiti database services until authorized by future ordinance. Council anticipates that such authority will not be granted until Seattle Public Utilities and the Seattle Police Department evaluate graffiti database needs and submit a joint recommendation for the scope of expanded database efforts, the responsibilities of each department, and the department assignment of new part-time staff for expanded graffiti database work.

Of the appropriation in the 2011 budget for Seattle Public Utilities Drainage and Wastewater Fund Other Operating BCL, \$80,000 is appropriated solely for participation in a new citywide 2011 program for public outreach and education activities related to trees and may be spent for no other purpose.



\$80,000 of the money appropriated in the 2011 budget for Seattle Public Utilities Drainage and Wastewater Fund Other Operating BCL may not be spent for participation in a new citywide 2011 program for public outreach and education activities related to trees until authorized by future ordinance.

In the 2012 Endorsed Budget, the Administration Budget Control Levels in the Solid Waste, Drainage and Wastewater, and Water Funds are reduced by a total of \$500,000 to reflect reductions that will be made to management-related costs. Reductions will not be restricted to executives, managers, or strategic advisors. Other supervisory functions may be restructured and some non-labor savings aimed at reducing internal costs may be achieved. SPU will identify specific steps toward meeting this reduction as part of the 2012 budget process.

**SPU**

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
<b>Drainage &amp; Wastewater Utility</b>					
<b>Administration Budget Control Level</b>					
Administration		12,179,907	12,393,279	13,918,854	13,706,807
General and Administrative Credit		(8,686,881)	(10,451,203)	(10,816,551)	(10,922,149)
<b>Administration Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N100B-DW</b>	<b>3,493,026</b>	<b>1,942,076</b>	<b>3,102,303</b>	<b>2,784,658</b>
<b>Combined Sewer Overflows Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C360</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24,171,960</b>	<b>17,806,875</b>	<b>25,769,534</b>
<b>Control Structures Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C310B</b>	<b>17,123,450</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Customer Service Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N300B-DW</b>	<b>6,334,297</b>	<b>7,174,417</b>	<b>7,089,545</b>	<b>7,026,865</b>
<b>Flooding, Sewer Back-up, and Landslides Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C380</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25,053,790</b>	<b>35,069,776</b>	<b>23,240,984</b>
<b>General Expense Budget Control Level</b>					
Debt Service		29,806,595	34,920,603	37,274,252	39,863,112
Other General Expenses		126,304,879	124,983,729	141,157,439	141,232,653
Taxes		32,067,961	31,978,028	36,979,272	38,640,160
<b>General Expense Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N000B-DW</b>	<b>188,179,436</b>	<b>191,882,360</b>	<b>215,410,962</b>	<b>219,735,925</b>
<b>Landslide Mitigation &amp; Special Programs Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C335B</b>	<b>714,362</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Low Impact Development Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C334B</b>	<b>945,732</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Other Operating Budget Control Level</b>					
Field Operations		18,898,959	19,835,354	19,895,761	19,854,568
Pre-Capital Planning & Development		510,226	1,615,167	1,989,291	2,069,669
Project Delivery		7,786,480	9,522,624	9,348,989	9,407,616
Utility Systems Management		12,915,297	15,306,562	17,879,199	18,442,069
<b>Other Operating Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N400B-DW</b>	<b>40,110,961</b>	<b>46,279,706</b>	<b>49,113,240</b>	<b>49,773,922</b>
<b>Protection of Beneficial Uses Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C333B</b>	<b>930,984</b>	<b>4,757,062</b>	<b>2,283,081</b>	<b>6,040,474</b>
<b>Rehabilitation Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C370</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,484,079</b>	<b>6,471,519</b>	<b>10,526,291</b>

**SPU**

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Sediments Budget Control Level	C350B	3,343,681	2,732,244	6,350,146	5,385,277
Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level	C410B-DW	7,983,492	16,205,574	11,804,290	16,660,024
Stormwater & Flood Control Budget Control Level	C332B	10,014,977	0	0	0
Technology Budget Control Level	C510B-DW	2,302,840	4,044,631	4,062,403	5,001,418
Wastewater Conveyance Budget Control Level	C320B	7,543,170	0	0	0
<b>Total Drainage &amp; Wastewater Utility</b>		<b>289,020,409</b>	<b>330,727,900</b>	<b>358,564,141</b>	<b>371,945,372</b>
<b>Solid Waste Utility</b>					
<b>Administration Budget Control Level</b>					
Administration		5,530,872	6,001,815	6,694,970	6,577,534
General and Administrative Credit		(1,311,053)	(1,578,756)	(1,531,564)	(1,637,756)
<b>Administration Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N100B-SW</b>	<b>4,219,819</b>	<b>4,423,058</b>	<b>5,163,406</b>	<b>4,939,778</b>
<b>Customer Service Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N300B-SW</b>	<b>13,850,598</b>	<b>13,724,136</b>	<b>12,871,098</b>	<b>12,911,309</b>
<b>General Expense Budget Control Level</b>					
Debt Service		10,743,269	5,923,850	7,338,581	10,593,193
Other General Expenses		83,359,705	102,797,491	100,478,376	103,346,324
Taxes		20,320,538	18,970,770	18,123,440	18,692,662
<b>General Expense Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N000B-SW</b>	<b>114,423,512</b>	<b>127,692,111</b>	<b>125,940,398</b>	<b>132,632,180</b>
<b>New Facilities Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C230B</b>	<b>3,612,157</b>	<b>24,886,900</b>	<b>25,710,121</b>	<b>35,411,056</b>
<b>Other Operating Budget Control Level</b>					
Field Operations		10,353,768	11,641,715	11,711,008	12,011,224
Pre-Capital Planning & Development		68,578	426,601	463,700	472,758
Project Delivery		488,287	386,157	463,424	445,168
Utility Systems Management		1,541,267	1,496,584	3,170,183	2,715,226
<b>Other Operating Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N400B-SW</b>	<b>12,451,900</b>	<b>13,951,057</b>	<b>15,808,315</b>	<b>15,644,376</b>
<b>Rehabilitation and Heavy Equipment Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C240B</b>	<b>9,809,787</b>	<b>5,358,950</b>	<b>262,140</b>	<b>270,504</b>
<b>Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C410B-SW</b>	<b>2,135,326</b>	<b>1,875,959</b>	<b>1,860,260</b>	<b>2,295,274</b>
<b>Technology Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C510B-SW</b>	<b>1,742,897</b>	<b>1,745,411</b>	<b>1,415,282</b>	<b>2,138,175</b>
<b>Total Solid Waste Utility</b>		<b>162,245,997</b>	<b>193,657,583</b>	<b>189,031,020</b>	<b>206,242,652</b>
<b>Water Utility</b>					

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
<b>Administration Budget Control Level</b>					
Administration		14,286,477	14,108,697	14,043,468	13,981,359
General and Administrative Credit		(9,479,308)	(11,299,777)	(9,906,163)	(9,912,397)
<b>Administration Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N100B-WU</b>	<b>4,807,169</b>	<b>2,808,920</b>	<b>4,137,305</b>	<b>4,068,962</b>
<b>Customer Service Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N300B-WU</b>	<b>9,625,465</b>	<b>10,307,603</b>	<b>10,221,542</b>	<b>10,158,605</b>
<b>Distribution Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C110B</b>	<b>19,760,493</b>	<b>22,380,000</b>	<b>20,491,716</b>	<b>20,819,443</b>
<b>General Expense Budget Control Level</b>					
Debt Service		164,293,371	71,616,012	80,319,400	86,113,751
Other General Expenses		35,565,181	23,869,268	22,141,567	23,292,383
Taxes		34,326,595	38,202,875	32,310,846	36,531,293
<b>General Expense Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N000B-WU</b>	<b>234,185,147</b>	<b>133,688,155</b>	<b>134,771,812</b>	<b>145,937,427</b>
<b>Habitat Conservation Program Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C160B</b>	<b>5,027,829</b>	<b>9,626,951</b>	<b>11,122,687</b>	<b>4,236,695</b>
<b>Other Operating Budget Control Level</b>					
Field Operations		21,683,133	22,806,690	23,038,803	22,686,543
Pre-Capital Planning & Development		1,233,643	2,563,064	2,276,203	2,160,390
Project Delivery		4,355,383	5,346,835	5,522,707	5,514,851
Utility Systems Management		15,512,308	16,745,203	16,230,741	16,332,095
<b>Other Operating Budget Control Level</b>	<b>N400B-WU</b>	<b>42,784,467</b>	<b>47,461,792</b>	<b>47,068,454</b>	<b>46,693,879</b>
<b>Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C410B-WU</b>	<b>16,357,280</b>	<b>19,648,846</b>	<b>15,047,995</b>	<b>18,481,989</b>
<b>Technology Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C510B-WU</b>	<b>3,039,586</b>	<b>4,633,861</b>	<b>4,770,105</b>	<b>6,067,119</b>
<b>Transmission Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C120B</b>	<b>2,505,124</b>	<b>3,173,000</b>	<b>1,688,100</b>	<b>3,024,443</b>
<b>Water Quality &amp; Treatment Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C140B</b>	<b>26,045,436</b>	<b>21,657,059</b>	<b>18,329,399</b>	<b>8,115,120</b>
<b>Water Resources Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C150B</b>	<b>7,853,605</b>	<b>15,793,000</b>	<b>6,516,169</b>	<b>4,769,325</b>
<b>Watershed Stewardship Budget Control Level</b>	<b>C130B</b>	<b>3,798,705</b>	<b>1,634,978</b>	<b>1,141,554</b>	<b>896,831</b>
<b>Total Water Utility</b>		<b>375,790,306</b>	<b>292,814,166</b>	<b>275,306,838</b>	<b>273,269,838</b>

<b>Appropriations</b>	<b>Summit Code</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>827,056,712</b>	<b>817,199,649</b>	<b>822,901,999</b>	<b>851,457,862</b>
<b>Department Full-time Equivalents Total*</b>		<b>1,449.25</b>	<b>1,449.25</b>	<b>1,420.75</b>	<b>1,414.75</b>
<i>* FTE totals are provided for informational purposes only. Changes in FTEs resulting from City Council or Personnel Director actions outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.</i>					

<b>Resources</b>		<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
General Subfund		11,163,546	1,351,415	1,224,022	1,254,236
Other		815,893,166	815,848,234	821,677,977	850,203,626
<b>Department Total</b>		<b>827,056,712</b>	<b>817,199,649</b>	<b>822,901,999</b>	<b>851,457,862</b>

## Drainage & Wastewater Utility

### Administration Budget Control Level

#### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Administration Budget Control Level is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities and, more specifically, for the Drainage and Wastewater Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department. This BCL also supports the efforts and services provided by the Urban League's Contractor Development and Competitiveness Center (CDCC) for the development of small, economically disadvantaged businesses, including women- and minority-owned firms, as authorized by Ordinance 120888.

#### Program Expenditures

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Administration	12,179,907	12,393,279	13,918,854	13,706,807
General and Administrative Credit	-8,686,881	-10,451,203	-10,816,551	-10,922,149
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,493,026</b>	<b>1,942,076</b>	<b>3,102,303</b>	<b>2,784,658</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	62.50	62.50	59.75	59.75

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



## **Administration: Administration**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Administration Program is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities and, more specifically, for the Drainage and Wastewater Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department.

### **Program Summary**

Reduce funding for citywide Geographic Information System (GIS) services by \$211,000 including a reduction of \$112,000 in SPU's General Fund allocation for this program. SPU manages the City's Geographic Databases on behalf of other City departments, using a combination of revenues from utility rates, General Fund support, and reimbursements from other departments. In keeping with reductions in General Fund throughout the City, this program's General Fund allocation is being reduced. As a result of these reductions, training for citywide users and maintenance of various applications and data layers will be reduced, with some impacts to data quality and to efficiency.

Reduce budget authority by \$92,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Personnel Specialist, Senior position as part of a Citywide effort to streamline the delivery of human resources services. This position had supported hiring and recruiting services, and the reduction is consistent with the retrenchment in hiring at SPU.

Reduce budget authority by \$63,000 and convert one Information Technology Professional - B-BU position from full-time to part-time, as part of a Citywide effort to streamline the delivery of information technology services. This position supported a variety of technology projects in SPU through work on data architecture and standards. Priority workload will be reassigned but some technology projects may experience delays.

Reduce budget authority by \$210,000 and make a variety of position changes as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to reduce spans of control and deliver core services as efficiently as possible. The position changes in this program include: abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager 2, Finance, Budget and Accounting position ;convert one part-time Strategic Advisor 1, General Government, position to full-time; and increase a part-time Research and Evaluation Assistant position from 0.5 FTE to 0.75 FTE. Portions of the positions displayed in this program were budgeted in other programs, and the associated financial impacts are displayed in the budget pages for those programs.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager 1, Finance, Budget and Accounting position. This position was identified for reduction as part of the City's 2010 MidYear Review. There are no appropriation changes necessary, as the position was already unfunded in vacancy assumptions included in the 2010 Adopted Budget and 2011-2012 baseline.

Increase budget authority by \$55,000 in 2012 to fund costs of upgrading all SPU desktop and laptop computers to the Windows 7 operation system. The upgrade is necessary because extended support for the current WindowsXP operating system will end in 2014.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$101,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$61,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Reduce 2012 budget authority by \$200,000, consistent with the City Council's fall 2010 guidance to several departments to identify further reductions in management-related costs. SPU will bring forward specific strategies to generate these savings in the 2012 budget process.

Increase budget by \$2.26 million to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1.53 million.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Administration	12,179,907	12,393,279	13,918,854	13,706,807
Full-time Equivalents Total*	62.50	62.50	59.75	59.75

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

## **Administration: General and Administrative Credit**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility General and Administrative Credit Program is to eliminate double-budgeting related to implementation of capital projects and equipment depreciation.

### **Program Summary**

Decrease general and administrative credit amounts by \$365,000 reflecting the application of current inflators to SPU's general and administrative costs, and the appropriate distribution of these costs between the O&M and capital budgets based on the 2011-2012 rates and CIP.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
General and Administrative Credit	-8,686,881	-10,451,203	-10,816,551	-10,922,149

**Combined Sewer Overflows Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage and wastewater revenues, is to plan and construct large infrastructure systems, smaller retrofits, and green infrastructure for CSO control.

**Summary**

Decrease funding by \$10.2 million compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Combined Sewer Overflows	0	24,171,960	17,806,875	25,769,534
Full-time Equivalents Total*	30.00	30.00	30.00	30.00

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

**Control Structures Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Control Structures Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by wastewater revenues, is to design and construct facilities to control overflows from the combined sewer system.

**Summary**

This BCL was discontinued as part of a reorganization of the fund's capital expenditures approved in the 2010 Adopted Budget.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Control Structures	17,123,450	0	0	0

## Customer Service Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Customer Service Budget Control Level is to provide customer service in the direct delivery of essential programs and services that anticipate and respond to customer expectations.

### Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$66,000, abrogate 1.0 FTE Utility Account Representative I position in the Joint Utility Call Center, and convert a 0.5 FTE part-time Utility Account Representative I position to full-time. The call center receives over 800,000 customer calls annually from Seattle City Light (SCL) and SPU customers. SPU budgets for the total costs of the call center and is reimbursed by SCL for its share. The approved reductions are anticipated to have few impacts on customer service, and are made possible by performance improvements resulting from the Customer Response Revitalization Project. The reductions respond to the City Council's Budget Guidance Statement 10-1-A-1 from fall 2009, which required SPU to reduce the call center O&M budget. A further 1.0 FTE Utility Account Representative I position is abrogated in 2012 from this program.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$88,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$15,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Increase budget by \$84,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$85,000.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Customer Service	6,334,297	7,174,417	7,089,545	7,026,865
Full-time Equivalents Total*	59.00	59.00	58.50	57.50

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

**Flooding, Sewer Back-up, and Landslides Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Flooding, Sewer Back-up, and Landslides Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage and wastewater revenues, is to plan, design, and construct systems aimed at preventing or alleviating flooding and sewer backups in the city of Seattle, protecting public health, safety, and property. This program also protects SPU drainage and wastewater infrastructure from landslides, and makes drainage improvements where surface water generated from the City right-of-way contributes to landslides.

**Summary**

Increase funding by \$16.6 million compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Flooding, Sewer Back-up, and Landslides	0	25,053,790	35,069,776	23,240,984
Full-time Equivalents Total*	25.00	25.00	25.00	25.00

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



## General Expense Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility General Expense Budget Control Level is to appropriate funds to pay the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's general expenses.

### Program Expenditures

	2009	2010	2011	2012
	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Debt Service	29,806,595	34,920,603	37,274,252	39,863,112
Other General Expenses	126,304,879	124,983,729	141,157,439	141,232,653
Taxes	32,067,961	31,978,028	36,979,272	38,640,160
<b>Total</b>	<b>188,179,436</b>	<b>191,882,360</b>	<b>215,410,962</b>	<b>219,735,925</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50

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

## General Expense: Debt Service

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Debt Service Program is to provide appropriation for debt service on Drainage and Wastewater Utility bonds.

### Program Summary

Increase budget authority by \$2.35 million to reflect current estimates for 2011 debt service costs, based on payment schedules and the issue of debt planned to support the Drainage and Wastewater 2011-2016 Adopted CIP.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Debt Service	29,806,595	34,920,603	37,274,252	39,863,112

## General Expense: Other General Expenses

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Other General Expenses Program is to appropriate funds for payment to King County Metro for sewage treatment, and the Drainage and Wastewater Fund's share of City central costs, claims, and other general expenses.

### Program Summary

Increase budget authority by \$11.9 million reflecting current estimates for the costs of the City's contract with King County for the treatment of sewage and wastewater. SPU administers the contract under which Seattle residents' and businesses' sewage and wastewater are piped to King County's regional treatment facilities, primarily at the West Point Wastewater Treatment Plant in Discovery Park. The contract amounts in the City's 2011 Adopted and 2012 Endorsed Budget include increases to King County rates that are passed through to Seattle customers. Legislation related to King County cost increases was acted upon by the City Council as part of the budget process in the fall of 2010.

Increase budget authority by \$275,000 to cover the non-labor costs of an \$851,000 grant awarded to SPU by the Puget Sound Watershed Management Assistance Program within the US. Environmental Protection Agency. The grant-supported project will establish a flow control plan for Piper's Creek watershed stormwater using hydrologic modeling and green stormwater infrastructure (GSI) techniques. A required City match of \$450,000 is budgeted in the Venema Natural Drainage System project in the Drainage and Wastewater CIP.

Increase budget authority by \$99,000 to restore funding to pay annual dues for 2011-2012 to Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 9 Management Committee as part of an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) to implement the Chinook Salmon Habitat Plan for the WRIA 9 Green/Duwamish and Central Puget Sound Watershed for 2007-2015. Due to 2010 budget constraints, SPU did not pay the 2010 dues and instead negotiated a temporary agreement to provide equivalent in-kind staffing.

Increase budget by \$3.85 million to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$16.17 million.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Other General Expenses	126,304,879	124,983,729	141,157,439	141,232,653
Full-time Equivalents Total*	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50

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

**General Expense: Taxes**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Taxes Program is to provide appropriation for payment of city and state taxes.

**Program Summary**

Increase budget authority by \$5.0 million to provide sufficient appropriation for payment of taxes, including City Drainage and City Wastewater Public Utility Business Taxes.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Taxes	32,067,961	31,978,028	36,979,272	38,640,160

**Landslide Mitigation & Special Programs Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Landslide Mitigation & Special Programs Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage and wastewater revenue, is to protect SPU drainage and wastewater infrastructure from landslides, provide drainage improvements where surface water generated from the city right-of-way is contributing to landslides, and manage stormwater policy and grants, interdepartmental coordination and programs, and citizen response activities.

**Summary**

This BCL was discontinued as part of a reorganization of the fund's capital expenditures approved in the 2010 Adopted Budget.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Landslide Mitigation & Special Programs	714,362	0	0	0

**Low Impact Development Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Low Impact Development Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage revenues, is to develop multiple functionality stormwater facilities for achieving the primary goals of flood protection, surface water quality improvement, and/or habitat enhancement.

**Summary**

This BCL was discontinued as part of a reorganization of the fund's capital expenditures approved in the 2010 Adopted Budget.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Low Impact Development	945,732	0	0	0

## Other Operating Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Other Operating Budget Control Level is to fund the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's operating expenses for Engineering Services, Field Operations, Pre-Capital Planning & Development, and Utility Systems Management programs.

### Program Expenditures

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Field Operations	18,898,959	19,835,354	19,895,761	19,854,568
Pre-Capital Planning & Development	510,226	1,615,167	1,989,291	2,069,669
Project Delivery	7,786,480	9,522,624	9,348,989	9,407,616
Utility Systems Management	12,915,297	15,306,562	17,879,199	18,442,069
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,110,961</b>	<b>46,279,706</b>	<b>49,113,240</b>	<b>49,773,922</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	262.00	262.00	261.75	261.75

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



**Other Operating: Field Operations**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Field Operations Program is to operate and maintain drainage and wastewater infrastructure that protects the public's health, and protects and improves the environment.

**Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$17,000 as a result of an SPU-wide vehicle review intended to make the department's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient.

Increase budget authority by a one-time amount of \$11,000 in 2011 to provide partial funding for SDOT to address a backlog of repaving work resulting from SPU street openings. During some maintenance and construction projects, SPU cuts into roadways to access underground infrastructure. SPU provides a temporary patch to the pavement upon project completion. SDOT performs the permanent repaving.

Reduce budget authority by \$170,000 and reduce position authority by 0.75 FTE as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to reduce spans of control and deliver core services as efficiently as possible. The position changes in this program include: abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager 1, Utilities position; and, increase part-time Office/Maintenance Aide position from 0.5 FTE to 0.75 FTE. Portions of the positions displayed in this program were allocated to other programs, and the associated financial impacts are displayed in the budget pages for those programs.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$139,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$23,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Reduce budget authority by \$150,000, reflecting savings to be identified from additional workplace efficiencies. In 2012, the reduction is \$300,000.

Increase budget by \$549,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$61,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Field Operations	18,898,959	19,835,354	19,895,761	19,854,568
Full-time Equivalents Total*	106.00	106.00	105.25	105.25

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

**Other Operating: Pre-Capital Planning & Development  
Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Pre-Capital Planning & Development Program is to support business case development, project plans, and options analysis for the drainage and wastewater system. This program will capture all costs associated with a project that need to be expensed during its life-cycle, including any post-construction monitoring and landscape maintenance.

**Program Summary**

Increase budget by \$374,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Pre-Capital Planning & Development	510,226	1,615,167	1,989,291	2,069,669

**Other Operating: Project Delivery**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Project Delivery Program is to provide engineering design and support services, construction inspection, and project management services to Drainage and Wastewater Utility's capital improvement projects and to the managers of drainage and wastewater facilities.

**Program Summary**

Reduce \$143,000 in General Fund funding for engineering services in order to meet the reduction target for General Fund support provided to SPU. Fewer staff hours will be available to perform electronic archiving for newly completed engineering plans; to staff the counter at the Electronic Records Center, where residents and developers can review the official Public Works records for information about their property or the adjacent right-of-way; and to replace damaged and missing monuments and benchmarks in city streets that are used by surveyors. There are no FTE reductions associated with this action. Existing staff will be redeployed to address work funded by non-General Fund resources, to reduce impact on the General Fund.

Reduce budget authority by \$215,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Utilities position, and 1.0 FTE Civil Engineering Specialist, Supervisor position. These changes are the result an SPU-wide review of operations intended to reduce spans of control and deliver core services as efficiently as possible. To minimize service level impacts on customers and performance metrics, priority work will be redistributed to remaining employees.

Unfund 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Utilities position dedicated to the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) program that is expected to grow in the future in response to regulatory changes. This position was identified for reduction as part of the City's 2010 MidYear Review. There are no appropriation changes necessary, as the position was already unfunded in vacancy assumptions included in the 2010 Adopted Budget and 2011-2012 baseline.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$44,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$17,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Increase budget by \$246,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$173,000.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Project Delivery	7,786,480	9,522,624	9,348,989	9,407,616
Full-time Equivalents Total*	69.00	69.00	67.00	67.00

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

## **Other Operating: Utility Systems Management Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's Utility Systems Management Program is to ensure that each SPU utility system and associated assets are properly planned, developed, operated, and maintained and that asset management principles and practices are applied to achieve established customer and environmental service levels at the lowest life-cycle cost.

### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$293,000 and abrogate a net 2.5 FTE as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to deliver core services as efficiently as possible. The position changes include: abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Utilities position, 1.0 FTE Environmental Analyst, Senior position, and 1.0 FTE Civil Engineering Specialist, Associate position; convert one part-time Administrative Specialist II-BU position to full-time; and reclassify a full-time Manager 2, General Government position to a Strategic Advisor 2, Utilities position. The staffing reductions will result in less analytical, planning and administrative support for the drainage and wastewater lines of business, and will require SPU to focus resources on highest priority core services.

Increase budget authority by \$286,000 and create 2.0 FTE Civil Engineering Specialist, Associate positions to address fats, oils and greases in the wastewater system. The approved positions will provide education, outreach, and inspection of the 4,600 food service establishments in Seattle, consistent with the anticipated Compliance Order by Consent that is currently under negotiation between SPU and the federal Environmental Protection Agency. When discharged into sewage, fats, oils and greases can collect in pipes and cause sewer Backups. The anticipated outcome of this investment is to significantly reduce sewer backups and overflows in compliance with the Clean Water Act.

Increase budget authority by \$228,000 to restore funding for two Source Control Inspector positions that were created in the 2009-2010 Adopted Budget and unfunded in the 2010 Adopted Budget. These positions are needed to comply with the NPDES stormwater permit. No new position authority is required.

Increase budget authority by \$479,000, create 2.0 FTE Civil Engineer, Senior positions, and provide funding for program costs, to identify and implement projects that will reduce the impacts of urban flooding and sanitary sewer overflows on public safety, private property, and public infrastructure.

Increase budget authority by \$710,000 in the operating budget and create 1.0 FTE Civil Engineer, Senior position to establish a street sweeping for water quality program. This program will address NPDES requirements by removing pollutants from curbed arterials that drain directly through the stormwater system to receiving bodies of water.

Increase budget authority by \$75,000 to incorporate information about utility infrastructure capacity in City planning initiatives led by the Department of Planning and Development. SPU's infrastructure will be impacted by increasing population growth and housing density so adequate, cost-effective planning is a benefit to the utility as well.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$63,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$42,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Increase budget by \$1.16 million to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$2.57 million.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Utility Systems Management	12,915,297	15,306,562	17,879,199	18,442,069
Full-time Equivalents Total*	87.00	87.00	89.50	89.50

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

**Protection of Beneficial Uses Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Protection of Beneficial Uses Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage revenues, is to make improvements to the city's drainage system to reduce the harmful effects of stormwater runoff on creeks and receiving waters by improving water quality and protecting or enhancing habitat.

**Summary**

Increase funding by \$499,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Protection of Beneficial Uses	930,984	4,757,062	2,283,081	6,040,474
Full-time Equivalents Total*	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00

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

**Rehabilitation Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Rehabilitation Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage and wastewater revenues, is to rehabilitate or replace existing drainage and wastewater assets in kind, to maintain the current functionality of the system.

**Summary**

Increase funding by \$127,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Rehabilitation	0	6,484,079	6,471,519	10,526,291
Full-time Equivalents Total*	30.00	30.00	30.00	30.00

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

**Sediments Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Sediments Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage and wastewater revenues, is to restore and rehabilitate natural resources in or along Seattle's waterways.

**Summary**

Increase funding by \$421,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Sediments	3,343,681	2,732,244	6,350,146	5,385,277
Full-time Equivalents Total*	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00

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



**Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level, a Drainage and Wastewater Capital Improvement Program, is to implement the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's share of capital improvement projects that receive funding from multiple SPU funds benefiting the Utility.

**Summary**

Decrease funding by \$3.1 million compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Shared Cost Projects	7,983,492	16,205,574	11,804,290	16,660,024
Full-time Equivalents Total*	39.00	39.00	39.00	39.00

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

**Stormwater & Flood Control Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Stormwater & Flood Control Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by drainage revenues, is to make improvements to the city's drainage system to alleviate and prevent flooding in Seattle, with a primary focus on the protection of public health, safety and property.

**Summary**

This BCL was discontinued as part of a reorganization of the fund's capital expenditures approved in the 2010 Adopted Budget.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Stormwater & Flood Control	10,014,977	0	0	0

**Technology Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Technology Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program, is to make use of recent technology advances to increase the Drainage and Wastewater Utility's efficiency and productivity.

**Summary**

Increase funding by \$167,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Technology	2,302,840	4,044,631	4,062,403	5,001,418
Full-time Equivalents Total*	13.00	13.00	13.00	13.00

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

**Wastewater Conveyance Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Drainage and Wastewater Utility Wastewater Conveyance Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by wastewater revenues, is to improve the effectiveness of the City's wastewater system.

**Summary**

This BCL was discontinued as part of a reorganization of the fund's capital expenditures approved in the 2010 Adopted Budget.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Wastewater Conveyance	7,543,170	0	0	0

## Solid Waste Utility

### Administration Budget Control Level

#### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Administration Budget Control Level is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and, more specifically, for the Solid Waste Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department. This BCL also supports the efforts and services provided by the Urban League's Contractor Development and Competitiveness Center (CDCC) for the development of small, economically disadvantaged businesses, including women- and minority-owned firms, as authorized by Ordinance 120888.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Administration	5,530,872	6,001,815	6,694,970	6,577,534
General and Administrative Credit	-1,311,053	-1,578,756	-1,531,564	-1,637,756
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,219,819</b>	<b>4,423,058</b>	<b>5,163,406</b>	<b>4,939,778</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	35.00	35.00	31.50	30.50

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

## **Administration: Administration**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Administration Program is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and, more specifically, for the Solid Waste Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department.

### **Program Summary**

Reduce funding for citywide Geographic Information System (GIS) by \$8,000. SPU manages the City's GIS on behalf of all City departments, using a combination of revenues from utility rates, General Fund support, and reimbursements from other departments. As a result of reductions in SPU's General Fund allocation for GIS displayed in other programs in the SPU budget, proportional reductions to non-General Fund sources of funding are also approved, including the reduction in this program. Training for citywide users and maintenance of various applications and data layers will be reduced, with some impacts to data quality and to efficiency.

Reduce budget authority by \$50,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Personnel Specialist position as part of a Citywide initiative to generate efficiencies by streamlining the delivery of human resources services. This position had supported hiring and recruitment services, and the reduction is consistent with the retrenchment in hiring at SPU.

Reduce budget authority by \$20,000 and convert one Research and Evaluation Assistant position from full-time to part-time, as part of a Citywide initiative to generate efficiencies by streamlining the delivery of information technology services.

Reduce budget authority by \$79,000 and make a variety of position changes as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to reduce spans of control and deliver core services as efficiently as possible. The position changes in this program include: abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Finance, Budget and Accounting position, and reclassify 1.0 FTE Manager 2, Utilities position to 1.0 FTE Economist, Principal, position. In addition, this item abrogates a 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, CSPI&P position, effective January 1, 2012.

Increase budget authority by \$30,000 in 2012 to fund costs of upgrading all SPU desktop and laptop computers to the Windows 7 operation system. The upgrade is necessary because extended support for the current WindowsXP operating system will end in 2014.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Information Technology position. This position was identified for reduction as part of the City's 2010 MidYear Review. There are no appropriation changes necessary, as the position was already unfunded in vacancy assumptions included in the 2010 Adopted Budget and 2011-2012 baseline.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$44,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$26,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Reduce 2012 budget authority by \$150,000, consistent with the City Council's fall 2010 guidance to several departments to identify further reductions in management-related costs. SPU will bring forward specific strategies to generate these savings in the 2012 budget process.

Increase budget by \$920,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$693,000.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Administration	5,530,872	6,001,815	6,694,970	6,577,534
Full-time Equivalents Total*	35.00	35.00	31.50	30.50

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

**Administration: General and Administrative Credit**  
**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility General and Administrative Credit Program is to eliminate double-budgeting related to implementation of capital projects and equipment depreciation.

**Program Summary**

Increase general and administrative credit amounts by \$47,000 reflecting the application of current inflators to SPU's general and administrative costs, and the appropriate distribution of these costs between the O&M and capital budgets based on the adopted 2011-2012 rates and CIP.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
General and Administrative Credit	-1,311,053	-1,578,756	-1,531,564	-1,637,756

## **Customer Service Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Customer Service Budget Control Level is to provide customer service in the direct delivery of essential programs and services that anticipate and respond to customer expectations.

### **Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$66,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist I-BU position in the Joint Utility Call Center. The approved reductions are anticipated to have few impacts on customer service, and are made possible by performance improvements resulting from the Customer Response Revitalization Project. The reductions respond to the City Council's Budget Guidance Statement 10-1-A-1 from fall 2009, which required SPU to reduce the call center O&M budget. This item also abrogates a 1.0 FTE Utility Account Representative I position from this program, effective January 1, 2012.

Reduce budget authority by \$4,000 as a result of an SPU-wide vehicle review intended to make the department's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient.

Reduce budget authority by \$267,000 and make a variety of position changes as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to deliver core services as efficiently as possible. The position changes in this program include: abrogate 1.0 FTE Solid Waste Field Representative, Lead position, 1.0 FTE Solid Waste Field Representative I position, and 1.0 FTE Planning and Development Specialist II position, and convert a part-time Environmental Analyst, Senior, position to full-time to reflect actual workload. This item reduces the number of staff available to respond to customer complaints about the collection of the garbage, recycling, and compost. In order to minimize service level impacts, SPU will review work sector designations and assignments to help resolve workload issues.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$38,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$7,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Increase budget by \$92,000, funded by an increase in solid waste tonnage taxes from \$8.50 per ton to \$8.69 per ton, to implement the following SPU-related recommendations from the 2010 City Auditor's report on City graffiti control:

- Create an 0.5 FTE Public Education Program Specialist position for community coalition building and outreach planning (\$41,000);
- Fund Keep America Beautiful membership and provide ongoing information campaigns (\$8,000);
- Add funding for expanded graffiti database efforts, with the intent that a part-time position (0.5 FTE) would be added in either SPU or the Seattle Police Department in 2011 to help build and maintain an expanded graffiti database (\$43,000); and,
- Evaluate transfer of an SPU graffiti control position to the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) for pay station graffiti control as directed in the City Council's Statement of Legislative Intent 8-2-A-1.



Decrease budget by \$563,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$853,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Customer Service	13,850,598	13,724,136	12,871,098	12,911,309
Full-time Equivalents Total*	91.00	91.00	88.00	87.00

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

**General Expense Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility General Expense Budget Control Level is to provide appropriation to pay the Solid Waste Utility's general expenses.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Debt Service	10,743,269	5,923,850	7,338,581	10,593,193
Other General Expenses	83,359,705	102,797,491	100,478,376	103,346,324
Taxes	20,320,538	18,970,770	18,123,440	18,692,662
<b>Total</b>	<b>114,423,512</b>	<b>127,692,111</b>	<b>125,940,398</b>	<b>132,632,180</b>

**General Expense: Debt Service**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Debt Service Program is to appropriate funds for debt service on Solid Waste Utility bonds.

**Program Summary**

Increase budget authority by \$1.41 million to reflect current estimates for 2011 debt service costs, based on payment schedules and the issue of debt planned to support the Solid Waste 2011-2016 Adopted CIP.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Debt Service	10,743,269	5,923,850	7,338,581	10,593,193

**General Expense: Other General Expenses**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Other General Expenses Program is to provide appropriation for payments to contractors who collect the city's solid waste, the Solid Waste Fund's share of City central costs, claims, and other general expenses.

**Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$6.43 million to align costs for the City's solid waste contracts with current estimates. SPU manages the City's contracts with private providers who offer weekly collection of garbage, compost and organics, and recycling. The baseline budget overstated the contract costs, because the baseline assumed higher volumes of solid waste than are now forecast given the economic downturn.

Increase budget authority by \$2.46 million in a technical correction reflecting revisions to the City's solid waste contracts that allow the City, rather than the contractors providing garbage and recycling collection, to own the recycling, garbage, and compost containers used by residents and businesses to collect their waste. The shift in ownership has financial advantages to rate payers, and has been factored into contract costs elsewhere in this document.

In 2012, increase budget authority by \$75,000 for the City's payments to the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program (LHWMP). The LHWMP program is administered by King County in partnership with Seattle and 37 suburban cities. The program seeks to reduce production and limit residents' exposure to hazardous materials, and to provide safe management for hazardous waste including solvents, lead, and mercury. The program includes outreach and education for vulnerable and traditionally underserved communities.

Increase budget authority by \$80,000 to restore funding for matching grants provided by SPU to community organizations and schools for waste reduction and recycling activities.

Increase budget by \$1.58 million to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$2.32 million.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Other General Expenses	83,359,705	102,797,491	100,478,376	103,346,324

**General Expense: Taxes**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Taxes Program is to appropriate funds for payment of city and state taxes.

**Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$847,000 to correspond to latest projections for payment of taxes, including City Solid Waste Utility Business Taxes.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Taxes	20,320,538	18,970,770	18,123,440	18,692,662

**New Facilities Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility New Facilities Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by solid waste revenues, is to design and construct new facilities to enhance solid waste operations.

**Summary**

Decrease funding by \$9.86 million compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
New Facilities	3,612,157	24,886,900	25,710,121	35,411,056
Full-time Equivalents Total*	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00

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

## Other Operating Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Other Operating Budget Control Level is to fund the Solid Waste Utility's operating expenses for Engineering Services, Field Operations, Pre-Capital Planning & Development, and Utility Systems Management programs.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Field Operations	10,353,768	11,641,715	11,711,008	12,011,224
Pre-Capital Planning & Development	68,578	426,601	463,700	472,758
Project Delivery	488,287	386,157	463,424	445,168
Utility Systems Management	1,541,267	1,496,584	3,170,183	2,715,226
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,451,900</b>	<b>13,951,057</b>	<b>15,808,315</b>	<b>15,644,376</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	76.06	76.06	75.56	75.56

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

## Other Operating: Field Operations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Field Operations Program is to operate and maintain the City's solid waste transfer stations and hazardous materials disposal facilities, and to monitor and maintain the City's closed landfills so the public's health is protected and opportunities are provided for reuse and recycling.

### Program Summary

Increase budget authority by \$255,000 to provide additional funding for overtime at the north and south transfer stations to reflect actual overtime costs. SPU has implemented policies that have successfully reduced overtime at the transfer stations since 2008, including better management of sick leave and use of temporary labor during seasonal spikes in workload. However, overtime costs are still exceeding budgeted amounts. Once the South Transfer Station opens in 2012, SPU will re-evaluate staffing needs and determine the correct mix of overtime and additional hiring.

Reduce budget by \$50,000 reflecting savings in overall overtime expenditures in this program.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$60,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$10,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Decrease budget by \$66,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$69,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Field Operations	10,353,768	11,641,715	11,711,008	12,011,224
Full-time Equivalents Total*	56.00	56.00	56.00	56.00

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

**Other Operating: Pre-Capital Planning & Development  
Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Pre-Capital Planning & Development Program is to support business case development, project plans, and options analysis for the solid waste system. This program will capture all costs associated with a project that needs to be expensed during its life-cycle, including any post-construction monitoring and landscape maintenance.

**Program Summary**

Increase budget by \$37,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on the adopted rates and CIP.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Pre-Capital Planning & Development	68,578	426,601	463,700	472,758



**Other Operating: Project Delivery  
Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Project Delivery Program is to provide engineering design and support services, construction inspection, and project management services to Solid Waste Fund capital improvement projects, and to solid waste facility managers.

**Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$18,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager 3, Engineering and Plans Review position as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to reduce spans of control and deliver core services as efficiently as possible. While the FTE change from abrogating the Manager position is displayed fully in this program, portions of the position were allocated to other programs, and the associated financial impacts are displayed in the budgets for those programs. This action reduces resources to lead continuous improvements to SPU's CIP program management and project delivery. Because work will be redistributed across remaining employees, minimal service level impacts are anticipated.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$19,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$7,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Increase budget by \$121,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on adopted rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$77,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Project Delivery	488,287	386,157	463,424	445,168
Full-time Equivalents Total*	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00

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

## **Other Operating: Utility Systems Management**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility's Utility Systems Management Program is to ensure that each SPU utility system and associated assets are properly planned, developed, operated, and maintained and that asset management principles and practices are applied to achieve established customer and environmental service levels at the lowest life-cycle cost.

### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$18,000 and convert a part-time Planning and Development Specialist II to full-time as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to deliver core services as efficiently as possible. The appropriation changes in this program also include the effects of position reductions displayed in other programs that in fact include a small amount of budget in this program.

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

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$18,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Increase budget by \$295,000 in 2011 to implement a pilot program to assess whether every-other-week garbage collection may help advance City recycling goals, save money, and maintain customer satisfaction levels. With less frequent garbage pick-up, customers may be motivated to divert more organic waste (which has weekly pick-up) and recyclables from their garbage. The pilot program would be conducted in a few neighborhoods that reflect Seattle's diversity to provide data to help the City determine whether to move in this direction in 2013. The 2011 budget amount includes the pilot program's start up costs; the funding allocation to continue the pilot program in 2012 is \$55,000.

Increase budget by \$425,000 to create a single City-sponsored yellow pages opt-out registry that would allow residents to opt-out of receiving yellow pages phone books and help reduce the tons of paper that enter the City's solid waste stream. Many people now find businesses through the Internet and no longer want paper phone books, and the City has received feedback from residents that their efforts to contact phone book publishers and opt out of receiving the phone books have not, in the past, been successful. The budget also establishes a recovery fee to pay City costs for the opt-out registry and recycling of yellow pages books. The ongoing cost is \$225,000.

Increase budget by \$250,000 in 2011 and 2012 to cover start up costs associated with introducing universal food and yard waste collection subscription for multi-family dwellings starting in the fall of 2011, to help the City meet its solid waste diversion goals.

Increase budget by \$767,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on current law rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$1.67 million.

# SPU

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Utility Systems Management	1,541,267	1,496,584	3,170,183	2,715,226
Full-time Equivalents Total*	19.06	19.06	19.56	19.56

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

**Rehabilitation and Heavy Equipment Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Rehabilitation and Heavy Equipment Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by solid waste revenues, is to implement projects to repair and rehabilitate the City's solid waste transfer stations and improve management of the City's closed landfills and household hazardous waste sites.

**Summary**

Increase funding by \$116,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Rehabilitation and Heavy Equipment	9,809,787	5,358,950	262,140	270,504

**Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level, a Solid Waste Capital Improvement Program, is to implement the Solid Waste Utility's share of capital improvement projects that receive funding from multiple SPU funds and will benefit the Solid Waste Fund.

**Summary**

Decrease funding by \$93,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Shared Cost Projects	2,135,326	1,875,959	1,860,260	2,295,274

## **Technology Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Solid Waste Utility Technology Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program, is to make use of technology to increase the Solid Waste Utility's efficiency and productivity.

### **Summary**

Decrease funding by \$258,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Technology	1,742,897	1,745,411	1,415,282	2,138,175
Full-time Equivalents Total*	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00

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

## Water Utility

### Administration Budget Control Level

#### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Administration Budget Control Level is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and, more specifically, for the Water Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department. This BCL also supports the efforts and services provided by the Urban League's Contractor Development and Competitiveness Center (CDCC) for the development of small, economically disadvantaged businesses, including women- and minority-owned firms, as authorized by Ordinance 120888.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Administration	14,286,477	14,108,697	14,043,468	13,981,359
General and Administrative Credit	-9,479,308	-11,299,777	-9,906,163	-9,912,397
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,807,169</b>	<b>2,808,920</b>	<b>4,137,305</b>	<b>4,068,962</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	99.60	99.60	95.60	95.60

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

## **Administration: Administration**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Administration Program is to provide overall management and policy direction for Seattle Public Utilities, and, more specifically, for the Water Utility, and to provide core financial, human resource, and information technology services to the entire Department.

### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$1,000 as a result of an SPU-wide vehicle review intended to make the department's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient.

Reduce funding for citywide Geographic Information System (GIS) by \$33,000. SPU manages the City's GIS on behalf of all City departments, using a combination of revenues from utility rates, General Fund support, and reimbursements from other departments. As a result of reductions in SPU's General Fund allocation for GIS displayed in other programs in the SPU budget, proportional reductions to non-General Fund sources of funding are also approved, including the reduction in this program. Training for citywide users and maintenance of various applications and data layers will be reduced, with some impacts to data quality and to efficiency.

Reduce budget authority by \$148,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Management Systems Analyst, Senior position as part of a Citywide effort to generate efficiencies by streamlining the delivery of human resources services. This position had supported training and education, and the workload will be prioritized and reassigned to other staff.

Reduce budget authority by \$71,000, and convert one Civil Engineering Specialist, Assistant I position and one Information Technology Systems Analyst position from full-time to part-time, as part of a Citywide initiative to generate efficiencies by streamlining the delivery of information technology services. Work will be prioritized among remaining employees to minimize impacts.

Reduce budget authority by \$245,000, abrogate a 1.0 FTE Information Technology Professional A, Exempt position, and reclassify a 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Finance, Budget, and Accounting position to an Economist, Senior position, as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to reduce spans of control and deliver core services as efficiently as possible. The appropriation changes in this program also include the effects of position reductions displayed in other programs that in fact include a small amount of budget in this program.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Finance, Budget and Accounting, reducing staffing for financial analysis and financial process improvements. The position was identified for reduction as part of the City's 2010 MidYear Review, and workload has been prioritized and assigned to remaining staff. There are no appropriation Changes necessary, as the position was already unfunded in vacancy assumptions included in the 2010 Adopted Budget and 2011-2012 baseline.

Increase budget authority by \$95,000 in 2012 to fund costs of upgrading all SPU desktop and laptop computers to the Windows 7 operation system. The upgrade is necessary because extended support for the current WindowsXP operating system will end in 2014.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$116,000 in savings.



In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$70,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Reduce 2012 budget authority by \$150,000, consistent with the City Council's fall 2010 guidance to several departments to identify further reductions in management-related costs. SPU will bring forward specific strategies to generate these savings in the 2012 budget process.

Increase budget by \$618,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on current law rates and the adopted CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$65,000.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Administration	14,286,477	14,108,697	14,043,468	13,981,359
Full-time Equivalents Total*	99.60	99.60	95.60	95.60

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

## **Administration: General and Administrative Credit**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility General and Administrative Credit Program is to eliminate double-budgeting related to implementation of capital projects and equipment depreciation.

### **Program Summary**

Increase general and administrative credit amounts by \$1.39 million reflecting the application of current inflators to SPU's general and administrative costs, and the appropriate distribution of these costs between the O&M and capital budgets.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
General and Administrative Credit	-9,479,308	-11,299,777	-9,906,163	-9,912,397

**Customer Service Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Customer Service Budget Control Level is to provide customer service in the direct delivery of essential programs and services that anticipate and respond to customer expectations.

**Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$69,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Utility Account Representative I position in the Joint Utility Call Center. The approved reductions are anticipated to have few impacts on customer service, and are made possible by performance improvements resulting from the Customer Response Revitalization Project. The reductions respond to the City Council's Budget Guidance Statement 10-1-A-1 from fall 2009, which required SPU to reduce the call center O&M budget. A further 1.0 FTE Utility Account Representative I position is abrogated in 2012 from this program.

Reduce budget authority by \$150,000, abrogate 1.0 FTE Utility Service Inspector position and 1.0 FTE Manager 2, Utilities position, and reclassify a 1.0 FTE Manager 2, General Government position to a Strategic Advisor 2, General Government position. These changes are the result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to reduce spans of control and deliver core services as efficiently as possible. Priority work in the Utility Services team will be reassigned. Portions of the positions displayed in this program were allocated to other programs, and the associated financial impacts are displayed in the budget pages for those programs.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$102,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$18,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Increase budget by \$252,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on current law rates and the adopted CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$86,000.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Customer Service	9,625,465	10,307,603	10,221,542	10,158,605
Full-time Equivalents Total*	88.00	88.00	85.00	84.00

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

**Distribution Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Distribution Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to repair and upgrade the City's water lines, pump stations, and other facilities.

**Summary**

Decrease funding by \$785,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. FTE values include position changes made outside of the budget process. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Distribution	19,760,493	22,380,000	20,491,716	20,819,443
Full-time Equivalents Total*	78.00	78.00	79.00	79.00

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

**General Expense Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility General Expense Budget Control Level is to appropriate funds to pay the Water Utility's general expenses.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Debt Service	164,293,371	71,616,012	80,319,400	86,113,751
Other General Expenses	35,565,181	23,869,268	22,141,567	23,292,383
Taxes	34,326,595	38,202,875	32,310,846	36,531,293
<b>Total</b>	<b>234,185,147</b>	<b>133,688,155</b>	<b>134,771,812</b>	<b>145,937,427</b>

**General Expense: Debt Service**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Debt Service Program is to appropriate funds for debt service on Water Utility bonds.

**Program Summary**

Increase budget authority by \$8.7 million to reflect current estimates for 2011 debt service costs, based on payment schedules and the issue of debt planned to support the Water 2011-2016 Adopted CIP.

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Debt Service	164,293,371	71,616,012	80,319,400	86,113,751

## General Expense: Other General Expenses

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Other General Expenses Program is to appropriate funds for the Water Fund's share of City central costs, claims, and other general expenses.

### Program Summary

Decrease budget by \$1.73 million to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on current law rates and the adopted CIP.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Other General Expenses	35,565,181	23,869,268	22,141,567	23,292,383

## General Expense: Taxes

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Taxes Program is to appropriate funds for payment of City and state taxes.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$5.89 million to align with current estimates of tax expenses in 2011. The reduction includes the effect, as of December 31, 2010, of eliminating the temporary tax rate increase and water rate surcharge enacted in February 2009 to respond to Lane vs. City of Seattle.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Taxes	34,326,595	38,202,875	32,310,846	36,531,293

**Habitat Conservation Program Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Habitat Conservation Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to manage projects directly related to the Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan.

**Summary**

Increase funding by \$2.53 million compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on Project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Habitat Conservation Program	5,027,829	9,626,951	11,122,687	4,236,695
Full-time Equivalents Total*	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00

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

**Other Operating Budget Control Level****Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Other Operating Budget Control Level is to fund the Water Utility's operating expenses for Engineering Services, Field Operations, Pre-Capital Planning & Development, and Utility Systems Management programs.

<b>Program Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Field Operations	21,683,133	22,806,690	23,038,803	22,686,543
Pre-Capital Planning & Development	1,233,643	2,563,064	2,276,203	2,160,390
Project Delivery	4,355,383	5,346,835	5,522,707	5,514,851
Utility Systems Management	15,512,308	16,745,203	16,230,741	16,332,095
<b>Total</b>	<b>42,784,467</b>	<b>47,461,792</b>	<b>47,068,454</b>	<b>46,693,879</b>
Full-time Equivalents Total *	291.59	291.59	279.59	277.59

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

## Other Operating: Field Operations

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Field Operations Program is to operate and maintain the infrastructure that provides the public with an adequate, reliable, and safe supply of high-quality drinking water.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$38,000 as a result of an SPU-wide vehicle review intended to make the department's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient.

Increase budget authority by a one-time amount of \$426,000 in 2011 to provide partial funding for SDOT to address a backlog of repaving work resulting from SPU street openings. During some maintenance and construction projects, SPU cuts into roadways to access underground infrastructure. SPU provides a temporary patch to the pavement upon project completion. SDOT performs the permanent repaving.

Reduce budget authority by \$144,000 and abrogate 2.0 FTE as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to deliver core services as efficiently as possible. The abrogations include 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 1, Utilities position and 1.0 FTE Capital Projects Coordinator position. Portions of the positions displayed in this program were allocated to other programs, and the associated financial impacts are displayed in the budget pages for those programs. This action also unfunds 1.0 FTE Heavy Truck Driver position in response to the decline in new taps work and transportation-related capital projects associated with the continued economic downturn. A proposal to restore the position's funding is expected after the economy has recovered and workload again justifies the headcount. Finally, this action abrogates a 1.0 FTE Water Pipe CC-WDM II position effective January 1, 2012.

Continue the unfunding of 3.0 FTE Water Pipe Worker positions and 1.0 FTE Water Pipe Worker, Senior position reflecting the current slowdown in the construction markets, including the installation of new water taps. These positions were identified for unfunding as part of the City's 2010 MidYear Review. The positions are not approved for abrogation, because they will be needed when construction activity returns to more normal levels. There are no appropriation changes necessary since the positions were already unfunded in vacancy assumptions included in the 2010 Adopted Budget and 2011-2012 baseline.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$161,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$27,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Reduce budget by \$75,000 in 2011 and \$150,000 in 2012 reflecting savings from workforce efficiencies.

Increase budget by \$251,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on current law rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$232,000.



<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Field Operations	21,683,133	22,806,690	23,038,803	22,686,543
Full-time Equivalents Total*	131.00	131.00	129.00	127.00

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

**Other Operating: Pre-Capital Planning & Development**  
**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Pre-Capital Planning & Development Program is to support business case development, project plans, and options analysis for the water system. This program will capture all costs associated with a project that need to be expensed during the life-cycle of the project, including any post-construction monitoring and landscape maintenance.

**Program Summary**

Reduce budget by \$287,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on current law rates and the adopted CIP .

<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Pre-Capital Planning & Development	1,233,643	2,563,064	2,276,203	2,160,390

## Other Operating: Project Delivery

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Project Delivery Program is to provide engineering design and support services, construction inspection, and project management services to Water Utility's capital improvement projects and to the managers of water facilities.

### Program Summary

Reduce budget authority by \$140,000 and abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager 3, Exempt position as a result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to reduce spans of control and deliver core services as efficiently as possible. This position led environmental permitting and SEPA policy work, which will be reallocated to existing staff.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager 3, Engineering and Plans Review position, reducing staffing for the oversight and implementation of capital projects in the Project Delivery Branch. The position was identified for reduction as part of the City's 2010 MidYear Review, and workload has been prioritized and assigned to remaining staff. There are no appropriation changes necessary, as the position was already unfunded in vacancy assumptions included in the 2010 Adopted Budget and 2011-2012 baseline.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$51,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$20,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Increase budget by \$386,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on current law rates and the adopted CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$175,000.

	2009	2010	2011	2012
Expenditures/FTE	Actual	Adopted	Adopted	Endorsed
Project Delivery	4,355,383	5,346,835	5,522,707	5,514,851
Full-time Equivalents Total*	26.50	26.50	24.50	24.50

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

**Other Operating: Utility Systems Management**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility's Utility Systems Management Program is to assure that each SPU utility system and associated assets are properly planned, developed, operated and maintained and that asset management principles and practices are applied to achieve established customer and environmental service levels at the lowest life-cycle cost.

**Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$27,000 as a result of an SPU-wide vehicle review intended to make the department's fleet smaller, greener, and more efficient.

Increase budget authority by \$25,000 to provide data about utility infrastructure capacity to City planning efforts as part of a sustainable approach to capital planning and community development.

Reduce budget authority by \$650,000 and abrogate 8.0 FTE as the result of an SPU-wide review of operations intended to deliver core services as efficiently as possible. Several of these positions supported work on the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The abrogations include: 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist III-BU position; 1.0 FTE Watershed Inspector position; 1.0 FTE Construction and Maintenance Equipment Operator, Senior position; 1.0 FTE Water Quality Engineer, Senior position; 1.0 FTE Civil Engineer, Assistant II, position; 2.0 FTE Environmental Analyst, Senior positions; and 1.0 FTE Civil Engineer, Associate position. SPU will carefully prioritize habitat conservation plan activities to ensure compliance with regulatory agreements. Over the longer-term, HCP activity is expected to decline as more of the work plan reaches completion. However, a reduction in staffing at the Cedar River Watershed may impact public services at the Education Center. In addition, this adjustment reduces analytical, planning, and administrative support for the Water line of business.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager 3, Utilities position. The position was identified for reduction as part of the City's 2010 MidYear Review, and workload has been prioritized and assigned to remaining staff. There are no appropriation changes necessary since the position was already unfunded in vacancy assumptions included in the 2010 Adopted Budget and 2011-2012 baseline.

The Mayor and the Council worked with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. As a result of ratified agreements with represented employees and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications, this program will achieve \$72,000 in savings.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$48,000 is saved in this program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Increase budget by \$258,000 to reflect citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs, and to update the distribution of allocated costs across programs and funds based on current law rates and the adopted CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Adopted Budget of approximately \$514,000.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Adopted</b>	<b>Endorsed</b>
Utility Systems Management	15,512,308	16,745,203	16,230,741	16,332,095
Full-time Equivalents Total*	134.09	134.09	126.09	126.09

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

**Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Shared Cost Projects Budget Control Level, which is a Water Capital Improvement Program, is to implement the Water Utility's share of capital improvement projects that receive funding from multiple SPU funds.

**Summary**

Decrease funding by \$5.7 million compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Shared Cost Projects	16,357,280	19,648,846	15,047,995	18,481,989
Full-time Equivalents Total*	56.00	56.00	56.00	56.00

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

**Technology Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Technology Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program, is to make use of technology to increase the Water Utility's efficiency and productivity.

**Summary**

Increase funding by \$91,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Technology	3,039,586	4,633,861	4,770,105	6,067,119
Full-time Equivalents Total*	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00

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

## Transmission Budget Control Level

### Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Water Utility Transmission Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to repair and upgrade the City's large transmission pipelines that bring untreated water to the treatment facilities, and convey water from the treatment facilities to Seattle and its suburban wholesale customers' distribution systems.

### Summary

Decrease funding by \$1.57 million compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Transmission	2,505,124	3,173,000	1,688,100	3,024,443
Full-time Equivalents Total*	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

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

**Water Quality & Treatment Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Water Quality & Treatment Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to design, construct, and repair water treatment facilities and remaining open-water reservoirs.

**Summary**

Decrease funding by \$2.57 million compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Water Quality & Treatment	26,045,436	21,657,059	18,329,399	8,115,120
Full-time Equivalents Total*	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00

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

**Water Resources Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Water Resources Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to manage untreated water to meet anticipated demands at our supply-reliability standard and instream flow requirement, and promote residential and commercial water conservation.

**Summary**

Increase funding by \$585,000 compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Water Resources	7,853,605	15,793,000	6,516,169	4,769,325
Full-time Equivalents Total*	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00

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



**Watershed Stewardship Budget Control Level**

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Water Utility Watershed Stewardship Budget Control Level, a Capital Improvement Program funded by water revenues, is to implement projects associated with the natural land, forestry, and fishery resources within the Tolt, Cedar, and Lake Youngs watersheds.

**Summary**

Decrease funding by \$1.07 million compared to the 2011 budget in the 2010-2015 CIP. For more detail on project level changes, see the 2011-2016 Adopted CIP document.

<b>Expenditures/FTE</b>	<b>2009 Actual</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
Watershed Stewardship	3,798,705	1,634,978	1,141,554	896,831
Full-time Equivalents Total*	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00

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

## 2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Drainage and Wastewater Fund

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
408000	Capital Grants and Contributions (excluding donated assets)	4,775,179	5,579,898	3,173,250	4,923,250	3,073,250
437010	Call Center Reimbursement from SCL	1,605,083	1,771,877	1,771,877	1,676,405	1,688,806
443210	GIS CGDB Corporate Support (N2408 and N2418)	788,093	788,093	788,093	1,148,267	1,171,233
443510	Wastewater Utility Services	185,549,160	184,057,294	184,952,480	210,512,050	215,608,814
443610	Drainage Utility Services	58,135,990	59,228,823	59,027,560	67,129,364	74,763,545
443691	Side Sewer Permit Fees	862,089	1,160,425	862,089	862,089	862,089
443694	Drainage Permit Fees	196,505	414,521	196,505	196,505	196,505
469990	Other Operating Revenues	151,896	97,325	156,453	159,582	162,774
469990	Transfer from Construction Fund	38,177,017	59,092,577	55,846,983	57,418,859	63,425,475
479010	Operating Grants	300,076	309,611	300,076	300,076	300,076
485400	Other Non Operating Revenue	242,217	0	0	0	0
543210	GF - Various GIS & Eng Svcs (N4303 & N2418)	661,521	1,088,947	1,088,947	881,305	904,665
543210	GIS Maps & Publications (N2409 and 2419)	157,619	157,619	157,619	157,619	157,619
543210	Parks & Other City Depts. (N4405)	1,126,276	1,126,276	1,126,276	502,112	511,053
543210	SCL Fund (N4403)	235,403	235,404	235,403	337,525	339,176
543210	SDOT Fund (N4404)	3,692,608	3,692,608	3,692,608	1,630,363	1,670,771
705000	General Subfund -- Transfer In -- Restore Our Waters	103,481	106,761	106,761	183,896	187,574
705000	GF Reimbursement of Abandoned Vehicles	51,769	51,383	51,383	52,411	53,459
705000	Technical Adjustments	0	0	0	960,000	991,400
<b>Total Revenues</b>		<b>296,811,982</b>	<b>318,959,442</b>	<b>313,534,364</b>	<b>349,031,678</b>	<b>366,068,285</b>
379100	Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital	(7,791,573)	11,768,458	18,738,247	9,532,463	5,877,087
<b>Total Resources</b>		<b>289,020,409</b>	<b>330,727,900</b>	<b>332,272,611</b>	<b>358,564,141</b>	<b>371,945,372</b>

## 2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Solid Waste Fund

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
408000	Other Nonoperating Revenue	1,294,888	0	0	0	0
416457	Transfer Fee	0	1,806,842	0	0	0
416458	Transfer Fee - Out City	77,520	0	0	0	0
437010	Operating Fees, Contributions and grants	981,660	400,000	500,000	382,573	0
443710	Commercial Services	43,876,849	53,391,629	46,599,265	48,848,341	48,610,322
443710	Residential Services	71,638,048	85,375,465	86,850,195	92,365,820	98,242,623
443741	Recycling and Disposal Station Charges	11,554,963	11,989,267	12,662,528	12,752,087	12,827,084
443745	Comm'l Disposal (Longhaul) Charges	388,000	628,511	443,126	476,360	476,360
466990	Recovery Fees/Yellow Pages	0	0	0	765,000	574,000
469990	Other Operating Revenue	155,229	301,488	0	0	0
481200	Transfers from Construction Fund	14,600,168	32,400,000	18,208,140	23,505,342	32,384,827
485400	Gain (Loss) on sale of capital assets	(392,905)	0	0	0	0
516456	Landfill Closure Fee	4,133,286	0	0	0	0
516457	Transfer Fee - In City	3,817,263	3,425,448	3,979,236	4,042,780	4,017,254
705000	Call Center Reimbursement from SCL	1,159,702	1,771,877	1,159,702	1,676,405	1,688,806
705000	GSF - Transfer In - Aband'd Vehicle Calls	51,769	51,383	51,383	52,411	53,459
705000	KC Reimb for Local Hzrd Waste Mgt Prgm	2,418,262	2,418,261	2,418,262	2,418,262	2,418,262
<b>Total Revenues</b>		<b>155,754,702</b>	<b>193,960,171</b>	<b>172,871,836</b>	<b>187,285,382</b>	<b>201,292,997</b>
379100	Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital	6,491,295	(302,588)	20,816,102	1,745,638	4,949,655
<b>Total Resources</b>		<b>162,245,997</b>	<b>193,657,583</b>	<b>193,687,938</b>	<b>189,031,020</b>	<b>206,242,652</b>

## 2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Water Fund

Summit Code	Source	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
408000	GF Lane Related Payments	10,246,113	0	0	0	0
408000	Other Non-Operating Revenue	3,719,589	0	240,297	243,300	246,342
408000	Reimbursement for NS activities	734,409	0	177,880	180,104	182,355
437010	Operating Grants	2,001,339	0	0	0	0
443410	Retail Water Sales	130,272,378	139,498,906	141,399,625	141,204,240	157,282,204
443420	Water Service for Fire Protection	5,670,083	5,895,700	5,895,700	6,658,755	7,390,816
443420	Wholesale Water Sales	48,280,764	47,500,000	47,124,914	47,200,000	47,672,000
443450	Facilities Charges	173,259	200,000	173,259	173,259	346,518
443450	Tap Fees	5,263,816	7,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,050,000
461110	Build America Bond Interest Income	0	0	1,126,982	2,135,334	2,135,334
462500	Rentals--Non-City	429,576	381,913	381,913	391,461	401,247
469990	Other Operating Revenues	1,709,287	2,652,706	1,850,913	1,897,186	1,944,615
479010	Capital Grants and Contributions	3,154,167	3,349,911	3,124,813	3,142,832	3,143,548
481200	Public Works Loan Proceeds	3,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	0	0
481200	Transfers from Construction Fund	67,705,678	87,381,012	62,344,318	57,759,482	45,612,930
481200	Withdrawal from Redemption Fund	93,000,000	0	0	0	0
485400	Proceeds on sale of capital assets	4,726,259	0	0	0	0
543970	Inventory Purchased by SDOT	732,191	393,984	720,740	740,540	755,351
587000	Op Transfer In - Rev Stab Subfund - BPA Acct	1,099,162	800,000	680,000	80,761	0
587000	Op Transfer In - Rev Stab Subfund	0	1,500,000	3,000,000	1,433,700	0
705000	Call Center Reimbursement from SCL	1,726,044	1,825,570	1,825,570	1,727,205	1,739,981
705000	GF Reimb Abandoned Vehicles	48,893	52,940	52,940	53,999	55,079
<b>Total Revenues</b>		<b>383,693,006</b>	<b>307,432,642</b>	<b>283,119,863</b>	<b>269,022,157</b>	<b>272,958,321</b>
379100	Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital	(7,902,700)	(14,618,476)	14,130,655	6,284,681	311,517
<b>Total Resources</b>		<b>375,790,306</b>	<b>292,814,166</b>	<b>297,250,518</b>	<b>275,306,838</b>	<b>273,269,838</b>

**Drainage and Wastewater Fund**

	<b>2009 Actuals</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Revised</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
<b>Operating Cash at End of Previous Year</b>	<b>20,760,152</b>	<b>9,300,000</b>	<b>23,524,844</b>	<b>12,600,733</b>	<b>10,420,796</b>
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	296,811,982	318,959,442	313,534,364	349,031,678	366,068,285
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	289,020,409	330,727,900	332,272,112	358,564,141	371,945,372
Less: CIP Accompl. Assumptions	0	0	(8,472,271)	(8,384,809)	(9,262,400)
Plus: Accounting and Technical Adjustments	(5,026,881)	12,347,984	(658,634)	(1,032,283)	(3,501,609)
<b>Ending Operating Cash Balance</b>	<b>23,524,844</b>	<b>9,879,526</b>	<b>12,600,733</b>	<b>10,420,796</b>	<b>10,304,500</b>

**Solid Waste Fund**

	<b>2009 Actuals</b>	<b>2010 Adopted</b>	<b>2010 Revised</b>	<b>2011 Adopted</b>	<b>2012 Endorsed</b>
<b>Operating Cash at End of Previous Year</b>	<b>14,033,102</b>	<b>7,438,133</b>	<b>3,872,212</b>	<b>6,954,984</b>	<b>11,261,906</b>
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	155,754,702	193,960,171	172,871,836	187,285,382	201,292,997
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	162,245,997	193,657,583	193,687,940	189,031,020	206,242,652
Less: CIP Accompl. Assumptions	0	0	(12,808,621)	(2,924,780)	(4,011,501)
Plus: Accounting and Technical Adjustments	(3,669,595)	(1,014,409)	11,090,255	3,127,780	3,439,676
<b>Ending Operating Cash Balance</b>	<b>3,872,212</b>	<b>6,726,312</b>	<b>6,954,984</b>	<b>11,261,906</b>	<b>13,763,428</b>

## Water Fund

	2009 Actuals	2010 Adopted	2010 Revised	2011 Adopted	2012 Endorsed
<b>Operating Cash at End of Previous Year</b>	<b>7,211,244</b>	<b>15,000,000</b>	<b>8,193,588</b>	<b>7,080,178</b>	<b>7,036,100</b>
Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue	383,693,006	307,432,642	283,097,327	269,022,157	272,958,321
Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures	375,790,306	292,814,166	297,250,519	275,306,838	273,269,838
Less: CIP Accompl. Assumptions	0	0	(17,144,471)	(7,910,772)	(6,641,097)
Plus: Accounting and Technical Adjustments	(6,920,356)	(24,299,704)	(4,104,689)	(1,670,170)	(5,988,528)
<b>Ending Operating Cash Balance</b>	<b>8,193,588</b>	<b>5,318,772</b>	<b>7,080,178</b>	<b>7,036,100</b>	<b>7,377,152</b>