## **Seattle City Light**

## Jorge Carrasco, Superintendent

#### **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/light/

#### **Department Description**

Seattle City Light (City Light) was created by the residents of Seattle in 1902 to provide affordable, reliable, and environmentally sound electric power to the City of Seattle and neighboring suburbs. Owned by the community it serves, City Light is a nationally recognized leader in energy efficiency, renewable resource development, and environmental stewardship.

City Light provides electric power to approximately 395,000 residential, business, and industrial customers within a 130 square-mile service area. City Light provides power to the City of Seattle and surrounding jurisdictions, including parts of Shoreline, Burien, Tukwila, SeaTac, Lake Forest Park, Renton, Normandy Park, and areas of unincorporated King County.

City Light owns about 2,000 megawatts of very low-cost, environmentally-responsible, hydroelectric generation capacity. In an average year, City Light meets about 50% of its load with owned hydroelectric generation and obtains the remainder primarily through the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). City Light is the nation's ninth largest publicly-owned electric utility in terms of customers served.

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

In 2009 and 2010, unexpectedly depressed energy prices and unusually low precipitation levels placed significant financial strain on the utility, forcing City Light to cut costs and reduce spending on operations and capital improvements. In a typical year, City Light sells surplus power generated in the winter and spring, and purchases additional power to supplement lower generation in the summer and fall. This "power shaping" allows City Light to respond to seasonal swings in supply and demand and provides net wholesale revenue to help offset costs that would otherwise need to be paid by retail rate payers. Over the last two years, City Light received significantly less net wholesale revenue than was anticipated when rates were set. The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget restores core maintenance activities that were deferred as a response to the revenue downturn and addresses significant regulatory changes affecting the utility industry, while holding down rate increases during the recession. The Proposed Budget anticipates a rate increase of 4.3% in 2011 and 4.2% in 2012, and reflects the creation of the Rate Stabilization Account in 2010 to mitigate future risks to wholesale revenue.

The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget restores funding for core maintenance at City Light's power generating facilities that had been deferred in recent years. This includes replacing or refurbishing turbine runners, generators, and transformers; dredging and clearing of dams, reservoirs, and waterways; and restoring regular maintenance programs. City Light is also in the process of relicensing Boundary Dam with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to continue power operations. Boundary Dam is City Light's largest generating facility and generates between 20% and 40% of City Light's annual power needs, depending on water availability. The budget includes resources to develop the environmental, cultural, and recreational mitigation measures anticipated as a part of FERC relicensing. While significant relicensing costs are expected in future years, these costs will be allocated over the life of the license and are not expected to have a material impact on future City Light rates.

The Proposed Budget also provides for maintenance and upkeep of City Light's power distribution facilities. In 2011, City Light will continue to implement the Work and Asset Management System (WAMS) to track and manage the utility's assets, schedule maintenance crews, and help identify efficiencies in business practices and

capital decision making. The first phase of WAMS will become operational in the second quarter of 2011, with full implementation in 2012, and the utility is already taking steps to address its aging assets. On the basis of condition assessments performed under the asset management program, City Light is proposing a proactive rehabilitation and replacement program for deteriorating wood poles, accelerating the replacement schedule for aging substation transformers, and continuing the neighborhood cable injection program to extend the useful life of direct-buried cables without having to dig them out of the ground. In addition, the budget provides additional resources for vegetation management and improves the tree-trimming cycle from five years to four years to lessen the potential risk of power outages due to storms and tree-fall. These programs are designed to maintain and enhance the reliability of the electric service that City Light's customers expect, and achieve lower life-cycle costs of assets through planned maintenance.

The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget provides funding for necessary maintenance and upgrades of critical utility information technology systems. This includes on-going maintenance and future replacement planning for the Energy Management System, the Transformer/Network Load Management System, the Consolidated Customer Service System, and other utility-specific systems. These systems manage the flow of power from City Light's dams through the distribution system, support utility design and engineering, and provide for customer billing and meter reading. City Light also proposes replacement of aging desktops, servers, and basic software that will no longer be serviced by the manufacturer or supported by Microsoft or other venders.

In addition to basic maintenance, City Light must respond to the changing regulatory environment of the power utility industry. Although City Light continues to maintain dams and facilities that have been in operation for decades, the 2000-2001 West Coast energy crisis and the 2003 East Coast blackouts that affected the nation's transmission grid have led to increased scrutiny and regulation of utility companies by FERC and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC). The increased federal scrutiny on power marketing activities, as well as the need to maximize revenue generation opportunities for the utility, requires new procedures and systems for energy trading and interactions with the regional power grid.

The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes new systems to record real-time power sales, power grid control systems required as part of the new BPA Slice contract, and additional power marketing support to protect against risk and liability in energy trading transactions. NERC has established new security and operational procedures that carry significant penalties for non-compliance. The budget includes resources to ensure compliance with evolving NERC requirements.

In Washington State, Initiative 937 requires City Light to pursue additional renewable resources and conservation. These new requirements align with City Light's Five Year Conservation Plan and the utility's resource planning goals. The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes additional funding for purchasing renewable resources or renewable energy credits. City Light is committed to maintaining its status as a net-zero emitter of greenhouse gases.

The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget also responds to the needs of local jurisdictions. The budget includes capital projects to support conversion of overhead power lines to underground facilities at the request of suburban cities, and funding to support utility relocation for the Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement, Mercer Corridor construction, Sound Transit, and other transportation driven needs.

The Proposed Budget captures savings in the financial management and operations of City Light. In connection with the utility's 2010 bond issue, City Light maintained favorable bond ratings of Aa2 from Moody's and AA-from Standard & Poor's despite the emerging financial challenges of 2009 and 2010. These ratings allowed City Light to borrow money at favorable interest rates and to take advantage of refinancing opportunities. The refinancing of existing debt resulted in debt service savings of \$32 million in 2010 and \$22 million in 2011, which are being used to fund the Rate Stabilization Account. Between the refinancing savings and the issuance of new 2010 debt, City Light's debt service payments in 2011 are reduced by \$8 million from the 2010 Adopted

Budget. Debt service is anticipated to increase in 2012 when the refinancing savings cease. The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget anticipates a 2011 bond issue to generate approximately \$210 million for the capital improvement program, and potentially to refinance certain existing debt to generate additional savings.

City Light recognizes the need to continually improve efficiencies and cut controllable costs during the recession, and participated in the Citywide effort to identify cost savings through changes in management structure and administrative efficiencies. The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget maintains some of the cost reductions made during the past two years, including scaled back public tours of City Light's Skagit facilities, reduced consulting support for policy analysis and strategic planning, reduced travel and training budgets, and other reductions. The Proposed Budget anticipates labor cost savings resulting from negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions, freezes cost-of-living salary adjustments for management-level positions and other employees in discretionary pay bands, cuts 16.6 FTE vacant positions (including 7.0 FTE management-level positions), and downgrades an additional 5.0 FTE management-level positions to control costs, address span-of-control issues, and reduce the budgeted vacancy rate.

In the Budget Control Level (BCL) summaries that follow, budget adjustments for Operating BCLs describe changes from the 2010 Adopted Budget. For Capital BCLs, budget adjustments describe changes from the anticipated 2011 spending in the 2010-2015 Adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

|  | Summit         | 2009                                 | 2010                            | 2011                                | 2012                       |
|--|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Appropriations Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs O&M Budget Control Level   | Code<br>SCL220 | Actual 50,900,808                    | Adopted 46,167,558              | Proposed 48,129,846                 | Proposed 50,070,070        |
| Customer Services and Energy<br>Delivery - CIP Budget Control<br>Level   | SCL350         | 130,535,356                          | 110,902,133                     | 133,295,463                         | 153,373,292                |
| Customer Services Budget Control<br>Level  | SCL320         | 27,023,647                           | 26,880,122                      | 27,819,177                          | 28,488,205                 |
| <b>Debt Service Budget Control Level</b>   | SCL810         | 216,839,238                          | 150,692,659                     | 142,658,754                         | 173,113,109                |
| Distribution Services Budget<br>Control Level  | SCL310         | 65,285,644                           | 61,625,166                      | 69,103,313                          | 72,568,827                 |
| Financial Services - CIP Budget<br>Control Level   | SCL550         | 6,963,996                            | 6,391,563                       | 6,461,855                           | 7,973,849                  |
| Financial Services - O&M Budget<br>Control Level   | SCL500         | 26,295,956                           | 28,928,871                      | 35,298,574                          | 29,472,938                 |
| General Expenses Budget Control<br>Level   | SCL800         | 67,184,966                           | 65,765,573                      | 68,441,557                          | 72,677,802                 |
| Human Resources Budget Control<br>Level  | SCL400         | 5,624,506                            | 6,544,319                       | 6,883,193                           | 6,810,318                  |
| Office of Superintendent Budget<br>Control Level   | SCL100         | 3,152,586                            | 3,123,480                       | 2,876,578                           | 2,916,667                  |
| Power Supply & Environmental<br>Affairs - CIP Budget Control Level   | SCL250         | 47,224,920                           | 46,263,834                      | 57,845,507                          | 43,973,100                 |
| Power Supply O&M Budget<br>Control Level   | SCL210         | 59,548,553                           | 60,738,167                      | 66,694,668                          | 70,019,887                 |
| Purchased Power Budget Control<br>Level  | SCL700         | 297,442,362                          | 405,347,045                     | 347,195,283                         | 358,635,217                |
| <b>Taxes Budget Control Level</b>  | SCL820         | 62,574,559                           | 70,245,290                      | 74,841,040                          | 77,977,439                 |
| Department Total   |                | 1,066,597,095                        | 1,089,615,780                   | 1,087,544,808                       | 1,148,070,720              |
| <b>Department Full-time Equivalents To</b> * FTE totals are provided for informational purpos outside of the budget process may not be detailed he | es only. Chang | <b>1,840.10</b> es in FTEs resulting | 1,840.10<br>a from City Council | <b>1,824.50</b> or Personnel Direct | <b>1,824.50</b> or actions |
|  |                | 2009                                 | 2010                            | 2011                                | 2012                       |
| Resources  |                | Actual                               | Adopted                         | Proposed                            | Proposed                   |
| Other  |                | 1,066,597,095                        | 1,089,615,780                   | 1,087,544,808                       | 1,148,070,720              |

1,066,597,095 1,089,615,780 1,087,544,808 1,148,070,720

**Department Total** 

## <u>Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs O&M Budget Control</u> Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs O&M Budget Control Level is to design and implement demand-side conservation measures that offset the need for additional generation resources to meet the utility's load; meet federal, state and local regulatory requirements for conservation and renewable resources; and to see that the utility generates and delivers energy in an environmentally responsible manner.

#### **Summary**

Add \$1.23 million to meet the conservation targets of City Light's Five Year Conservation Plan, the Regional Sixth Power Plan, and Initiative-937. This funding allows City Light to fill positions that had been left vacant due to financial constraints, continue to participate in the regional utility-funded Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, and expand the OPower program (previously named Positive Energy) which encourages residents to conserve energy by providing comparable electricity use of similarly situated customers.

Add \$800,000 for development of small-scale renewable resources. These appropriations are funded by voluntary customer contributions to "green" programs at City Light.

Convert 1.0 FTE Planning & Development Specialist II into 1.0 FTE Environmental Analyst, Senior to support environmental, cultural resource, and recreation mitigation measures required by FERC relicensing of Boundary Dam.

Convert 1.0 FTE Energy Planning Analyst, 1.0 FTE Marketing Development Coordinator, and 1.0 FTE Planning & Development Specialist II into 3.0 FTE Capital Projects Coordinator, Senior and transfer out positions and \$224,000 to Power Supply O&M BCL to support FERC relicensing of Boundary Dam.

Convert 1.0 FTE Marketing Development Coordinator into 1.0 FTE Hydro Maintenance Machinist and transfer out the position and \$79,000 to Power Supply O&M BCL to support maintenance of power generation projects.

Transfer out \$80,000 to the Office of Superintendent BCL to support public outreach for conservation initiatives.

Reduce \$66,000 in travel, training, and consulting services.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager 3, Utilities, 1.0 FTE Energy Management Analyst Assistant, 1.0 FTE Energy Research and Evaluation Analyst, 1.0 FTE Energy Planning Analyst, and 1.0 FTE Economist for a total reduction of 5.0 FTE to align staffing levels with budget, address span-of-control issues, and reduce the budgeted vacancy rate.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs BCL will achieve \$94,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$40,000 is saved in the Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs BCL by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$516,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.0 million.

|  | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|--|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE                         | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Conservation Resources and Environmental | 50,900,808 | 46,167,558 | 48,129,846      | 50,070,070 |
| Affairs O&M                              |            |            |                 |            |
| Full-time Equivalents Total*             | 117.00     | 117.00     | 108.00          | 108.00     |

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

### **Customer Services and Energy Delivery - CIP Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Customer Services and Energy Delivery - CIP Budget Control Level is to provide for the capital costs of installation, maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacement of transmission lines, substations, distribution feeders, transformers, services connections, and meters to meet customer demand. This Budget Control Level's capital program also coordinates the utility's plant improvements with the efforts of other agencies involved in the implementation of large projects such as the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement, North Downtown redevelopment, and Sound Transit light rail.

#### **Summary**

Add \$4 million to support the Wood Pole Replacement Program and proactively replace wood poles before failure. City Light's Asset Management Program estimates that over 51,000 wood poles (approximately 47% of the system) are nearing the end of their useful life.

Add \$5.61 million to accelerate the Neighborhood Cable Injection Program. Cable injection has proven to be a reliable, cost-effective, and least-disruptive method of rehabilitating direct buried cable.

Add \$1 million to purchase software and implement changes and upgrades to the Transformer Load Management/Network Load Management program.

Add \$1 million to purchase utility-specific design and drafting software to streamline distribution engineering design and facilitate data sharing with other City Light systems, including the Work and Asset Management System and the Outage Management System.

Add \$300,000 to replace meter reading software that will become unsupported by the vendor in 2012.

Add \$33.3 million for relocation of transmission and distribution power systems in support of the Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement project.

Add \$112,000 for design of distribution and transmission facility relocations in support of the Mercer West Corridor project.

Add \$1 million for design and relocation of distribution systems in support of Seattle Department of Transportation street, sidewalk, and bike path improvements. Funding in 2011 includes in-kind relocation of overhead power lines for the Linden Avenue North project.

Add \$1 million to support increased power requirements for Sound Transit's Capitol Hill station site. This project is fully reimbursable by Sound Transit.

Add \$4.7 million to support City Light's overhead to underground power facility conversions under the terms of the franchise agreement with the City of Burien. Per the terms of the agreement, this project is fully reimbursable through a new underground rate payment on Burien ratepayers' monthly bills.

Add \$1 million to support City Light's overhead to underground power facility conversions under the terms of the franchise agreement with the City of SeaTac. Per the terms of the agreement, this project is fully reimbursable through direct billings to the City of SeaTac.

Add \$1 million for make ready work required to meet all applicable codes for customers approved to attach communication cables to City Light facilities and for other work related to cell site construction. This work is reimbursable.

Reduce \$21.2 million due to project-level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 spending in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|   | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Expenditures/FTE                            | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| Customer Services and Energy Delivery - CIP | 130,535,356 | 110,902,133 | 133,295,463 | 153,373,292 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total*                | 290.38      | 290.38      | 290.38      | 290.38      |

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

### **Customer Services Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Customer Services Budget Control Level is to provide outstanding customer care and service through efficient, accurate metering and billing, and effective customer account management.

#### **Summary**

Convert 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 3, Utilities into 1.0 FTE Management Systems Analyst, Senior to implement NERC compliance activities within the Customer Service and Energy Delivery Business Unit.

Transfer in \$662,000 from the Distribution Services BCL to reflect reorganization of the Technical Metering and Meter Reading divisions.

Convert 1.0 FTE Meter Electrician into 1.0 FTE Electrical Engineering Specialist, Associate and transfer out position and \$80,000 to Distribution Services BCL to support distribution system planning.

Reduce \$25,000 for incident response training exercises.

Reduce \$94,000 in travel and training.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Accounting Technician III-BU to align staffing levels with budget and reduce the budgeted vacancy rate.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Customer Services BCL will achieve \$160,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$55,000 is saved in the Customer Services BCL by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$687,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$939,000.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Customer Services            | 27,023,647 | 26,880,122 | 27,819,177      | 28,488,205 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 213.75     | 213.75     | 211.75          | 211.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Debt Service Budget Control Level**

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Debt Service Budget Control Level is to meet principal repayment and interest obligations on funds borrowed to meet City Light's capital expenditure requirements.

#### **Summary**

Reduce \$8 million in debt service to reflect refunding savings from City Light's 2010 debt refinancing. Debt service is anticipated to increase in 2012 when refunding savings cease.

|                    | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Expenditures       | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| Debt Service - BCL | 216.839.238 | 150,692,659 | 142,658,754 | 173,113,109 |

### **Distribution Services Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Distribution Services Budget Control Level is to provide reliable electricity to customers through cost-effective operation and maintenance of City Light's overhead and underground distribution systems, substations, and transmission systems.

#### **Summary**

Convert 1.0 FTE Power Dispatcher, Assistant into 1.0 FTE Electrical Power Systems Engineer and add \$200,000 to accelerate the Neighborhood Cable Injection Program. Cable injection has proven to be a reliable, cost-effective, and least-disruptive method of rehabilitating direct buried cable.

Convert 2.0 FTE Electrician-Constructor and 2.0 FTE Lineworker into 4.0 FTE Electrical Power Systems Engineer to support the Wood Pole Replacement Program. City Light's Asset Management Program estimates that over 51,000 wood poles (approximately 47% of the system) are nearing the end of their useful life.

Convert 1.0 FTE Electrical Engineer, Associate into 1.0 FTE Electrical Power Systems Engineer and add \$180,000 to double support for the Substation Transformer Replacement Program. This funding allows City Light to begin replacement of the most degraded transformers to a rate of two per year.

Add \$100,000 for improvements to the Backup Control Center at the North Service Center to improve startup time for incident response.

Add \$2 million in the vegetation management contract budget. This funding will restore vegetation management from a five-year maintenance cycle to a four-year cycle on transmission and distribution lines.

Transfer in \$80,000 and 1.0 FTE Electrical Engineering Specialist, Associate from the Customer Services BCL; convert 1.0 FTE Electrical Power Systems Engineer into 1.0 FTE Electrical Power Systems Engineer, Principal; convert 1.0 FTE Cable Splicer-Network Area into 1.0 FTE Electrical Power Systems Engineer; convert 1.0 FTE Lineworker into 1.0 FTE Electrical Engineer, Associate; and add \$430,000 for distribution system planning. Funding supports staffing for detailed load modeling, analyzing transmission and distribution system needs, and vetting future capital projects.

Add \$400,000 to conduct two system planning engineering studies. This funding will allow City Light to evaluate the need for a North Downtown Substation and evaluate Columbia Grid's Puget Sound Transmission Congestion Relief study.

Add \$2.46 million for planned increased spending to implement the Asset Management Program. The new Oracle Work and Asset Management System will be fully implemented in 2012.

Add \$100,000 to implement changes and upgrades to the Transformer Load Management/Network Load Management program.

Add \$147,000 to implement NERC compliance activities within the Customer Service and Energy Delivery Business Unit.

Add \$1.32 million for make ready work required to meet all applicable codes for customers approved to attach communication cables to City Light facilities and for other work related to cell site construction. This work is reimbursable.

Transfer out \$662,000 to the Customer Services BCL to reflect reorganization of the Technical Metering and Meter Reading divisions.

Reduce \$127,000 in support for one-stop permitting, reflecting reduced permit activity during the recession.

Reduce \$100,000 and defer the Skagit Wood Pole Inspection Program for two years.

Reduce \$25,000 for travel and training.

Convert 2.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 3, Utilities into 2.0 FTE Management Systems Analyst, Senior, to align staffing levels with budget, address span-of-control issues, and reduce the budgeted vacancy rate.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Distribution Services BCL will achieve \$172,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$77,000 is saved in the Distribution Services BCL by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$1.24 million for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$7.5 million.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Distribution Services        | 65,285,644 | 61,625,166 | 69,103,313      | 72,568,827 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 598.27     | 598.27     | 599.27          | 599.27     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Financial Services - CIP Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Financial Services - CIP Budget Control Level is to provide for the capital costs of rehabilitation and replacement of the utility's information technology infrastructure and to fund the development of large software applications.

#### **Summary**

Add \$145,000 to update network firewall and IT security systems in compliance with NERC standards.

Add \$540,000 to maintain the existing Consolidated Customer Service System and begin planning for replacement of the system. Seattle Public Utilities is contributing an equal share towards the project costs.

Add \$524,000 to begin replacement of desktop PCs and upgrade desktop software. City Light's desktops are no longer being supported by the manufacturer and Microsoft will end support for Windows XP and Office 2003 in 2014.

Add \$84,000 due to project-level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 spending in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Financial Services - CIP     | 6,963,996 | 6,391,563 | 6,461,855 | 7,973,849 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 6.71      | 6.71      | 6.71      | 6.71      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

### Financial Services - O&M Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Financial Services - O&M Budget Control Level is to foster City Light's financial health through prudent planning, risk mitigation, and provision of information to drive financial discipline. Information Technology services are provided through this Budget Control Level to support systems and applications used throughout the utility. This Budget Control Level also supports the efforts and services provided by the Urban League's Contractor Development and Competitiveness Center for the development of small, economically-disadvantaged businesses, including women and minority firms, as authorized by Ordinance 120888.

#### **Summary**

Add \$2.18 million for IT software and hardware maintenance for City Light's Energy Management System, Business Production Systems, desktops, network infrastructure, and servers. This funding will cover two years support for these systems and shifts anticipated maintenance costs from 2012 to 2011. A corresponding reduction will be taken in the 2012 Endorsed Budget.

Add \$112,000 for on-going license and maintenance fees for power marketing and control center IT applications, including the Accounting, Contracts and Energy Scheduling software and Stancil voice recording software required for recording energy trades.

Add \$275,000 to maintain the existing Consolidated Customer Service System and begin planning for replacement of the system. Seattle Public Utilities is contributing an equal share towards the project costs.

Add \$2.94 million for license and maintenance fees for the Consolidated Customer Service System, Outage Management System, Work and Asset Management System, and associated Oracle and Microsoft products. This funding will cover two years' support for these systems.

Add \$640,000 to align budget with the costs for support services from the Department of Information Technology and Seattle Public Utilities-GIS.

Add \$207,000 for improved cyber security of the Energy Management System to comply with NERC security standards.

Add \$85,000 to restore contract funding for comprehensive risk policy compliance assessment and review.

Convert 1.0 FTE Material Controller Supervisor into 1.0 FTE Power Marketer, and transfer out position and \$79,000 to Power Supply O&M BCL to support power marketing.

Reduce \$215,000 for reduced maintenance of information technology infrastructure.

Reduce \$65,000 for policy analysis. This reduction defers the hiring of a National Urban Fellow.

Reduce \$364,000 in consulting services for strategic planning, benchmarking and other Financial Services projects.

Reduce \$86,000 in staff training and certifications.

Reduce \$88,000 in staff overtime for IT application support.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Executive 2, 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Information Technology, 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 1, CSPI&P, 1.0 FTE Information Technology Professional B-BU, 1.0 FTE Management Systems Analyst, Senior, 1.0 FTE Mechanical Engineer Senior, 1.0 FTE Economist, Senior, and 0.6 FTE Administrative Specialist III for a total reduction of 7.6 FTE; convert 1.0 FTE Manager 2, Information Technology into 1.0 FTE Information Technology Professional A, Exempt; and reduce \$193,000 to align staffing levels with budget, address span-of-control issues, and reduce the budgeted vacancy rate.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Financial Services - O&M BCL will achieve \$72,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$111,000 is saved in the Financial Services - O&M BCL by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$729,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$6.4 million.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Financial Services - O&M     | 26,295,956 | 28,928,871 | 35,298,574 | 29,472,938 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 197.50     | 197.50     | 189.90     | 189.90     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Expenses Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the General Expenses Budget Control Level is to budget, track, and monitor the expenses of the utility that, for the most part, are not directly attributable to a specific organizational unit. These expenditures include insurance, bond issue costs, bond maintenance fees, audit costs, Law Department legal fees, external legal fees, employee benefits (medical and retirement costs), industrial insurance costs, general claims costs, and services provided by the City's internal services departments through the central cost allocation mechanism.

#### **Summary**

Add \$127,000 to cover the associated benefit costs of NERC compliance positions in the Power Supply O&M BCL, Distribution Services BCL, and Human Resources BCL.

Add \$11,000 to cover the associated benefit costs of the 1.0 FTE Equipment Servicer in the Power Supply O&M BCL.

Reduce \$1 million in deferred environmental clean-up for Cedar Falls.

Reduce \$600,000 in budgeted bond maintenance costs resulting from eliminating variable rate debt in the 2010 City Light bond issue.

Reduce \$60,000 for lower anticipated audit fees.

Reduce \$107,000 for position classification support by City Personnel due to reduced workload.

Add \$1.13 million for increased labor costs of medical and dental benefits.

Add \$1.65 million for increased labor costs of workers compensation and unemployment benefits.

Add \$1.27 million for increased labor costs of pensions.

Other citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$255,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.7 million.

|                  | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012            |
|------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|
| Expenditures     | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | <b>Proposed</b> |
| General Expenses | 67.184.966 | 65,765,573 | 68,441,557 | 72,677,802      |

### <u>Human Resources Budget Control Level</u>

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Human Resources Budget Control Level is to help City Light be a safe, high performance organization through excellence in safety, organizational development and training, employee and management services, and labor relations.

#### **Summary**

Add \$40,000 to provide background checks of City Light employees with access to secure assets in compliance with NERC security standards.

Add \$147,000 to implement NERC compliance activities within the Human Resources Business Unit.

Transfer in \$93,000 from the Power Supply O&M BCL for the Arc Flash Clothing program.

Reduce \$10,000 in travel and training.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 1, General Government and convert 1.0 FTE Manager 2 into 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Exempt to align staffing levels with budget, address span-of-control issues, and reduce the budgeted vacancy rate.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Human Resources BCL will achieve \$41,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$137,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$339,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed  |
| Human Resources              | 5,624,506 | 6,544,319 | 6,883,193       | 6,810,318 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 37.52     | 37.52     | 36.52           | 36.52     |

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

### Office of Superintendent Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Office of the Superintendent Budget Control Level is to assemble high-level staff to assure the effective delivery of reliable electric power in an environmentally sound manner, and enable the Superintendent to focus on the utility's broad departmental policy direction and leadership, its financial health, and stakeholder relations. The utility's communications and governmental affairs functions are included in this Budget Control Level.

#### **Summary**

Transfer in \$80,000 from the Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs BCL to support public outreach for conservation initiatives.

Reduce \$187,000 to scale back public tours of City Light's Skagit facilities.

Reduce \$137,000 in professional services for communications, advertising and web development.

Reduce \$50,000 in travel and training.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Office of Superintendent BCL will achieve \$8,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$29,000 is saved in the Office of Superintendent BCL by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$91,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$247,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Office of Superintendent     | 3,152,586 | 3,123,480 | 2,876,578 | 2,916,667 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 18.75     | 18.75     | 18.75     | 18.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Power Supply & Environmental Affairs - CIP Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Power Supply & Environmental Affairs - CIP Budget Control Level is to provide for the capital costs of maintaining the physical generating plant to meet the electrical needs of City Light's customers. This Budget Control Level's capital program provides for the utility's physical plant and associated power license and regulatory requirements.

#### **Summary**

Add \$2.6 million for the permanent re-establishment of boat and barge access to the Ross Powerhouse and National Parks Facilities which was disrupted by a significant rock slide in 2010.

Add \$500,000 to begin implementing mitigation measures for FERC relicensing of Boundary Dam.

Add \$432,000 to establish a dedicated Backup Control Center for power system operations at the North Service Center.

Reduce \$10.8 million due to project-level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 spending in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|  | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE                           | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Power Supply & Environmental Affairs - CIP | 47,224,920 | 46,263,834 | 57,845,507 | 43,973,100 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total*               | 73.26      | 73.26      | 73.26      | 73.26      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

### Power Supply O&M Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Power Supply O&M Budget Control Level is to provide clean, safe, economic, efficient, reliable sources of electric power for City Light customers, and to provide support for the safe and efficient operation of the Utility.

#### **Summary**

Transfer in \$79,000 and 1.0 FTE Hydroelectric Maintenance Machinist from the Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs O&M BCL, convert 1.0 FTE Hydroelectric Maintenance Machinist into 1.0 FTE Hydro Maintenance Worker I-Generation, and add \$3.95 million to restore essential maintenance and operations for power generation projects which cannot be deferred any longer.

Add \$136,000 to restore support for transformer maintenance at Boundary Power House.

Convert 1.0 FTE HVAC Technician into 1.0 FTE Hydroelectric Maintenance Machinist and add \$78,000 to restore one journey-level position and support power generation projects.

Add \$508,000 for increased license fees imposed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The increase covers federal land use charges for City Light dams on the Pend Oreille, Skagit, and Tolt rivers.

Transfer in \$224,000 and 3.0 FTE Capital Projects Coordinator, Senior from the Conservation Resources and Environmental Affairs O&M BCL, convert 1.0 FTE Mechanical Engineer, Associate into 1.0 FTE Capital Projects Coordinator, Senior, and add \$90,000 to begin implementing mitigation measures for FERC relicensing of Boundary Dam.

Convert 1.0 FTE Manager 2, Utilities into 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Utilities, and add \$147,000 to implement NERC compliance activities within the Power Supply and Environmental Affairs Business Unit.

Transfer in \$79,000 and 1.0 FTE Power Marketer from Financial Services O&M, and add \$122,000 to address BPA curtailments and market available transmission and Renewable Energy Credits to generate additional wholesale revenue.

Add \$140,000 for Phase II development of the Slice Customer Interface software application. This software is a contractual obligation of City Light's Slice contract with the Bonneville Power Administration.

Convert 1.0 FTE Truck Driver into 1.0 FTE Equipment Servicer and add \$49,000 to increase staffing and management of City Light's motor pool.

Add \$250,000 for rental of yard space during renovation of City Light's South Service Center.

Transfer out \$93,000 to the Human Resources BCL for the Arc Flash Clothing program.

Reduce \$900,000 for professional services to support mitigation efforts for FERC relicensing of Boundary Dam. Mitigation costs will increase in future years.

Reduce \$408,000 in travel, training, and consulting services for resource planning.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor 2, Utilities and 1.0 FTE Civil Engineer, Assistant III to align staffing levels with budget, address span-of-control issues, and reduce the budgeted vacancy rate.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Power Supply O&M BCL will achieve \$187,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings during the recession, \$54,000 is saved in the Power Supply O&M BCL by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$186,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$6.0 million.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Power Supply O&M             | 59,548,553 | 60,738,167 | 66,694,668      | 70,019,887 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 286.96     | 286.96     | 289.96          | 289.96     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Purchased Power Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Purchased Power Budget Control Level is to acquire power, transmission, and other services associated with wholesale power purchases in a cost-effective manner to meet the day-to-day electricity needs of City Light's retail customers.

#### **Summary**

Reduce \$58.2 million for lower anticipated acquisition costs for long-term power and transmission purchase contracts, short-term wholesale marketing purchase activities, and new renewable resources.

|                 | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Expenditures    | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| Purchased Power | 297,442,362 | 405,347,045 | 347,195,283 | 358,635,217 |

## **Taxes Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Taxes Budget Control Level is to pay City Light's legally required tax payments for state, city, and local jurisdictions. This Budget Control Level includes funding for franchise contract payments negotiated with local jurisdictions in City Light's service territory.

#### **Summary**

Add \$144,000 for settlement costs related to the franchise agreement with Pend Oreille County for continued operation of Boundary Dam.

Add \$4.45 million to align budget with estimated tax payments.

|              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Taxes        | 62.574.559 | 70.245.290 | 74.841.040 | 77,977,439 |

## 2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the City Light Fund

| 43100   Operating Grants   1,695,506   710,000   300,000   115,000   431200   BPA Conservation & Renewables Credit   2,497,809   2,486,316   1,864,737   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   | Summit<br>Code | Source   | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|--|----------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 431200 BPA Conservation & Renewables Credit   2,497,809   2,486,316   1,864,737   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0  | 431010         | Operating Grants   | 1,695,506       | 710,000         | 300,000          | 115,000          |
| 443250         Other O'&M Revenue From Damage         9,351,595         6,619,630         5,374,846         5,501,958           443250         Revenue From Damage         1,853,912         1,533,540         1,566,4569         1,596,840           443345         BPA Credit for South Fork Tolt         3,429,444         3,521,368         3,462,462         3,382,347           443380         Construction & Miscellaneous Charges         447,810         (888,969)         1,135,719         1,161,396           443380         Late Payment Fees         3,822,947         3,622,266         3,706,548         3,794,205           443380         Late Payment Fees         3,822,947         3,622,266         3,706,548         3,794,205           443380         Pole Attachments         1,172,294         1,366,381         2,024,393         2,073,390           443380         Reconnect Charges         311,160         242,747         248,395         254,269           443380         Reconnect Charges         311,160         242,747         248,395         254,269           443380         Transmission Attach. & Cell Sites         1,439,934         2,865,433         2,719,612         2,749,843           443380         Transmission Attach. & Cell Sites         1,439,934         2,865,433  | 431200         |  |                 |                 |                  |                  |
| 443250         Revenue From Damage         1,853,912         1,533,540         1,564,569         1,594,347           443345         BPA Credit for South Fork Tolt         3,429,444         3,213,68         3,462,462         3,382,347           443380         Account Change Fees         1,187,742         1,448,010         1,455,656         1,492,047           443380         Late Payment Fees         3,822,947         3,622,266         3,706,548         3,794,205           443380         Pole Attachments         1,172,294         1,366,381         2,024,393         2,073,390           443380         Property Rentals         2,835,314         1,260,631         1,289,963         1,320,470           443380         Transmission Attach. & Cell Sites         1,439,934         2,865,433         2,719,612         2,749,843           443380         Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals         161,978         183,412         187,680         192,119           461100         Interest         4,345,302         4,416,530         4,247,7862         10,372,915           461100         Interest         4,345,302         4,416,530         4,427,862         10,372,915           461100         Increase A Miscellaneous Rentals         161,978         183,42         185,847,786 <td>431200</td> <td>BPA Payments for Conservation Deferred</td> <td>217,857</td> <td>2,300,000</td> <td>4,732,690</td> <td>0</td>   | 431200         | BPA Payments for Conservation Deferred                                 | 217,857         | 2,300,000       | 4,732,690        | 0                |
| 443345         BPA Credit for South Fork Tolt         3,429,444         3,521,368         3,462,462         3,382,347           443380         Account Change Fees         1,187,742         1,448,010         1,155,656         1,492,047           443380         Construction & Miscellaneous Charges         447,810         (888,969)         1,135,719         1,161,396           443380         Late Payment Fees         3,822,947         3,622,266         3,706,548         3,794,205           443380         Pole Attachments         1,172,294         1,366,381         2,024,393         2,073,390           443380         Property Rentals         2,835,314         1,260,631         1,289,963         1,320,470           443380         Reconnect Charges         311,160         242,747         248,395         254,269           443380         Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals         161,978         183,412         187,680         192,119           461100         Interest         4,345,302         4,416,530         4,427,862         10,372,915           461100         Interest         1,550,030         6,249,646         1,819,226         2,250,000           462900         North Mountain Substation (Snohomish PUID)         1,072,097         0         0 <t< td=""><td>443250</td><td>Other O&amp;M Revenue</td><td>9,351,595</td><td>6,619,630</td><td>5,374,846</td><td>5,501,958</td></t<>   | 443250         | Other O&M Revenue  | 9,351,595       | 6,619,630       | 5,374,846        | 5,501,958        |
| 443380         Account Change Fees         1,187,742         1,448,010         1,455,656         1,492,047           443380         Construction & Miscellaneous Charges         447,810         (888,969)         1,135,719         1,161,396           443380         Late Payment Fees         3,822,947         3,622,266         3,706,548         3,794,205           443380         Pole Attachments         1,172,294         1,366,381         2,024,393         2,073,390           443380         Reconnect Charges         311,160         242,747         248,395         254,269           443380         Reconnect Charges         311,160         242,747         248,395         254,269           443380         Transmission Attach. & Cell Sites         1,439,934         2,865,433         2,719,612         2,749,843           443380         Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals         161,978         183,412         187,680         192,119           461100         Interest         4,345,302         4,416,530         4,427,862         10,372,919           461100         Sale of Property, Material & Equip.         0         1,725,097         2,546,256         2,250,000           462900         Transmission Sales         1,550,030         6,249,646         1,819,226   | 443250         | Revenue From Damage  | 1,853,912       | 1,533,540       | 1,564,569        | 1,596,840        |
| 443380         Construction & Miscellaneous Charges         447,810         (888,969)         1,135,719         1,161,396           443380         Late Payment Fees         3,822,947         3,622,266         3,706,548         3,794,205           443380         Pole Attachments         1,172,294         1,366,6381         2,024,393         2,073,390           443380         Property Rentals         2,835,314         1,260,631         1,289,963         1,320,470           443380         Reconnect Charges         311,160         242,747         248,395         254,269           443380         Transmission Attach. & Cell Sites         1,439,934         2,865,433         2,719,612         2,749,843           443380         Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals         161,978         183,412         187,680         192,119           461100         Interest         4,345,302         4,416,530         4,427,862         10,372,915           461100         Interest         4,345,302         4,416,530         4,427,862         2,250,000           462900         North Mountain Substation (Snohomish         223,114         329,765         369,978         377,974           PUD)         Transmission Sales         1,550,030         6,249,646         1,819,226   | 443345         | BPA Credit for South Fork Tolt   | 3,429,444       | 3,521,368       | 3,462,462        | 3,382,347        |
| 443380   | 443380         | Account Change Fees  | 1,187,742       | 1,448,010       | 1,455,656        | 1,492,047        |
| 443380   Pole Attachments  | 443380         | Construction & Miscellaneous Charges                                   | 447,810         | (888,969)       | 1,135,719        | 1,161,396        |
| 443380   Property Rentals   2,835,314   1,260,631   1,289,963   1,320,470     443380   Reconnect Charges   311,160   242,747   248,395   254,269     443380   Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals   161,978   183,412   187,680   192,119     461100   Interest   4,345,302   4,416,530   4,427,862   10,372,915     461100   Sale of Property, Material & Equip.   0 1,725,097   2,546,256   2,250,000     462900   North Mountain Substation (Snohomish   223,114   329,765   369,978   377,974     PUD)  | 443380         | Late Payment Fees  | 3,822,947       | 3,622,266       | 3,706,548        | 3,794,205        |
| Ad3380   Reconnect Charges   311,160   242,747   248,395   254,269   443380   Transmission Attach. & Cell Sites   1,439,934   2,865,433   2,719,612   2,749,843   443380   Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals   161,978   183,412   187,680   192,119   161    | 443380         | Pole Attachments   | 1,172,294       | 1,366,381       | 2,024,393        | 2,073,390        |
| 443380         Transmission Attach. & Cell Sites         1,439,934         2,865,433         2,719,612         2,749,843           443380         Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals         161,978         183,412         187,680         192,119           461100         Interest         4,345,302         4,416,530         4,427,862         10,372,915           461100         Sale of Property, Material & Equip.         0         1,725,097         2,546,256         2,250,000           462900         North Mountain Substation (Snohomish PUD)         23,114         329,765         369,978         377,974           462900         Transmission Sales         1,550,030         6,249,646         1,819,226         1,853,497           462900         Conservation - Customer Payments         0         0         0         0         0           462900         Contributions in Aid of Construction         17,613,182         27,307,357         26,779,093         19,351,023           482000         Contributions in Aid of Construction         17,613,182         27,307,357         26,779,093         19,351,023           482000         Suburban Undergrounding         409,213         621,676         691,417         924,094           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP         0<   | 443380         | Property Rentals   | 2,835,314       | 1,260,631       | 1,289,963        | 1,320,470        |
| 443380         Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals         161,978         183,412         187,680         192,119           461100         Interest         4,345,302         4,416,530         4,277,862         10,372,915           461100         Sale of Property, Material & Equip.         0         1,725,097         2,546,256         2,250,000           462900         North Mountain Substation (Snohomish PUID)         223,114         329,765         369,978         377,974           462900         Transmission Sales         1,550,030         6,249,646         1,819,226         1,853,497           469990         Conservation - Customer Payments         0         0         0         0         0           473010         Capital Fees and Grants         4,919,992         120,717         96,000         101,000           482000         Contributions in Aid of Construction         17,613,182         27,307,357         26,779,093         19,351,023           482000         Suburban Undergrounding         409,213         621,676         691,417         924,094           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP         0         0         0         0         0           443310         Energy Sales to Customers         543,740,989         610,889,032  | 443380         | Reconnect Charges  | 311,160         | 242,747         | 248,395          | 254,269          |
| 461100   | 443380         | Transmission Attach. & Cell Sites                                      | 1,439,934       | 2,865,433       | 2,719,612        |                  |
| 461100         Sale of Property, Material & Equip.         0         1,725,097         2,546,256         2,250,000           462900         North Mountain Substation (Snohomish PUD)         223,114         329,765         369,978         377,974           462900         Transmission Sales         1,550,030         6,249,646         1,819,226         1,853,497           469990         Conservation - Customer Payments         0         0         0         0           473010         Capital Fees and Grants         4,919,992         120,717         96,000         101,000           482000         Contributions in Aid of Construction         17,613,182         27,307,357         26,779,093         19,351,023           482000         Suburban Undergrounding         409,213         621,676         691,417         924,094           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP         0         0         0         0         0           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - O&M         716,061         2,297,581         2,297,581         2,297,581           443310         Energy Sales to Customers         543,740,989         610,889,032         659,972,870         695,897,974           443310         Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer  | 443380         | Water Heater & Miscellaneous Rentals                                   | 161,978         | 183,412         | 187,680          | 192,119          |
| A62900   North Mountain Substation (Snohomish PUD)   PUD)   Refail Revenue   Reverse Hards 1, 250,030   Retail Revenue   Reverse Hards 1, 329,765   Revers | 461100         | Interest   | 4,345,302       | 4,416,530       | 4,427,862        | 10,372,915       |
| PUD  | 461100         | Sale of Property, Material & Equip.                                    | 0               | 1,725,097       | 2,546,256        | 2,250,000        |
| 469990         Conservation - Customer Payments         0         0         0         0           473010         Capital Fees and Grants         4,919,992         120,717         96,000         101,000           482000         Contributions in Aid of Construction         17,613,182         27,307,357         26,779,093         19,351,023           482000         Suburban Undergrounding         409,213         621,676         691,417         924,094           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP         0         0         0         0         0           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - O&M         716,061         2,297,581         2,297,581         2,297,581           Total Other         60,202,196         70,339,134         69,094,684         61,161,968           443310         Energy Sales to Customers         543,740,989         610,889,032         659,972,870         695,897,974           443310         Retail Energy Revenue from Current         0         0         0         0         0           443310         Seattle Green Power/Greenup         1,369,861         1,082,095         330,000         385,000           Total Retail Revenue         545,110,850         614,077,127         662,408,870         698,   | 462900         | · ·  | 223,114         | 329,765         | 369,978          | 377,974          |
| 473010         Capital Fees and Grants         4,919,992         120,717         96,000         101,000           482000         Contributions in Aid of Construction         17,613,182         27,307,357         26,779,093         19,351,023           482000         Suburban Undergrounding         409,213         621,676         691,417         924,094           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP         0         0         0         0         0           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - O&M         716,061         2,297,581         2,297,581         2,297,581           Total Other         60,202,196         70,339,134         69,094,684         61,161,968           443310         Energy Sales to Customers         543,740,989         610,889,032         659,972,870         695,897,974           443310         Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings         1,369,861         1,082,095         330,000         385,000           Total Retail Revenue         545,110,850         614,077,127         662,408,870         698,388,974           443310         Sales from Priest Rapids         5,355,327         8,590,472         8,200,000         9,500,000           443315         Sales from   | 462900         | Transmission Sales   | 1,550,030       | 6,249,646       | 1,819,226        | 1,853,497        |
| 482000         Contributions in Aid of Construction         17,613,182         27,307,357         26,779,093         19,351,023           482000         Suburban Undergrounding         409,213         621,676         691,417         924,094           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP         0         0         0         0         0           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - O&M         716,061         2,297,581         2,297,581         2,297,581           Total Other         60,202,196         70,339,134         69,094,684         61,161,968           443310         Energy Sales to Customers         543,740,989         610,889,032         659,972,870         695,897,974           443310         Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings         0         0         2,106,000         2,106,000         2,106,000         385,000           443310         Seattle Green Power/Greenup         1,369,861         1,082,095         330,000         385,000           443310         Sales from Priest Rapids         5,355,327         8,590,472         8,200,000         9,500,000           443310         Sales from Priest Rapids         5,355,327         8,590,472         8,200,000         9,500,000   | 469990         | Conservation - Customer Payments                                       | 0               | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 482000         Suburban Undergrounding         409,213         621,676         691,417         924,094           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP         0         0         0         0           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - O&M         716,061         2,297,581         2,297,581         2,297,581           Total Other         60,202,196         70,339,134         69,094,684         61,161,968           443310         Energy Sales to Customers         543,740,989         610,889,032         659,972,870         695,897,974           443310         Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings         0         0         0         0         2,106,000         2,106,000         385,000           Total Retail Revenue         545,110,850         614,077,127         662,408,870         698,388,974           443310         Sales from Priest Rapids         5,355,327         8,590,472         8,200,000         9,500,000           443345         Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country         1,721,879         1,763,888         1,696,984         1,738,071           443345         Basis Sales         6,697,701         10,841,813         5,712,483         7,289,147           443345 </td <td>473010</td> <td>Capital Fees and Grants</td> <td>4,919,992</td> <td>120,717</td> <td>96,000</td> <td>101,000</td>  | 473010         | Capital Fees and Grants  | 4,919,992       | 120,717         | 96,000           | 101,000          |
| 541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP         0         0         0         0           541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - O&M         716,061         2,297,581         2,297,581         2,297,581           Total Other         60,202,196         70,339,134         69,094,684         61,161,968           443310         Energy Sales to Customers         543,740,989         610,889,032         659,972,870         695,897,974           443310         Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings         0         2,106,000         2,106,000         2,106,000         2,106,000         385,000           Total Retail Revenue         545,110,850         614,077,127         662,408,870         698,388,974           443310         Sales from Priest Rapids         5,355,327         8,590,472         8,200,000         9,500,000           443345         Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country         1,721,879         1,763,888         1,696,984         1,738,071           443345         Basis Sales         6,697,701         10,841,813         5,712,483         7,289,147           443345         Other Power Related Services         12,718,223         9,808,205         14,683,607         7,667,701   | 482000         | Contributions in Aid of Construction                                   | 17,613,182      | 27,307,357      | 26,779,093       | 19,351,023       |
| 541830         Reimbursement for CCSS - O&M         716,061         2,297,581         2,297,581         2,297,581           Total Other         60,202,196         70,339,134         69,094,684         61,161,968           443310         Energy Sales to Customers         543,740,989         610,889,032         659,972,870         695,897,974           443310         Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings         0         2,106,000         2,106,000         2,106,000         2,106,000         385,000           Total Retail Revenue         545,110,850         614,077,127         662,408,870         698,388,974           443310         Sales from Priest Rapids         5,355,327         8,590,472         8,200,000         9,500,000           443345         Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country         1,721,879         1,763,888         1,696,984         1,738,071           443345         Basis Sales         6,697,701         10,841,813         5,712,483         7,289,147           443345         Other Power Related Services         12,718,223         9,808,205         14,683,607         7,667,701   | 482000         | Suburban Undergrounding  | 409,213         | 621,676         | 691,417          | 924,094          |
| Total Other         60,202,196         70,339,134         69,094,684         61,161,968           443310         Energy Sales to Customers         543,740,989         610,889,032         659,972,870         695,897,974           443310         Out of System Sales         0         0         0         0         0           443310         Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings         2,106,000         2,106,000         2,106,000         385,000           Total Retail Revenue         545,110,850         614,077,127         662,408,870         698,388,974           443310         Sales from Priest Rapids         5,355,327         8,590,472         8,200,000         9,500,000           443345         Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country         1,721,879         1,763,888         1,696,984         1,738,071           443345         Basis Sales         6,697,701         10,841,813         5,712,483         7,289,147           443345         Other Power Related Services         12,718,223         9,808,205         14,683,607         7,667,701  | 541830         | Reimbursement for CCSS - CIP   | 0               | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 443310       Energy Sales to Customers       543,740,989       610,889,032       659,972,870       695,897,974         443310       Out of System Sales       0       0       0       0       0         443310       Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings       0       2,106,000       2,106,000       2,106,000         443310       Seattle Green Power/Greenup       1,369,861       1,082,095       330,000       385,000         Total Retail Revenue       545,110,850       614,077,127       662,408,870       698,388,974         443310       Sales from Priest Rapids       5,355,327       8,590,472       8,200,000       9,500,000         443345       Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country       1,721,879       1,763,888       1,696,984       1,738,071         443345       Basis Sales       6,697,701       10,841,813       5,712,483       7,289,147         443345       Other Power Related Services       12,718,223       9,808,205       14,683,607       7,667,701   | 541830         | Reimbursement for CCSS - O&M   | 716,061         | 2,297,581       | 2,297,581        | 2,297,581        |
| 443310       Out of System Sales       0       0       0       0         443310       Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings       0       2,106,000       2,106,000       2,106,000         443310       Seattle Green Power/Greenup       1,369,861       1,082,095       330,000       385,000         443310       Sales from Priest Rapids       5,355,327       8,590,472       8,200,000       9,500,000         443345       Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country       1,721,879       1,763,888       1,696,984       1,738,071         443345       Basis Sales       6,697,701       10,841,813       5,712,483       7,289,147         443345       Other Power Related Services       12,718,223       9,808,205       14,683,607       7,667,701   |                | Total Other  | 60,202,196      | 70,339,134      | 69,094,684       | 61,161,968       |
| 443310       Out of System Sales       0       0       0       0         443310       Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings       0       2,106,000       385,000       385,000       385,000       385,000       385,000       385,000       385,000       44336,000       9,500,000       44336,000       45,000       2,106,000       462,408,870       662,408,870       662,408,870       662,408,870 </td <td>443310</td> <td>Energy Sales to Customers</td> <td>543,740,989</td> <td>610,889,032</td> <td>659,972,870</td> <td>695,897,974</td>  | 443310         | Energy Sales to Customers  | 543,740,989     | 610,889,032     | 659,972,870      | 695,897,974      |
| 443310       Retail Energy Revenue from Current Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate Billings       0       2,106,000       2,106,000       2,106,000         443310       Seattle Green Power/Greenup       1,369,861       1,082,095       330,000       385,000         Total Retail Revenue       545,110,850       614,077,127       662,408,870       698,388,974         443310       Sales from Priest Rapids Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country       5,355,327       8,590,472       8,200,000       9,500,000         443345       Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country       1,721,879       1,763,888       1,696,984       1,738,071         443345       Basis Sales       6,697,701       10,841,813       5,712,483       7,289,147         443345       Other Power Related Services       12,718,223       9,808,205       14,683,607       7,667,701   | 443310         |  |                 |                 |                  |                  |
| 443310Seattle Green Power/Greenup1,369,8611,082,095330,000385,000Total Retail Revenue545,110,850614,077,127662,408,870698,388,974443310Sales from Priest Rapids5,355,3278,590,4728,200,0009,500,000443345Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country1,721,8791,763,8881,696,9841,738,071443345Basis Sales6,697,70110,841,8135,712,4837,289,147443345Other Power Related Services12,718,2239,808,20514,683,6077,667,701   | 443310         | Diversion, Un-Permitted House Rewires and No Longer Allowing Flat-Rate | 0               | 2,106,000       | 2,106,000        | 2,106,000        |
| Total Retail Revenue545,110,850614,077,127662,408,870698,388,974443310Sales from Priest Rapids5,355,3278,590,4728,200,0009,500,000443345Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country1,721,8791,763,8881,696,9841,738,071443345Basis Sales6,697,70110,841,8135,712,4837,289,147443345Other Power Related Services12,718,2239,808,20514,683,6077,667,701  |                | •  |                 |                 |                  |                  |
| 443310       Sales from Priest Rapids       5,355,327       8,590,472       8,200,000       9,500,000         443345       Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country       1,721,879       1,763,888       1,696,984       1,738,071         443345       Basis Sales       6,697,701       10,841,813       5,712,483       7,289,147         443345       Other Power Related Services       12,718,223       9,808,205       14,683,607       7,667,701   | 443310         | Seattle Green Power/Greenup  | 1,369,861       | 1,082,095       | 330,000          | 385,000          |
| 443345       Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country       1,721,879       1,763,888       1,696,984       1,738,071         443345       Basis Sales       6,697,701       10,841,813       5,712,483       7,289,147         443345       Other Power Related Services       12,718,223       9,808,205       14,683,607       7,667,701   |                | <b>Total Retail Revenue</b>  | 545,110,850     | 614,077,127     | 662,408,870      | 698,388,974      |
| 443345       Article 49 Sale to Pend Oreille Country       1,721,879       1,763,888       1,696,984       1,738,071         443345       Basis Sales       6,697,701       10,841,813       5,712,483       7,289,147         443345       Other Power Related Services       12,718,223       9,808,205       14,683,607       7,667,701   | 443310         | Sales from Priest Rapids   | 5,355,327       | 8,590,472       | 8,200,000        | 9,500,000        |
| 443345       Basis Sales       6,697,701       10,841,813       5,712,483       7,289,147         443345       Other Power Related Services       12,718,223       9,808,205       14,683,607       7,667,701  |                |  |                 |                 |                  |                  |
| 443345 Other Power Related Services 12,718,223 9,808,205 14,683,607 7,667,701  |                |  |                 |                 |                  |                  |
|  |                |  |                 |                 |                  |                  |
|  |                | Surplus Energy Sales   |                 |                 |                  | 151,190,694      |

## 2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the City Light Fund

| Summit<br>Code | Source   | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|----------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
|                | <b>Total Wholesale Sales</b>   | 127,026,943     | 185,435,552     | 173,296,289      | 177,385,612      |
| Total          | l Revenues   | 732,339,989     | 869,851,813     | 904,799,842      | 936,936,555      |
| 379100         | Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance<br>due to GSF St Lighting Payments | 0               | 0               | 0                | 0                |
|                | <b>Total Other</b>   | 0               | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 379100         | Transfers from Construction Fund   | 334,257,106     | 219,763,967     | 182,744,966      | 211,134,165      |
|                | Total Transfers  | 334,257,106     | 219,763,967     | 182,744,966      | 211,134,165      |
| Total          | l Resources  | 1,066,597,095   | 1,089,615,780   | 1,087,544,808    | 1,148,070,720    |

## **City Light Fund**

|  | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2010<br>Revised | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>          | 329,696,348     | 53,056,432      | 64,334,520      | 179,958,118      | 232,740,651      |
| Accounting and Technical Adjustments   | 68,895,278      | 241,738,978     | 388,844,251     | 235,527,499      | 200,120,973      |
| Plus: Actual and Estimated<br>Revenue  | 732,339,989     | 869,901,809     | 816,395,127     | 904,799,842      | 936,936,555      |
| Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures | 1,066,597,095   | 1,089,615,780   | 1,089,615,780   | 1,087,544,808    | 1,148,070,720    |
| <b>Ending Fund Balance</b>             | 64,334,520      | 75,081,439      | 179,958,118     | 232,740,651      | 221,727,458      |
| Less: Reserves against Cash Balanc     | es              |                 |                 |                  |                  |
| Restricted Accounts *                  | 4,129,067       | 10,000,000      | 2,951,900       | 12,951,900       | 12,951,900       |
| Contingency Reserve/RSA                | 25,000,000      | 25,000,000      | 68,918,128      | 101,394,765      | 104,336,358      |
| Total Reserves                         | 29,129,067      | 35,000,000      | 71,870,028      | 114,346,665      | 117,288,258      |
| Ending Unreserved Fund<br>Balance **   | 35,205,453      | 40,081,439      | 108,088,090     | 118,393,986      | 104,439,200      |

<sup>\*</sup> Includes Special Deposits and Bond Reserves \*\* Includes all City Light Cash other than Special Deposits and Bond Reserve

## **Seattle Department of Transportation**

## Peter Hahn, Director

#### **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-7623

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

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

#### **Department Description**

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) develops, maintains, and operates a transportation system that promotes the safe and efficient mobility of people and goods, and enhances the quality of life, environment, and economy of Seattle and the surrounding region. The major assets of the City's transportation system are 1,531 lane-miles of arterial streets, 2,412 lane-miles of non-arterial streets, 147 bridges, 582 retaining walls, 22 miles of seawalls, 1,045 signalized intersections, 45 miles of bike trails and 223 miles of on-street bicycle facilities, 35,000 street trees, 2,200 pay stations, 300 parking meters, 26,000 curb ramps, and 1.6 million lane markers. The transportation infrastructure is valued at over \$13 billion.

The SDOT budget comprises 11 different Budget Control Levels (BCLs) grouped into three Lines of Business (LOB):

- The Transportation Capital Improvement Program LOB is responsible for the major maintenance and replacement of SDOT's capital assets, as well as the development and construction of additions to the City's transportation infrastructure. This LOB contains the Major Maintenance/Replacement, Major Projects, and Mobility-Capital BCLs.
- The Operations and Maintenance LOB handles the day-to-day operations and routine maintenance to keep people and goods moving throughout the City. This LOB includes operation of the City's movable bridges, traffic signals, street cleaning, pothole repairs, permit issuance, tree maintenance, and engineering and transportation planning. The six BCLs in this area are Bridges and Structures, Engineering Services, Mobility-Operations, Right-of-Way Management, Street Maintenance, and Urban Forestry.
- The Business Management and Support LOB provides policy direction and business support for SDOT. These services are contained in two BCLs. Departmental support is in the Department Management BCL. The General Expense BCL includes debt service, judgment and claims payments, and the allocated City central costs the department pays for overall support services it receives from other departments.

The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) comprises two-thirds of SDOT's budget with the remaining attributable to operations and maintenance and self-supporting enterprise activities such as permits, utility cut restorations, and reimbursable contract work performed at the request of developers and the city's utilities.

Funding for programs and capital assets comes from a variety of sources including bonds, federal, state and local grants, state and regional partnership agreements, Bridging-the-Gap property tax levy, commercial parking tax, and the employee hours tax (this tax was repealed at the end of 2009 but some unprogrammed funds remain), fees for service, real estate excise taxes, street vacations, gas tax, and an annual allocation from the city's General Fund.

## **Proposed Policy and Program Changes**

In the past few years, with City and gas tax revenues down from previous years, support for transportation has been limited. Excluding Bridging the Gap, SDOT's base funding is 7% below 1996 levels, after adjusting for

inflation. Dedicated transportation revenues are down 62% and General Fund, real estate excise taxes, and street vacation fees that support transportation have declined 31% from their inflation adjusted highs in 2008. In 2010, the department faced a \$7.8 million shortfall in its General and Gas Tax funding. This was partially due to a Citywide need for mid-year reductions, which resulted in \$1.2 million in General Fund cuts to some of the most basic programs and services provided by SDOT. In addition, the department had an internal imbalance due to the depletion of Gas Tax reserves in 2009, earlier than planned. The early depletion was caused, in part, by requirements for emergency services activities, which have historically been underfunded, and the unbudgeted cleanup of homeless encampments. While 2010 mid-year reductions have resolved this shortfall, the City is facing additional financial challenges in 2011 that will serve to reduce SDOT's funding for basic maintenance even further.

#### Reductions:

The City of Seattle's General Fund is facing a \$67 million shortfall. The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes reductions for all General Fund-dependent functions. In addition, SDOT is also experiencing funding constraints from its other funding sources, resulting in reductions in real estate excise tax and Gas tax-funded programs. The proposed reductions to the SDOT budget are summarized as follows:

#### - Management and Supervisory Position Changes

The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes reductions in the number of manager and strategic advisor positions. As part of the citywide effort to preserve direct services, all departments developed options for achieving cost savings through changes in management structure and administrative efficiencies. The Proposed Budget for SDOT includes a reduction of seven manager positions and seven strategic advisor positions. Some of the positions are supervisory in nature. Many are related to design, project management, and construction management of capital projects. Others have specific supporting roles, such as the SDOT Chief of Staff position, a policy and planning advisor, and a public information officer. In general, work previously performed by these positions will be assumed by other staff, managers, and supervisors in the department.

#### - Internal Efficiencies

The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes significant internal efficiencies and savings achieved to avoid reductions in direct core services. These include reductions in administrative budgets for activities such as travel, training, temporary staffing, and use of professional services. These reductions will require the department to operate more efficiently in order to achieve the same level of service. Reductions in staff positions will require workloads to be transferred and assumed by other staff, when possible. Some redundant and non-core administrative and planning functions have been eliminated. Savings are also achieved through the continuation of a cost-of-living freeze for management-level positions and lower inflation factors.

#### - Deferred Maintenance

The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes reductions in routine maintenance for certain activities. Destination signs that have been maintained annually will no longer receive scheduled maintenance. The frequency of traffic signal routine cleaning, inspection, and testing will be reduced from twice to once per year, and preventative maintenance on warning beacons will no longer be scheduled. Deferred maintenance of these assets is not expected to have an immediate impact on service levels because of low failure rates, but the reductions will require SDOT to respond to and repair damaged and failed units instead of performing scheduled preventative maintenance.

#### - Service and Deliverable Impacts

Although significant effort is made to capture efficiencies and administrative savings, the 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes reductions that will result in direct service impacts in certain areas. These cuts may lead to less capability for routine activities, resulting in visible changes in the level of vegetation control and landscape maintenance. Additionally, SDOT will not accomplish as many signal maintenance projects, curb and pavement markings, and traffic spot improvements in the timeframe originally planned. Street maintenance operations, which includes emergency laborers and dispatchers supporting off-hours operations, will be reduced and have less response capability. Remaining resources will be prioritized to address the most critical needs and areas of highest concern. These reductions will be taken in such a way that they will not impact safety or critical transportation operations. These reductions were initiated mid-year 2010 and continue into the 2011-2012 biennium.

#### New Revenue:

For many years prior to passage of the Bridging the Gap transportation funding package in 2006, Seattle underfunded maintenance of its transportation infrastructure, creating a deferred maintenance backlog. Even with passage of Bridging the Gap, available funding did not cover all maintenance needs. In order to avoid deepening service cuts and further increases in the maintenance backlog, as well as maintain a sufficient level of service, new revenue sources are recommended. The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes a 5% increase in the Commercial Parking Tax for non Alaskan Way Viaduct (AWV)-related programs and establishment of a Transportation Benefit District with authority to implement a \$20 fee on vehicle licenses. Together these funding sources would provide approximately \$13.4 million in 2011. These revenues can only be used for transportation purposes, according to state law, and are appropriate sources to respond to the identified transportation needs. In the Proposed Budget, the new revenue sources are allocated to the following purposes:

#### - Maintaining Core-Services

New revenue will prevent approximately \$6 million of additional reductions to SDOT budget, which would represent deep and unsustainable cuts in core services. Some of the services preserved include proactive landscape maintenance work in the right-of-way, street cleaning activities, street surface repairs, freight spot improvements, the neighborhood traffic calming program, and the transportation demand management program. Some of the high-impact reductions that were implemented mid-year 2010 are also restored. These include nighttime scheduled alley flushing and cleaning, street maintenance emergency response activities, a large portion of the crash cushion and guardrail installation program, and \$868,000 for street surface repair. Many of these actions will help prevent the deferred maintenance backlog from growing at a faster rate.

#### - Programmatic Increases

The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes programmatic increase for some required and discretionary activities. Funding is required for SDOT to maintain the elevator on the new SR-519 structure next to Safeco Field, continue to provide cleanup of homeless encampments on city right-of-way, provide staff support for the South Park Bridge construction, and comply with new stormwater code requirements that match the State's requirements. Increased funding will also provide additional support for SDOT's Emergency Service program, which has been incurring expenditures above the budgeted amounts for mandatory emergency response needs, especially those due to severe winter weather. The new revenue also provides approximately \$1.5 million per year for debt service for the City's commitment of \$15 million to the South Park Bridge replacement project.

Additional funds have been directed towards increasing the number of small-scale freight mobility improvements to the City's street system that can be made to improve connections between the port, railroad intermodal yards, industrial businesses, and the regional highway system.

- Walk Bike Ride: Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Infrastructure

A portion of the dedicated transportation revenue will fund bicycle, pedestrian and transit improvements and programs with the goal of making walking, biking, and riding transit the easiest ways to get around in Seattle. The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes ongoing funding allocated in 2011 and 2012 to update and complete the Transit Master Plan, accelerate implementation of the Pedestrian Master Plan and the Bike Master Plan, and fully fund key projects such as Linden Avenue North Complete Streets. Some of these funds are allocated to the Neighborhood Streets Funds large projects, so that more high-scoring community-identified projects can be completed in the current program cycle. The new funding will help SDOT respond to the growing backlog of demand for sidewalks, curb ramps, and pedestrian lighting projects and will allow for implementation of new and upgraded bicycle facilities. Funds will also go to maintenance activities like sidewalk repair, stairway rehabilitation, and crosswalk remarking, helping make certain SDOT can maintain bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities.

#### Parking Management Policy Implementation:

The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes costs to implement several changes in the management and regulation of on-street parking and related fees. These include increasing the hourly rate by \$1.50 downtown and \$.50 in other parts of the city, extending the paid parking hours by two hours until 8:00 PM, and implementing paid parking on weekends in certain neighborhoods. These changes move on-street parking fees closer to market rates and will also reduce congestion and carbon emissions caused by vehicles searching for parking spots. Additionally, the two-year Restricted Parking Zone (RPZ) permits are increasing from \$45 to \$65 in order to fully recover the costs of implementing the RPZ program.

The Proposed Budget also includes outreach costs for a new scofflaw booting program. In 2011, the City will implement a new parking scofflaw program that will attempt to collect outstanding traffic payments from people who have four or more outstanding parking violations. There are currently over 27,000 vehicles with four or more outstanding parking violations totaling over \$15 million not including interest due to the City. The new program will help the City collect outstanding violations from existing scofflaws as well as increase compliance of parking regulations and payment of parking violations by providing a more compelling deterrence. The Seattle Police Department will utilize two vehicles equipped with mobile license late recognition cameras. The vehicles will look for cars with four or more defaulted parking tickets. When a scofflaw vehicle is located, an immobilizing boot will be affixed to the tire which will not be removed until all outstanding citations are paid. This change is more effective at getting parking violators to pay outstanding tickets by allowing for more vehicles to be immobilized than under the current policy. It is also less cumbersome for violators who will no longer have to visit the tow lot to retrieve their vehicles. Revenues raised by this program help offset the General Fund shortfall.

#### **Technical Adjustments:**

Technical adjustments in the 2011-2012 Proposed Budget include departmental and citywide non-programmatic adjustments that do not represent fundamental changes in SDOT's service delivery. Departmental operating technical adjustments are due to internal department reallocations and financing shifts. Most of the capital adjustments are related to schedule shifts in the large capital projects. Citywide technical adjustments reflect changes in central cost allocations, retirement, health care, workers compensation, and unemployment costs.

|   | Summit      | 2009                    | 2010                      | 2011                      | 2012                      |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Appropriations  | Code        | Actual                  | Adopted                   | Proposed                  | Proposed                  |
| <b>Bridges &amp; Structures Budget Control</b>                                    | Level       |                         |                           |                           |                           |
| Bridge Operations   |             | 2,463,012               | 2,511,306                 | 2,661,292                 | 2,769,466                 |
| Structures Engineering  |             | 761,574                 | 835,384                   | 882,557                   | 915,957                   |
| Structures Maintenance  |             | 3,957,862               | 3,898,291                 | 4,101,827                 | 4,242,425                 |
| Bridges & Structures Budget<br>Control Level                                      | 17001       | 7,182,448               | 7,244,982                 | 7,645,676                 | 7,927,848                 |
| Department Management Budget Con  | trol Level  |                         |                           |                           |                           |
| Director's Office   |             | 1,693,955               | 2,861,436                 | 2,957,933                 | 3,039,851                 |
| Division Management   |             | 10,953,509              | 12,391,517                | 11,723,939                | 12,048,515                |
| Human Resources Indirect Cost Recovery - Department Management Public Information |             | 871,322<br>(26,335,410) | 1,383,879<br>(27,166,431) | 1,151,829<br>(27,356,862) | 1,192,612<br>(28,232,282) |
|   |             | 628,342                 | 1,034,924                 | 909,994                   | 940,060                   |
| Resource Management   |             | 15,299,763              | 12,289,811                | 10,876,965                | 11,204,012                |
| Revenue Development   | 10001       | 487,863                 | 701,475                   | 657,894                   | 682,798                   |
| Department Management Budget<br>Control Level                                     | 18001       | 3,599,343               | 3,496,610                 | 921,692                   | 875,567                   |
| Engineering Services Budget<br>Control Level                                      | 17002       | 1,899,902               | 2,279,746                 | 2,125,726                 | 2,145,719                 |
| General Expense Budget Control Leve   | el          |                         |                           |                           |                           |
| City Central Costs  |             | 9,490,637               | 8,846,481                 | 11,361,817                | 11,657,439                |
| Debt Service  |             | 12,545,753              | 17,829,663                | 19,279,045                | 28,470,943                |
| Indirect Cost Recovery - General Exp  | ense        | (8,080,777)             | (8,846,481)               | (11,361,315)              | (11,682,778)              |
| Judgment & Claims   |             | 2,952,611               | 2,952,611                 | 3,507,637                 | 3,507,637                 |
| General Expense Budget Control<br>Level   | 18002       | 16,908,224              | 20,782,274                | 22,787,184                | 31,953,240                |
| Major Maintenance/Replacement Bud   | lget Contro | ol Level                |                           |                           |                           |
| Bridges & Structures  |             | 13,404,716              | 54,650,000                | 25,642,000                | 21,427,000                |
| Landslide Mitigation  |             | 841,050                 | 400,000                   | 400,000                   | 404,000                   |
| Roads   |             | 31,820,872              | 23,549,000                | 22,906,000                | 17,258,000                |
| Sidewalk Maintenance  |             | 1,645,558               | 2,074,000                 | 1,748,000                 | 1,814,000                 |
| Trails and Bike Paths   |             | 3,887,291               | 4,174,000                 | 6,087,001                 | 6,262,000                 |
| Major Maintenance/Replacement<br>Budget Control Level                             | 19001       | 51,599,488              | 84,847,001                | 56,783,001                | 47,165,000                |

|   | Summit       | 2009       | 2010              | 2011        | 2012             |
|---|--------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Appropriations                              | Code         | Actual     | Adopted           | Proposed    | Proposed         |
| <b>Major Projects Budget Control Level</b>  |              |            |                   |             |                  |
| Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall             |              | 5,505,448  | 14,398,908        | 21,765,701  | 29,707,684       |
| Replacement First Hill Streetcar            |              | 440,147    | 3,080,000         | 27,249,545  | 49,370,825       |
| Magnolia Bridge Replacement                 |              | 40,430     | 0                 | 0           | 0                |
| Mercer Corridor                             |              | 58,155,557 | 22,564,000        | 2,252,000   | 10,854,000       |
| Mercer West                                 |              | 0          | 9,290,000         | 9,037,437   | 15,055,207       |
| Spokane Street Viaduct                      |              | 20,474,882 | 25,769,222        | 44,526,228  | 11,815,435       |
| SR-520                                      |              | 263,962    | 75,000            | 303,068     | 301,684          |
| Major Projects Budget Control<br>Level      | 19002        | 84,880,426 | 75,177,130        | 105,133,979 | 117,104,835      |
|   |              |            |                   |             |                  |
| Mobility-Capital Budget Control Leve        |              | 0.710.722  | <b>5.7</b> 60.000 | 0.405.000   | <b>5</b> 000 000 |
| Corridor & Intersection Improvement         | S            | 9,719,732  | 5,769,000         | 8,405,000   | 5,023,000        |
| Freight Mobility                            |              | 681,855    | 724,000           | 905,000     | 1,235,000        |
| Intelligent Transportation System           |              | 8,320,870  | 910,000           | 7,869       | 0                |
| Neighborhood Enhancements                   |              | 7,401,047  | 5,576,000         | 7,614,000   | 8,254,000        |
| New Trails and Bike Paths                   |              | 3,288,082  | 6,875,000         | 4,070,000   | 20,000           |
| Sidewalks & Pedestrian Facilities           |              | 6,374,302  | 4,948,000         | 6,485,547   | 7,841,000        |
| Transit & HOV                               |              | 8,974,380  | 12,533,000        | 6,543,000   | 230,000          |
| Mobility-Capital Budget Control<br>Level    | 19003        | 44,760,269 | 37,335,000        | 34,030,416  | 22,603,001       |
| Mobility-Operations Budget Control I        | <b>Level</b> |            |                   |             |                  |
| Commuter Mobility                           |              | 11,035,986 | 10,911,353        | 13,863,846  | 14,670,336       |
| Neighborhoods                               |              | 4,628,168  | 4,071,690         | 2,199,361   | 2,338,553        |
| Parking                                     |              | 7,380,357  | 6,826,431         | 8,712,255   | 8,086,103        |
| Signs & Markings                            |              | 5,205,025  | 4,573,668         | 3,979,837   | 4,135,893        |
| Traffic Signals                             |              | 8,047,230  | 8,730,233         | 8,548,592   | 8,848,105        |
| Mobility-Operations Budget<br>Control Level | 17003        | 36,296,766 | 35,113,375        | 37,303,891  | 38,078,989       |
| ROW Management Budget Control<br>Level      | 17004        | 10,475,932 | 11,304,009        | 12,134,526  | 12,536,800       |

|   | Summit | 2009                              | 2010                              | 2011                               | 2012                     |
|---|--------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Appropriations  | Code   | Actual                            | Adopted                           | Proposed                           | Proposed                 |
| Street Maintenance Budget Control I   | Level  |                                   |                                   |                                    |                          |
| Emergency Response  |        | 2,963,085                         | 654,040                           | 1,594,270                          | 1,620,021                |
| Operations Support  |        | 3,874,513                         | 4,452,176                         | 5,152,457                          | 5,340,228                |
| Pavement Management   |        | 235,119                           | 247,191                           | 258,971                            | 266,599                  |
| Street Cleaning   |        | 4,075,638                         | 4,029,354                         | 3,922,962                          | 4,224,100                |
| Street Repair   |        | 13,936,922                        | 18,863,588                        | 19,365,302                         | 19,914,924               |
| Street Maintenance Budget Control<br>Level  | 17005  | 25,085,278                        | 28,246,349                        | 30,293,962                         | 31,365,873               |
| <b>Urban Forestry Budget Control Leve</b>   | l      |                                   |                                   |                                    |                          |
| Arborist Services   |        | 1,010,959                         | 822,574                           | 971,598                            | 1,006,039                |
| Tree & Landscape Maintenance  |        | 3,139,305                         | 3,548,914                         | 3,131,657                          | 3,238,578                |
| Urban Forestry Budget Control<br>Level  | 17006  | 4,150,263                         | 4,371,488                         | 4,103,255                          | 4,244,617                |
| Department Total  |        | 286,838,340                       | 310,197,963                       | 313,263,310                        | 316,001,488              |
| Department Full-time Equivalents To<br>* FTE totals are provided for informational purpos |        | <b>792.00</b> s in FTEs resulting | <b>792.00</b> from City Council o | <b>765.00</b> or Personnel Directo | <b>765.00</b> or actions |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

|                  | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Resources        | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| General Subfund  | 39,960,232  | 38,641,232  | 36,160,576  | 37,437,537  |
| Other            | 246,878,108 | 271,556,731 | 277,102,734 | 278,563,951 |
| Department Total | 286,838,340 | 310,197,963 | 313,263,310 | 316,001,488 |

### **Bridges & Structures Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Bridges and Structures Budget Control Level is to maintain the City's bridges and structures which helps provide for the safe and efficient movement of people, goods, and services throughout the city.

| Program Expenditures          | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012            |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| -                             | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
| Bridge Operations             | 2,463,012 | 2,511,306 | 2,661,292       | 2,769,466       |
| Structures Engineering        | 761,574   | 835,384   | 882,557         | 915,957         |
| Structures Maintenance        | 3,957,862 | 3,898,291 | 4,101,827       | 4,242,425       |
| Total                         | 7,182,448 | 7,244,982 | 7,645,676       | 7,927,848       |
| Full-time Equivalents Total * | 59.50     | 59.50     | 59.50           | 59.50           |

<sup>\*</sup>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.

# **Bridges & Structures: Bridge Operations Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Bridge Operations Program is to ensure the safe and efficient operation and preventive maintenance for over 180 bridges throughout the city.

#### **Program Summary**

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$1,000 is saved in the Bridge Operations Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Bridge Operations Program will achieve \$54,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$53,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$258,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$150,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Bridge Operations            | 2,463,012 | 2,511,306 | 2,661,292 | 2,769,466 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 28.00     | 28.00     | 28.00     | 28.00     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

# **Bridges & Structures: Structures Engineering Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Structures Engineering Program is to provide engineering services on all the bridges and structures within the City of Seattle to ensure the safety of transportation users as they use or move in proximity to these transportation facilities.

#### **Program Summary**

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$1,000 is saved in the Structures Engineering Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Structures Engineering Program will achieve \$15,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$16,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$79,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$47,000.

|                              | 2009    | 2010    | 2011            | 2012     |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual  | Adopted | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed |
| Structures Engineering       | 761,574 | 835,384 | 882,557         | 915,957  |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 6.75    | 6.75    | 6.75            | 6.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

# **Bridges & Structures: Structures Maintenance Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Structures Maintenance Program is to provide for the maintenance of all of the City of Seattle's bridges, roadside structures, and stairways.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase budget authority by \$120,000 to meet requirements to maintain the elevator for ADA compliance on the new Royal Brougham Bridge next to Safeco Field.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$1,000 is saved in the Structures Maintenance Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Structures Maintenance Program will achieve \$39,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$165,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$288,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$204,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Structures Maintenance       | 3,957,862 | 3,898,291 | 4,101,827 | 4,242,425 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 24.75     | 24.75     | 24.75     | 24.75     |

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

### **Department Management Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Department Management Budget Control Level is to provide leadership and operations support services to accomplish the mission and goals of the 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 firms, as authorized by Ordinance 120888.

| Program Expenditures                | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                     | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| Director's Office                   | 1,693,955   | 2,861,436   | 2,957,933   | 3,039,851   |
| Division Management                 | 10,953,509  | 12,391,517  | 11,723,939  | 12,048,515  |
| Human Resources                     | 871,322     | 1,383,879   | 1,151,829   | 1,192,612   |
| Indirect Cost Recovery - Department | -26,335,410 | -27,166,431 | -27,356,862 | -28,232,282 |
| Management                          |             |             |             |             |
| Public Information                  | 628,342     | 1,034,924   | 909,994     | 940,060     |
| Resource Management                 | 15,299,763  | 12,289,811  | 10,876,965  | 11,204,012  |
| Revenue Development                 | 487,863     | 701,475     | 657,894     | 682,798     |
| Total                               | 3,599,343   | 3,496,610   | 921,692     | 875,567     |
| Full-time Equivalents Total *       | 144.50      | 144.50      | 130.50      | 130.50      |

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

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

The purpose of the Director's Office Program is to provide overall direction and guidance to accomplish the mission and goals of the department.

#### **Program Summary**

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager III position, Chief of Staff, and reduce the budget by \$105,000. Duties will be reassigned to other staff. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Reduce the Director's Office consultant services budget by \$38,000, resulting in less use of outside expertise on major projects.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$17,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies including temporary help. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

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

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Director's Office Program will achieve \$4,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$128,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$139,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$96,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Director's Office            | 1,693,955 | 2,861,436 | 2,957,933 | 3,039,851 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 7.00      | 7.00      | 6.00      | 6.00      |

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

## **Department Management: Division Management Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Division Management Program is to provide division leadership and unique transportation technical expertise to accomplish the division's goals and objectives in support of the department's mission.

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$32,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies including travel and training.

Reduce budget authority by \$104,000, the amount of the transit pass subsidy to SDOT employees, which is now being allocated centrally citywide. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Abrogate 2.5 FTE Strategic Advisor II positions, 1.0 FTE Manager I position, and 4.0 Manager II positions, and reduce the Capital Projects support budget by \$136,000. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010 and is part of the department's effort to reduce manager and strategic advisor positions.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor III position and reduce support for Policy and Planning by \$122,000. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor II position supporting a Construction Coordinator, and reduce support for Major Projects by \$133,000. Certain duties will be absorbed by existing staff. This reduction is part of the department's effort to reduce manager and strategic advisor positions.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$11,000 is saved in the Division Management Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Division Management Program will achieve \$37,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$672,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$579,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$668,000.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Division Management          | 10,953,509 | 12,391,517 | 11,723,939      | 12,048,515 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 42.00      | 42.00      | 32.50           | 32.50      |

2010

2011

2012

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

## **Department Management: Human Resources Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Human Resources Program is to provide employee support services, safety management, and other personnel expertise to the department and its employees.

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$44,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies including training and professional services. This reduction was partially initiated mid-year 2010.

Abrogate 1.5 FTE Personnel Specialist and 0.5 FTE Administrative Specialist II positions, and reduce the budget by \$177,000. Staff will be reallocated and redeployed to address the recruiting, outreach, training coordination and administrative support lost through this reduction.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$1,000 is saved in the Human Resources Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Human Resources Program will achieve \$8,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$77,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$75,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$232,000.

|                              | 2009    | 2010      | 2011            | 2012            |
|------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual  | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
| Human Resources              | 871,322 | 1,383,879 | 1,151,829       | 1,192,612       |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 11.75   | 11.75     | 9.75            | 9.75            |

• • • •

• • • •

---

---

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

# Department Management: Indirect Cost Recovery - Department Management

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Indirect Cost Recovery - Department Management Program is to allocate departmental indirect costs to all transportation activities and capital projects and equitably recover funding from them to support departmental management and support services essential to the delivery of transportation services to the public.

#### **Program Summary**

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$625,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$815,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$190,000.

|                                     | 2009        | 2010        | 2011            | 2012        |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Expenditures                        | Actual      | Adopted     | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed    |
| Indirect Cost Recovery - Department | -26,335,410 | -27,166,431 | -27,356,862     | -28,232,282 |
| Management                          |             |             |                 |             |

## **Department Management: Public Information Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Public Information Program is to manage all community and media relations and outreach for the department, including all public information requests and inquiries from the City Council and other government agencies. Public Information also maintains the ROADS hotline and the SDOT web site for both citizens and department staff.

#### **Program Summary**

Abrogate 0.5 FTE Strategic Advisor II position, and reduce the public information budget by \$32,000. Duties will accrue to remaining staff. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$2,000 is saved in the Public Information Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Public Information Program will achieve \$4,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$137,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$51,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$125,000.

|                              | 2009    | 2010      | 2011     | 2012     |
|------------------------------|---------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual  | Adopted   | Proposed | Proposed |
| Public Information           | 628,342 | 1,034,924 | 909,994  | 940,060  |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 8.00    | 8.00      | 7.50     | 7.50     |

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

## **Department Management: Resource Management Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Resource Management Program is to provide the internal financial, accounting, information technology, and office space management support for all SDOT business activities.

#### **Program Summary**

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Information Technology Professional Business Analyst position, and reduce the Resource Management budget by \$150,000. This reduction eliminates SDOT's Lean Analysis program, which focused on analysis of long-term big picture efficiencies and improvements within the department.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Senior Finance Analyst position, and reduce the Risk Management and Facilities budget by \$113,000. The reduction will increase workloads for remaining staff. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Reduce budget authority by approximately \$45,000 to reflect reductions in expenditures for administrative efficiencies including temporary work assignments and professional services.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$34,000 is saved in the Resource Management Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Resource Management Program will achieve \$55,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

FTE values include an increase of 1.0 FTE Office/Maintenance Aide added outside of the budget process.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$1.57 million. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$557,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.41 million.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Resource Management          | 15,299,763 | 12,289,811 | 10,876,965      | 11,204,012 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 70.00      | 70.00      | 69.00           | 69.00      |

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

## Department Management: Revenue Development Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Revenue Development Program is to identify funding, grant and partnership opportunities for transportation projects and provide lead coordination for grant applications and reporting requirements.

#### **Program Summary**

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$2,000 is saved in the Revenue Development Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Revenue Development Program will achieve \$7,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$92,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$57,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$44,000.

|                              | 2009    | 2010    | 2011     | 2012     |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual  | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed |
| Revenue Development          | 487,863 | 701,475 | 657,894  | 682,798  |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 5.75    | 5.75    | 5.75     | 5.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Engineering Services Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Engineering Services Budget Control Level is to provide construction management for capital projects, engineering support for street vacations, the scoping of neighborhood projects, and other transportation activities requiring transportation engineering and project management expertise.

#### **Summary**

Increase budget authority by \$234,000 for new technology, training and equipment necessary to comply with the City's new stormwater code requirements, which match the State's requirements.

Eliminate the Environmental Management System program and reduce funding by \$205,000. Financial support for the sustainability and climate change agenda within SDOT will be reduced. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

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

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Engineering Services Program will achieve \$4,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$338,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$165,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$154,000.

|                                  | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE                 | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Engineering & Operations Support | 1,899,902 | 2,279,746 | 2,125,726 | 2,145,719 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total*     | 17.75     | 17.75     | 17.75     | 17.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 General Expense Budget Control Level is to account for certain City business expenses necessary to the overall effective and efficient delivery of transportation services. It equitably recovers funding from all transportation funding sources to pay for these indirect cost services. It also includes SDOT Judgment and Claims contributions and debt service payments made by SDOT.

| Program Expenditures                     | 2009       | 2010       | 2011        | 2012            |
|--|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------|
|  | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed    | <b>Proposed</b> |
| City Central Costs                       | 9,490,637  | 8,846,481  | 11,361,817  | 11,657,439      |
| Debt Service                             | 12,545,753 | 17,829,663 | 19,279,045  | 28,470,943      |
| Indirect Cost Recovery - General Expense | -8,080,777 | -8,846,481 | -11,361,315 | -11,682,778     |
| Judgment & Claims                        | 2,952,611  | 2,952,611  | 3,507,637   | 3,507,637       |
| Total                                    | 16,908,224 | 20,782,274 | 22,787,184  | 31,953,240      |

## **General Expense: City Central Costs Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the City Central Costs Program is to allocate the City's general services costs to SDOT in a way that benefits the delivery of transportation services to the public.

#### **Program Summary**

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$934,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$1.58 million for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.52 million.

|                    | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012       |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures       | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| City Central Costs | 9,490,637 | 8,846,481 | 11,361,817      | 11,657,439 |

#### General Expense: Debt Service Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Debt Service Program is to meet principal repayment and interest obligations on debt proceeds that are appropriated in SDOT's budget.

#### **Program Summary**

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$68,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$1.38 million for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.45 million.

|              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Debt Service | 12,545,753 | 17,829,663 | 19,279,045      | 28,470,943 |

## **General Expense: Indirect Cost Recovery - General Expense Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Indirect Cost Recovery - General Expense Program is to equitably recover funding from all transportation activities and capital projects to pay for allocated indirect costs for city services that are essential to the delivery of transportation services to the public.

#### **Program Summary**

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$933,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$1.58 million for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.51 million.

|  | 2009       | 2010       | 2011        | 2012        |
|--|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Expenditures                             | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| Indirect Cost Recovery - General Expense | -8,080,777 | -8,846,481 | -11,361,315 | -11,682,778 |

## **General Expense: Judgment & Claims Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Judgment & Claims Program is to represent SDOT's annual contribution to the City's centralized self-insurance pool from which court judgments and claims against the City are paid.

#### **Program Summary**

Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$555,000 from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget.

|                   | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures      | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Judgment & Claims | 2,952,611 | 2,952,611 | 3,507,637 | 3,507,637 |

## Major Maintenance/Replacement Budget Control Level

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Major Maintenance/Replacement Budget Control Level is to provide maintenance and replacement of roads, trails, bike paths, bridges, and structures.

| Program Expenditures          | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| -                             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Bridges & Structures          | 13,404,716 | 54,650,000 | 25,642,000      | 21,427,000 |
| Landslide Mitigation          | 841,050    | 400,000    | 400,000         | 404,000    |
| Roads                         | 31,820,872 | 23,549,000 | 22,906,000      | 17,258,000 |
| Sidewalk Maintenance          | 1,645,558  | 2,074,000  | 1,748,000       | 1,814,000  |
| Trails and Bike Paths         | 3,887,291  | 4,174,000  | 6,087,001       | 6,262,000  |
| Total                         | 51,599,488 | 84,847,001 | 56,783,001      | 47,165,000 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total * | 59.00      | 59.00      | 59.00           | 59.00      |

<sup>\*</sup>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.

### Major Maintenance/Replacement: Bridges & Structures Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Bridges & Structures Program is to provide for safe and efficient use of the City's bridges and structures to all residents of Seattle and adjacent regions to ensure movement of people, goods and services throughout the city.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase support by \$178,000 for continued coordination with King County during construction of the South Park Bridge and by \$1.5 million for a portion of the City's contribution to the construction costs.

Funding is reduced by \$23.89 million due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Bridges & Structures         | 13,404,716 | 54,650,000 | 25,642,000 | 21,427,000 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 21.50      | 21.50      | 21.50      | 21.50      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Major Maintenance/Replacement: Landslide Mitigation Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Landslide Mitigation Program is to proactively identify and address potential areas of landslide concerns that affect the right-of-way.

#### **Program Summary**

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

|                              | 2009    | 2010    | 2011     | 2012     |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual  | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed |
| Landslide Mitigation         | 841,050 | 400,000 | 400,000  | 404,000  |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 2.00    | 2.00    | 2.00     | 2.00     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Major Maintenance/Replacement: Roads Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Roads Program is to provide for the safe and efficient use of the city's roadways to all residents of Seattle and adjacent regions to ensure movement of people, goods, and services throughout the City.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase support for Arterial Major Maintenance by \$400,000. The additional support will allow an increase in lane-miles paved by City crews.

Funding is reduced by \$497,000 due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Roads                        | 31,820,872 | 23,549,000 | 22,906,000 | 17,258,000 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 18.50      | 18.50      | 18.50      | 18.50      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

### Major Maintenance/Replacement: Sidewalk Maintenance Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Sidewalk Maintenance Program is to maintain and provide safe and efficient use of the city's sidewalks to all residents of Seattle and adjacent regions to ensure movement of people, goods, and services throughout the city.

#### **Program Summary**

Funding is increased by \$20,000 due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012            |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
| Sidewalk Maintenance         | 1,645,558 | 2,074,000 | 1,748,000       | 1,814,000       |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 6.50      | 6.50      | 6.50            | 6.50            |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Major Maintenance/Replacement: Trails and Bike Paths Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Trails and Bike Paths Program is to maintain and provide safe and efficient use of the City's trails and bike paths to all residents of Seattle and adjacent regions to ensure movement of people, goods, and services throughout the city.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase support for the Bike Master Plan Implementation program by \$1.7 million. This increase in support is consistent with the Walk Bike Ride initiative.

Funding is increased by \$1.66 million as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Trails and Bike Paths        | 3,887,291 | 4,174,000 | 6,087,001 | 6,262,000 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 10.50     | 10.50     | 10.50     | 10.50     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

#### **Major Projects Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Major Projects Budget Control Level is to design, manage and construct improvements to the transportation infrastructure for the benefit of the traveling public including freight, transit, other public agencies, pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.

| Program Expenditures                        | 2009       | 2010       | 2011        | 2012        |
|---|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
|   | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement | 5,505,448  | 14,398,908 | 21,765,701  | 29,707,684  |
| First Hill Streetcar                        | 440,147    | 3,080,000  | 27,249,545  | 49,370,825  |
| Magnolia Bridge Replacement                 | 40,430     | 0          | 0           | 0           |
| Mercer Corridor                             | 58,155,557 | 22,564,000 | 2,252,000   | 10,854,000  |
| Mercer West                                 | 0          | 9,290,000  | 9,037,437   | 15,055,207  |
| Spokane Street Viaduct                      | 20,474,882 | 25,769,222 | 44,526,228  | 11,815,435  |
| SR-520                                      | 263,962    | 75,000     | 303,068     | 301,684     |
| Total                                       | 84,880,426 | 75,177,130 | 105,133,979 | 117,104,835 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total *               | 34.75      | 34.75      | 32.75       | 32.75       |

<sup>\*</sup>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.

### Major Projects: Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program is to fund the City's involvement in the replacement of the seismically-vulnerable viaduct and seawall. The Alaskan Way Viaduct is part of State Route 99, which carries one-quarter of the north-south traffic through downtown Seattle and is a major truck route serving the City's industrial areas.

#### **Program Summary**

The budget for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program reflects adjustments in the project schedule, including, acceleration of the Seawall Replacement component.

Abrogate 1.0 Strategic Advisor II position. This reduction is part of the Department's effort to reduce manager and strategic advisor positions and does not impact revenue or service.

Funding is increased by \$3.43 million as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                                 | 2009      | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE                | Actual    | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall | 5,505,448 | 14,398,908 | 21,765,701 | 29,707,684 |
| Replacement                     |           |            |            |            |
| Full-time Equivalents Total*    | 19.50     | 19.50      | 18.50      | 18.50      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Major Projects: First Hill Streetcar Purpose Statement

This program supports the First Hill Streetcar project, which connects First Hill employment centers to the regional Link light rail system, including but not limited to the International District/Chinatown Station and Capitol Hill Station at Broadway and John Street.

#### **Program Summary**

Funding is reduced by \$952,000 due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                      | 2009    | 2010      | 2011            | 2012       |
|----------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures         | Actual  | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| First Hill Streetcar | 440,147 | 3,080,000 | 27,249,545      | 49,370,825 |

## Major Projects: Magnolia Bridge Replacement Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Magnolia Bridge Replacement Program is to evaluate possible locations and bridge types for the replacement of the Magnolia Bridge, and to ultimately replace the bridge, which was damaged by a landslide in 1997 and the Nisqually earthquake in 2001.

#### **Program Summary**

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

|                             | 2009   | 2010    | 2011     | 2012     |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------|----------|----------|
| Expenditures                | Actual | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed |
| Magnolia Bridge Replacement | 40,430 | 0       | 0        | 0        |

### Major Projects: Mercer Corridor Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Mercer Corridor Program is to use existing street capacity along the Mercer Corridor and South Lake Union more efficiently and enhance all modes of travel, including pedestrian mobility.

#### **Program Summary**

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Manager II position and reduce support to the Capital Projects and Roadway Structures Division by \$17,000. Duties will be transferred to other managers in the division. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010 and is part of the Department's effort to reduce manager and strategic advisor positions.

Funding is reduced by \$31.2 million as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011      | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed  | Proposed   |
| Mercer Corridor              | 58,155,557 | 22,564,000 | 2,252,000 | 10,854,000 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 8.25       | 8.25       | 7.25      | 7.25       |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Major Projects: Mercer West Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Mercer West Program is to use existing street capacity along the west portion of Mercer Street more efficiently and enhance all modes of travel, including pedestrian mobility, and provide an east/west connection between I-5, SR99, and Elliott Ave W.

#### **Program Summary**

Funding is reduced by \$4.96 million due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|              | 2009   | 2010      | 2011      | 2012       |
|--------------|--------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Expenditures | Actual | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed   |
| Mercer West  | 0      | 9,290,000 | 9,037,437 | 15,055,207 |

## Major Projects: Spokane Street Viaduct Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Spokane Street Viaduct Program is to improve the safety of the Spokane Street Viaduct by building a new structure parallel and connected to the existing one and widening the existing viaduct.

#### **Program Summary**

Funding is reduced by \$17.03 million due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Spokane Street Viaduct       | 20,474,882 | 25,769,222 | 44,526,228 | 11,815,435 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 6.50       | 6.50       | 6.50       | 6.50       |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Major Projects: SR-520 Purpose Statement

The purpose of the SR-520 Program is to provide policy, planning and technical analysis support and to act as the City's representative in a multi-agency group working on the replacement of the SR-520 bridge.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase support by \$195,000 for the City's participation in design development, outreach efforts, and early mitigation for the SR-520 Bridge Replacement Project.

For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009    | 2010    | 2011            | 2012     |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual  | Adopted | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed |
| SR-520                       | 263,962 | 75,000  | 303,068         | 301,684  |
| Full-time Fauivalents Total* | 0.50    | 0.50    | 0.50            | 0.50     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

### **Mobility-Capital Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Mobility-Capital Budget Control Level is to help maximize the movement of traffic throughout the City by enhancing all modes of transportation including corridor and intersection improvements, transit and HOV improvements and sidewalk and pedestrian facilities.

| Program Expenditures                 | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                      | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Corridor & Intersection Improvements | 9,719,732  | 5,769,000  | 8,405,000       | 5,023,000  |
| Freight Mobility                     | 681,855    | 724,000    | 905,000         | 1,235,000  |
| Intelligent Transportation System    | 8,320,870  | 910,000    | 7,869           | 0          |
| Neighborhood Enhancements            | 7,401,047  | 5,576,000  | 7,614,000       | 8,254,000  |
| New Trails and Bike Paths            | 3,288,082  | 6,875,000  | 4,070,000       | 20,000     |
| Sidewalks & Pedestrian Facilities    | 6,374,302  | 4,948,000  | 6,485,547       | 7,841,000  |
| Transit & HOV                        | 8,974,380  | 12,533,000 | 6,543,000       | 230,000    |
| Total                                | 44,760,269 | 37,335,000 | 34,030,416      | 22,603,001 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total *        | 58.00      | 58.00      | 63.00           | 63.00      |

<sup>\*</sup>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.

## **Mobility-Capital: Corridor & Intersection Improvements Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Corridor & Intersection Improvements Program is to analyze and make improvements to corridors and intersections to move traffic more efficiently. Examples of projects include signal timing, left turn signals, and street improvements.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase support by \$900,000 for sidewalk and street improvements adjacent to the Seattle Streetcar on Terry Avenue North. The increase is supported by funding from private contributions and street vacation funds previously paid by adjacent property owners.

Funding is reduced by \$1.66 million as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                                      | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE                     | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Corridor & Intersection Improvements | 9,719,732 | 5,769,000 | 8,405,000 | 5,023,000 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total*         | 11.75     | 11.75     | 11.75     | 11.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Mobility-Capital: Freight Mobility Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Freight Mobility Program is to help move freight throughout the city in a safe and efficient manner.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase support by \$100,000 for freight mobility projects. These funds will increase the number of small-scale freight mobility improvements to the City's street system that can be made to improve connections between the port, railroad intermodal yards, industrial businesses, the regional highway system, and the first and last mile in the supply chain.

Funding is reduced by \$718,000 as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009    | 2010    | 2011     | 2012      |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual  | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed  |
| Freight Mobility             | 681,855 | 724,000 | 905,000  | 1,235,000 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 1.75    | 1.75    | 1.75     | 1.75      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Mobility-Capital: Intelligent Transportation System Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Program is to fund projects identified in the City's ITS Strategic Plan and ITS Master Plan. Examples of projects include implementation of transit signal priority strategies; installation of closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras to monitor traffic in key corridors; and development of parking guidance, traveler information, and real-time traffic control systems.

#### **Program Summary**

Funding is reduced by \$254,000 due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                                   | 2009      | 2010    | 2011     | 2012     |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE                  | Actual    | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed |
| Intelligent Transportation System | 8,320,870 | 910,000 | 7,869    | 0        |
| Full-time Equivalents Total*      | 12.50     | 12.50   | 12.50    | 12.50    |

• • • •

• • • •

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Mobility-Capital: Neighborhood Enhancements Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Neighborhood Enhancements Program is to make safe and convenient neighborhoods by improving sidewalks, traffic circles, streetscape designs, and the installation of pay stations.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase support by \$970,000 for SDOT's CRS allocation to the Neighborhood Projects Funds Small Projects workplan for 2011.

Provide \$1.00 million for increased support to the Neighborhood Projects Funds Large Projects workplan, allowing additional projects to be completed. This increase in support is consistent with the Walk Bike Ride initiative.

Funding is increased by \$1.22 million due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed  |
| Neighborhood Enhancements    | 7,401,047 | 5,576,000 | 7,614,000       | 8,254,000 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 11.00     | 11.00     | 11.00           | 11.00     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Mobility-Capital: New Trails and Bike Paths Purpose Statement

The purpose of the New Trails and Bike Paths Program is to construct new trails and bike paths that connect with existing facilities to let users transverse the city on a dedicated network of trails and paths.

#### **Program Summary**

Funding is increased by \$27,000 due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012     |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed |
| New Trails and Bike Paths    | 3,288,082 | 6,875,000 | 4,070,000       | 20,000   |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 8.25      | 8.25      | 8.25            | 8.25     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

### Mobility-Capital: Sidewalks & Pedestrian Facilities Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Sidewalk & Pedestrian Facilities Program is to install new facilities that help pedestrians move safely along the City's sidewalks by installing or replacing sidewalks, modifying existing sidewalks for elderly and handicapped accessibility, and increasing pedestrian lighting.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase support by \$1.28 million for additional support to the Pedestrian Master Plan Implementation program. This increase in support is consistent with the Walk Bike Ride initiative.

Funding is increased by \$3.67 million due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                                   | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012      |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE                  | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed  |
| Sidewalks & Pedestrian Facilities | 6,374,302 | 4,948,000 | 6,485,547       | 7,841,000 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total*      | 6.75      | 6.75      | 11.75           | 11.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Mobility-Capital: Transit & HOV Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Transit & HOV Program is to move more people in less time throughout the city.

#### **Program Summary**

Funding is reduced by \$24.34 million due to project level budget adjustments, as compared to anticipated 2011 allocations in the 2010-2015 Adopted CIP. For more detail on project-level changes, see the 2011-2016 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010       | 2011      | 2012     |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted    | Proposed  | Proposed |
| Transit & HOV                | 8,974,380 | 12,533,000 | 6,543,000 | 230,000  |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 6.00      | 6.00       | 6.00      | 6.00     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

### **Mobility-Operations Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Mobility-Operations Budget Control level is to promote the safe and efficient operation of all transportation modes in the City of Seattle. This includes managing the parking, pedestrian, and bicycle infrastructure; implementing neighborhood plans; encouraging alternative modes of transportation; and maintaining and improving signals and the non-electrical transportation management infrastructure.

| Program Expenditures          | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                               | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Commuter Mobility             | 11,035,986 | 10,911,353 | 13,863,846      | 14,670,336 |
| Neighborhoods                 | 4,628,168  | 4,071,690  | 2,199,361       | 2,338,553  |
| Parking                       | 7,380,357  | 6,826,431  | 8,712,255       | 8,086,103  |
| Signs & Markings              | 5,205,025  | 4,573,668  | 3,979,837       | 4,135,893  |
| Traffic Signals               | 8,047,230  | 8,730,233  | 8,548,592       | 8,848,105  |
| Total                         | 36,296,766 | 35,113,375 | 37,303,891      | 38,078,989 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total * | 169.75     | 169.75     | 155.75          | 155.75     |

<sup>\*</sup>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.

## **Mobility-Operations: Commuter Mobility Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Commuter Mobility Program is to provide a variety of services, including enforcement of City commercial vehicle limits, transit coordination, and planning, to increase mobility and transportation options to the citizens of Seattle.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase budget authority by \$750,000 for planned spending related to the City's Transit Service Partnership with King County Metro. The budget increase in 2011 is due to underspending in previous years.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Administrative Staff Assistant position, and reduce Collision Recovery Services by \$90,000. SDOT will direct remaining Collision Recovery Services towards seeking reimbursement for damages to SDOT property for cases in which it is cost effective. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Increase budget authority by \$200,000 for expenditures related to homeless encampment cleanup in the right-of-way. These required activities were previously unbudgeted.

Increase budget authority by \$65,000 for outreach and public education for a proposed parking scofflaw booting program.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Strategic Advisor I position, Traffic Data and Records Supervisor, and reduce the budget by \$113,000. Duties will accrue to the Deputy Director.

Reduce budget authority for safety-related traffic spot improvements by \$21,000. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Reduce support for special events by \$192,000. This reduction will eliminate the City's support for barricades and sign placement at special events. Event sponsors will be required to work with private vendors for placement of temporary no-parking easels.

Increase budget authority by \$1.05 million for support to the Transit Master Plan development, wayfinding and street furniture maintenance, and transportation demand management programs. This increase in support is consistent with the Walk Bike Ride initiative.

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

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Commuter Mobility Program will achieve \$43,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$100,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$1.25 million for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.95 million.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |  |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|--|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |  |
| Commuter Mobility            | 11,035,986 | 10,911,353 | 13,863,846      | 14,670,336 |  |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 48.00      | 48.00      | 46.00           | 46.00      |  |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

### Mobility-Operations: Neighborhoods Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Neighborhoods Program is to plan and forecast the needs of specific neighborhoods including neighborhood and corridor planning, development of the coordinated transportation plans, traffic control spot improvements, and travel forecasting. The program also constructs minor improvements in neighborhoods based on these assessments.

#### **Program Summary**

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

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Neighborhoods Program will achieve \$14,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$2.10 million. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$245,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.87 million.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Neighborhoods                | 4,628,168 | 4,071,690 | 2,199,361 | 2,338,553 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 14.50     | 14.50     | 14.50     | 14.50     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Mobility-Operations: Parking Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Parking Program is to manage the City's parking resources, maintain and operate pay stations and parking meters for on-street parking, and develop and manage the City's carpool program and Residential Parking Zones for neighborhoods.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase budget authority by \$1.9 million for implementation costs associated with pay station parking management program adjustments. The proposed changes include implementation of on-street paid parking on Sundays, extension of paid parking hours for two hours until 8:00 pm, and an increase in the hourly rates.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Senior Capital Project Coordinator position, and reduce the Pay Station Installation project management budget by \$134,000. Duties will be transferred to other staff.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Associate Transportation Planner position, and reduce the Pay Station GIS Services program by \$97,000. Creation and analysis of GIS maps will be assumed by others in the Department. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$2,000 is saved in the Parking Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Parking Program will achieve \$52,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$320,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs decrease the budget by \$45,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.89 million.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Parking                      | 7,380,357 | 6,826,431 | 8,712,255 | 8,086,103 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 31.75     | 31.75     | 29.75     | 29.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## Mobility-Operations: Signs & Markings Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Signs & Markings Program is to design, fabricate, and install signage, as well as provide pavement, curb, and crosswalk markings to facilitate the safe movement of vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists throughout the city.

#### **Program Summary**

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Cement Finisher position, and reduce the Traffic Sign Shop budget by \$85,000. Peak staffing needs will be met through temporary work assignments of other Traffic programs.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Material Controller position, and reduce the Sign Maintenance budget by \$132,000. Destination signs will not be maintained annually and special street cleanup activities for special events will be eliminated. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Reduce budget authority for curb and pavement marking by \$265,000. Remarking of barrier areas, stop bars, load zones, and restricted parking will be prioritized and reduced. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$1,000 is saved in the Signs & Markings Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Signs & Markings Program will achieve \$32,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$295,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$217,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$594,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Signs & Markings             | 5,205,025 | 4,573,668 | 3,979,837 | 4,135,893 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 28.75     | 28.75     | 26.75     | 26.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

### **Mobility-Operations: Traffic Signals Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Traffic Signals Program is to operate the Traffic Management Center that monitors traffic movement within the City and to maintain and improve signals and other electrical transportation management infrastructure.

#### **Program Summary**

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Senior Civil Engineering Specialist position, and reduce the budget for signal support and investigation by \$79,000. Some customer services and engineering support for signal detection will transferred to other staff and could result in longer plan review times. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Abrogate 0.5 FTE Signal Electrician and 0.5 FTE Associate Civil Engineering Specialist positions, and reduce the budget for signal maintenance supervision by \$85,000. Responsibilities will be transferred to other staff. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Abrogate 2.0 FTE Signal Electrical V positions and reduce the budget for traffic signal preventative maintenance by \$233,000. This reduction will result lower frequency of traffic signal maintenance, routine cleaning, and testing. Remaining resources will focus on responding to failed signals. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Signal Electrician V position, and eliminate the budget for warning beacon maintenance by \$234,000. Remaining resources will focus on responding to failed beacons. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Signal Electrical V position, and reduce the budget for signal major maintenance by \$217,000, reducing the number of signal intersections that are rehabilitated each year. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Associate Civil Engineering position, to align available staffing with available funding. Responsibilities for the guardrail and crash cushion program will be shared among remaining staff.

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Research and Evaluation Aide position to align available staffing with available funding. Responsibilities for the street name sign replacement program will be shared among other staff.

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$229,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$437,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$182,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Traffic Signals              | 8,047,230 | 8,730,233 | 8,548,592 | 8,848,105 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 46.75     | 46.75     | 38.75     | 38.75     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **ROW Management Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Right-of-Way (ROW) Management Budget Control Level is to ensure that projects throughout the city meet code specifications for uses of the right-of-way and to provide plan review, utility permit and street use permit issuance, and utility inspection and mapping services.

#### **Summary**

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist III position to align available staffing with available funding. The position provides staffing at the Traffic Permits Counter. Remaining staff will assume the responsibilities. Wait times for customers on the phone and in person may increase. The delays may be partly mitigated by the new RPZ ("Restricted" or "Residential" Parking Zones) online permit process.

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$220,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$611,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$831,000.

|                                     | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE                    | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Street Use Permitting & Enforcement | 10,475,932 | 11,304,009 | 12,134,526 | 12,536,800 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total*        | 68.50      | 68.50      | 67.50      | 67.50      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Street Maintenance Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Street Maintenance Budget Control Level is to maintain Seattle's roadways and sidewalks. Repair and maintenance of the right-of-way promotes safety, enhances mobility, and protects the environment. Through planned maintenance, cleaning, and spot repairs of streets, alleys, pathways, and stairways, Street Maintenance improves the quality of life and business climate in the city.

| Program Expenditures          | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                               | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Emergency Response            | 2,963,085  | 654,040    | 1,594,270       | 1,620,021  |
| Operations Support            | 3,874,513  | 4,452,176  | 5,152,457       | 5,340,228  |
| Pavement Management           | 235,119    | 247,191    | 258,971         | 266,599    |
| Street Cleaning               | 4,075,638  | 4,029,354  | 3,922,962       | 4,224,100  |
| Street Repair                 | 13,936,922 | 18,863,588 | 19,365,302      | 19,914,924 |
| Total                         | 25,085,278 | 28,246,349 | 30,293,962      | 31,365,873 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total * | 149.00     | 149.00     | 148.00          | 148.00     |

<sup>\*</sup>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.

## **Street Maintenance: Emergency Response Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Emergency Response Program is to respond to safety and mobility issues such as pavement collapses, severe weather such as ice and snow storms, landslides, and other emergencies to make the right-of-way safe for moving people and goods. This program proactively addresses landslide hazards to keep the right-of-way open and safe.

#### **Program Summary**

Increase budget authority by \$900,000 to fund the Emergency Services at historical levels of expenditure. The increase will provide funding for mandatory emergency response needs, especially those due to severe winter weather.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Emergency Response Program will achieve \$11,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$7,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$58,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$940,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010    | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Emergency Response           | 2,963,085 | 654,040 | 1,594,270 | 1,620,021 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 2.25      | 2.25    | 2.25      | 2.25      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Street Maintenance: Operations Support Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Operations Support Program is to provide essential operating support services necessary for the daily operation of SDOT's equipment and field workers dispatched from three field locations in support of street maintenance activities. These functions include warehousing, bulk material supply and management, tool cleaning and repair, equipment maintenance and repair, project accounting and technical support, and crew supervision.

#### **Program Summary**

Abrogate 1.0 FTE Administrative Specialist II position, and reduce the budget for Street Maintenance Operations by \$271,000. The reduction will result in lower 24-hour street maintenance operational response capabilities. Remaining off-hours operations will emphasize safety and spill related cleanup.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$1,000 is saved in the Operations Support Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Operations Support Program will achieve \$47,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$666,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$352,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$700,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed  |
| Operations Support           | 3,874,513 | 4,452,176 | 5,152,457       | 5,340,228 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 35.25     | 35.25     | 34.25           | 34.25     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Street Maintenance: Pavement Management Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Pavement Management Program is to assess the condition of asphalt and concrete pavements and establish citywide paving priorities for annual resurfacing and repair programs.

#### **Program Summary**

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Pavement Management Program will achieve \$1,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$2,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$15,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$12,000.

|                              | 2009    | 2010    | 2011     | 2012     |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual  | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed |
| Pavement Management          | 235,119 | 247,191 | 258,971  | 266,599  |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 1.25    | 1.25    | 1.25     | 1.25     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Street Maintenance: Street Cleaning Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Street Cleaning Program is to keep Seattle's streets, improved alleys, stairways, and pathways clean, safe, and environmentally friendly by conducting sweeping, hand-cleaning, flushing, and mowing on a regular schedule.

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority for walkway maintenance by \$48,000. Work will be completed through increased efficiency and prioritization so that the reduction will not result in a service impact. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

Reduce budget authority for landscape services by \$71,000, resulting in less mowing and vegetation control along the right-of-way. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Street Cleaning Program will achieve \$52,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$205,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$270,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$106,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Street Cleaning              | 4,075,638 | 4,029,354 | 3,922,962 | 4,224,100 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 22.25     | 22.25     | 22.25     | 22.25     |

2000

2010

2011

2012

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

## **Street Maintenance: Street Repair Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Street Repair Program is to preserve and maintain all streets and adjacent areas such as sidewalks and road shoulders by making spot repairs and conducting annual major maintenance paving and rehabilitation programs.

#### **Program Summary**

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$1,000 is saved in the Street Repair Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Street Repair Program will achieve \$31,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments decrease the budget by \$364,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$898,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$502,000.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Street Repair                | 13,936,922 | 18,863,588 | 19,365,302      | 19,914,924 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 88.00      | 88.00      | 88.00           | 88.00      |

\_\_\_\_

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

#### **Urban Forestry Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Urban Forestry Budget Control Level is to administer, maintain, protect, and expand the City's urban landscape in the street right-of-way through the maintenance and planting of new trees and landscaping to enhance the environment and aesthetics of the city. The Urban Forestry BCL maintains city-owned trees to improve the safety of the right-of-way for Seattle's residents and visitors.

| Program Expenditures          | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012      |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
|                               | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed  |
| Arborist Services             | 1,010,959 | 822,574   | 971,598         | 1,006,039 |
| Tree & Landscape Maintenance  | 3,139,305 | 3,548,914 | 3,131,657       | 3,238,578 |
| Total                         | 4,150,263 | 4,371,488 | 4,103,255       | 4,244,617 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total * | 31.25     | 31.25     | 31.25           | 31.25     |

<sup>\*</sup>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.

## **Urban Forestry: Arborist Services Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Arborist Services Program is to maintain, protect, and preserve city street trees and to regulate privately-owned trees in the right-of-way by developing plans, policies, and procedures to govern and improve the care and quality of street trees.

#### **Program Summary**

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$1,000 is saved in the Arborist Services Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Arborist Services Program will achieve \$10,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments increase the budget by \$94,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$66,000 for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$149,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010    | 2011     | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed  |
| Arborist Services            | 1,010,959 | 822,574 | 971,598  | 1,006,039 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 8.75      | 8.75    | 8.75     | 8.75      |

•

2010

0044

2012

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

# **Urban Forestry: Tree & Landscape Maintenance Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Tree & Landscape Maintenance Program is to provide planning, design, construction, and construction inspection services for the landscape elements of transportation capital projects, as well as guidance to developers on the preservation of city street trees and landscaped sites during construction of their projects.

#### **Program Summary**

Reduce budget authority for landscaping maintenance by \$67,000. This reduction will result in a decrease in the amount landscaping that is maintained in good or fair condition. This reduction was initiated mid-year 2010.

In keeping with the Mayor's policy to achieve salary savings to help close the 2011 General Fund deficit, \$1,000 is saved in the Tree & Landscape Maintenance Program by assuming no market rate salary adjustments for non-represented employees in the City discretionary pay plans for 2011.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. Savings in labor costs has the dual benefit of allowing the City to preserve funding for important direct services and to save jobs. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, the Tree & Landscape Maintenance Program will achieve \$25,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions to the Council in order to replace this adjustment.

Departmental technical adjustments reduce the budget by \$537,000. Citywide adjustments to labor and other operating costs increase the budget by \$212,000 for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$417,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Tree & Landscape Maintenance | 3,139,305 | 3,548,914 | 3,131,657 | 3,238,578 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 22.50     | 22.50     | 22.50     | 22.50     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Transportation Operating Fund

| Summit<br>Code | Source                                   | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|----------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 411100         | BTG-Property Tax Levy                    | 38,696,603      | 39,149,000      | 40,141,000       | 40,836,000       |
| 416310         | BTG-Commercial Parking Tax               | 18,734,495      | 21,840,010      | 22,387,240       | 23,199,897       |
| 418800         | BTG-Employee Hours Tax                   | 5,646,090       | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 419997         | Commercial Parking Tax - AWV             | 0               | 0               | 4,941,424        | 5,120,797        |
| 419998         | Commercial Parking Tax - Transportation  | 0               | 0               | 9,882,847        | 10,241,594       |
| 419999         | Transportation Benefit District - VLF    | 0               | 0               | 3,400,000        | 6,800,000        |
| 422490         | Other Street Use & Curb Permits          | 8,014,723       | 7,095,637       | 6,938,241        | 7,228,421        |
| 422990         | Other Non-Business Licenses / PE         | 702,944         | 574,591         | 805,506          | 631,830          |
| 436088         | Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax - City Street     | 12,863,641      | 13,422,635      | 13,691,088       | 13,964,909       |
| 439090         | Other Private Contributions and Donation | 23,586,656      | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 441900         | Other Charges - General Government       | 0               | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 441930         | Private Reimbursements                   | 0               | 1,705,000       | 650,000          | 5,750,000        |
| 442490         | Other Protective Inspection Fees         | 1,285,090       | 968,716         | 900,234          | 947,153          |
| 444100         | Street Maintenance & Repair Ch           | 723,632         | 934,079         | 934,231          | 305,298          |
| 444900         | Other Charges - Transportation           | 24,647,992      | 24,588,602      | 42,912,915       | 64,090,369       |
| 461110         | Investment Earnings on Residual Cash     | 327,102         | 105,000         | 0                | 0                |
|                | Balances                                 |                 |                 |                  |                  |
| 462500         | LT Space/Facilities Leases               | 79,759          | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 469990         | Other Miscellaneous Revenues             | 187,100         | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 471010         | Federal Grants                           | 14,539,608      | 22,803,000      | 14,148,801       | 8,970,059        |
| 474010         | State Grants                             | 5,757,361       | 5,533,400       | 24,435,797       | 12,013,519       |
| 477010         | Interlocal Grants                        | 491,561         | 810,000         | 0                | 1,425,046        |
| 481100         | G.O. Bond Proceeds                       | 0               | 0               | 61,686,000       | 53,554,000       |
| 481800         | LongTerm Intergovermental Loan Proc      | 1,250,000       | 0               | 4,200,000        | 1,800,000        |
| 516800         | IF Employee Hrs Tax Ord 122191           | 243,870         | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 543210         | IF Architect/ Engineering Services       | 0               | 346,000         | 0                | 354,000          |
| 544900         | IF Other Charges - Transportation        | 10,999,748      | 12,176,407      | 13,411,892       | 15,273,620       |
| 577010         | IF Capital Contributions and Grants      | 0               | 2,036,913       | 1,364,550        | 0                |
| 587001         | OPER TR IN-FR General Fund               | 39,966,839      | 38,641,232      | 36,160,576       | 37,437,537       |
| 587116         | OPER TR IN-FR Cumulative Reserve         | 9,138,823       | 7,656,000       | 5,382,950        | 3,774,156        |
|                | Subfund                                  |                 |                 |                  |                  |
| 587118         | OPER TR IN-FR Emergency Subfund          | 456,104         | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 587310         | OPER TR IN-2005 Multipurpose Bonds       | 22,386          | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 587316         | OPER TR IN-FR Trans. Bond Fund           | 1,267           | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 587331         | OPER TR IN-FR Park Renov/Improv.         | 307,076         | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 587338         | OP TSF IN 2000 Park Levy Fund            | 529,081         | 3,549,000       | 0                | 0                |
| 587339         | OPER TR IN-FR Denny Triangle             | 18,533          | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 587348         | OPER TR IN-FR 2003 LTGO Alaskan          | 18,874          | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 587351         | OPER TR IN-2007 Multipurpose Bonds       | 14,601,000      | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 587352         | OPER TR IN-2008 Multipurpose Bonds       | 31,024,140      | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 587353         | OPER TR IN-2009 Multipurpose Bonds       | 23,922,160      | 22,545,000      | 0                | 0                |
| 587354         | OPER TR IN-2010 Multipurpose Bonds       | 0               | 74,637,000      | 0                | 0                |

## 2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Transportation Operating Fund

| Summit<br>Code | Source                                | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 587410         | Oper TR IN-FR Seattle City Light Fund | 0               | 330,000         | 800,000          | 3,400,000        |
| 587503         | OPER TR IN-FR ESD Operating Fund      | 322,000         | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 587624         | OPER TR IN-FR Gen. Trust Fund         | 52,009          | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| Tota           | l Revenues                            | 289,158,267     | 301,447,222     | 309,175,292      | 317,118,205      |
| 379100         | Use of (Contribution to) Cash         | (2,319,931)     | 8,750,741       | 4,088,018        | (1,116,717)      |
| Tota           | l Resources                           | 286.838.336     | 310.197.963     | 313,263,310      | 316,001,488      |

## **Transportation Operating Fund**

|  | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2010<br>Revised | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>          | 32,604,485      | 24,520,423      | 34,155,514      | 29,620,644       | 25,532,625       |
| Accounting and Technical Adjustments   | (768,898)       | 0               | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue     | 289,158,267     | 301,447,222     | 301,482,222     | 309,175,292      | 317,118,205      |
| Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures | 286,838,340     | 310,197,963     | 306,017,092     | 313,263,310      | 316,001,488      |
| <b>Ending Fund Balance</b>             | 34,155,514      | 15,769,682      | 29,620,644      | 25,532,625       | 26,649,342       |
|  |                 |                 |                 |                  |                  |
| Continuing Appropriations              | 30,217,371      | 30,000,000      | 29,582,412      | 30,000,000       | 30,000,000       |
| <b>Total Reserves</b>                  | 30,217,371      | 30,000,000      | 29,582,412      | 30,000,000       | 30,000,000       |
| Ending Unreserved Fund<br>Balance      | 3,938,143       | (14,230,318)    | 38,232          | (4,467,375)      | (3,350,658)      |

Note: Through interfund loans from the City's Cash Pool, the Transportation Operating Fund is authorized to carry a negative balance of approximately \$17.5 million by Ordinances 122641 and 122603.

### **Capital Improvement Program Highlights**

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) is responsible for maintaining, upgrading, and monitoring the use of the City's system of streets, bridges, retaining walls, seawalls, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and traffic control devices. SDOT's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) outlines the Department's plan for repairing, improving, and adding to this extensive infrastructure. The CIP is financed from a variety of revenue sources that include the City's General Fund and Cumulative Reserve Subfund, state Gas Tax revenues, state and federal grants, Public Works Trust Fund loans, partnerships with private organizations and other public agencies, and bond proceeds.

The 2011-2016 Proposed CIP includes key infrastructure work such as support for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program, construction on the Mercer Corridor Project – East Phase and the Spokane Street Viaduct, continued work on the major bridge rehabilitation and retrofit projects, continued major maintenance and paving of the City's arterial and non-arterial streets, and accelerated implementation of the Pedestrian and Bike Master Plans.

Most capital appropriations for SDOT are included within the Budget Control Level (BCL) appropriations displayed at the start of this chapter. These appropriations are funded by a variety of revenue sources, most of which do not require separate authority to be transferred to the Transportation Operating Fund (TOF). Revenue sources which do require separate authority to transfer to the TOF include the Cumulative Reserve Subfund (CRS) and Limited Tax General Obligation Bond (LTGO) proceeds.

Table 1 provides an informational display of transfers of LTGO bond proceeds to the TOF and the projects to which these proceeds will be allocated. Authority to transfer these funds to the TOF is provided by the various LTGO bond ordinances or other legislation.

CRS appropriations authorized for specific programs are listed in the CRS section of the Proposed Budget. (See the informational Table 2, "2011-2016 Proposed SDOT Cumulative Reserve Subfund Program Detail" for a list of the specific CRS-funded projects by program). The CRS Debt Service Program requires a separate appropriation outside of SDOT BCLs. Funding for REET Debt is not included within the SDOT BCLs, and is appropriated in the CRS section of the Budget. CRS-Unrestricted funds, backed by a transfer for the King County Proposition 2 Trail and Open Space Levy, are included in SDOT's budget and are also appropriated in the CRS section of the Proposed Budget.

Table 3, entitled "Capital Improvement Budget Control Level Outlay," shows that portion of the various SDOT appropriations that represent the Department's CIP outlays. Consistent with RCW 35.32A.080, if any portion of these outlays remains unexpended or unencumbered at the close of the fiscal year, that portion shall be held available for the following year, except if abandoned by the City Council by ordinance. A detailed list of all programs and projects in SDOT's CIP can be found in the 2011-2016 Proposed Capital Improvement Program document.

Table 1: Bond Transfers to the Transportation Operating Fund – Information Only

| ruble 1. Bond Transfers to the Transportation Operating Fund | miormatic        | on Only          |
|--|------------------|------------------|
|  | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
| Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Replacement: TC366050          |                  |                  |
| 2011 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 14,900,000       | 22,100,000       |
| 2012 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 0                | 0                |
| Subtotal   | 14,900,000       | 22,100,000       |
| Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement: TC366850              |                  |                  |
| 2011 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 10,192,000       | 0                |
| 2012 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 0                | 8,709,000        |
| Subtotal   | 10,192,000       | 8,709,000        |
| Bridge Seismic Retrofit Phase II: TC365810                   |                  |                  |
| 2011 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 1,937,000        | 0                |
| 2012 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 0                | 1,690,000        |
| Subtotal   | 1,937,000        | 1,690,000        |
| Linden Avenue N Complete Streets: TC366930                   |                  |                  |
| 2012Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                   | 0                | 4,500,000        |
| Subtotal   | 0                | 4,500,000        |
| King Street Station Multimodal Terminal: TC366810            |                  |                  |
| 2011Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                   | 4,011,000        | 0                |
| Subtotal   | 4,011,000        | 0                |
| Mercer Corridor Project: TC365500                            |                  |                  |
| 2011 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 0                | 0                |
| 2012 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 0                | 5,000,000        |
| Subtotal   | 0                | 5,000,000        |
| Mercer Corridor Project West Phase: TC367110                 |                  |                  |
| 2011 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 8,137,000        | 0                |
| 2012 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 0                | 11,555,000       |
| Subtotal   | 8,137,000        | 11,555,000       |
| Spokane Street Viaduct: TC364800                             |                  |                  |
| 2011 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 22,509,000       | 0                |
| 2012 Multipurpose LTGO Bond                                  | 0                | 0                |
| Subtotal   | 22,509,000       | 0                |
|  |                  |                  |
| Total Bond Proceeds  | 61,686,000       | 53,554,000       |

Table 2: 2011 Proposed SDOT Cumulative Reserve Subfund Program Detail

Information Only (\$1,000s)

| Program/Project Bridges & Structures (19001A)          | Project ID | Sub-Account | 2011<br>Proposed<br>2,500 | 2012<br>Proposed<br>2,500 |
|--|------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Bridge Painting Program                                | TC324900   | REET II     | 2,000                     | 2,000                     |
| Hazard Mitigation Program - Areaways                   | TC365480   | REET II     | 288                       | 288                       |
| Retaining Wall Repair and Restoration                  | TC365890   | REET II     | 212                       | 212                       |
| Corridor & Intersection Improvements (19003A)          |            |             | 300                       | 0                         |
| Terry Avenue North Street Improvements                 | TC367030   | Street Vac. | 300                       | 0                         |
| Debt Service (18002D) – CRS-U                          |            |             | 1,113                     | 1,074                     |
| Trails – debt svc                                      | TG356590   | CRS-U       | 1,113                     | 1,074                     |
| Debt Service (18002D) – REET II                        |            |             | 2,697                     | 1,833                     |
| Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Replacement - debt svc   | TC320060   | REET II     | 1,263                     | 1,257                     |
| Bridge Way North and Fremont Circulation - debt svc    | TC320060   | REET II     | 278                       | 0                         |
| Fremont Bridge Approaches - debt svc                   | TC320060   | REET II     | 45                        | 110                       |
| Mercer Corridor - debt svc                             | TC320060   | REET II     | 466                       | 466                       |
| SR-519 - debt svc                                      | TC320060   | REET II     | 645                       | 0                         |
| Landslide Mitigation (19001B)                          |            |             | 200                       | 200                       |
| Hazard Mitigation Program - Landslide Mitigation Proj. | TC365510   | REET II     | 200                       | 200                       |
| Neighborhood Enhancements (19003D)                     |            |             | 970                       | 0                         |
| NSF/CRS Neighborhood Program                           | TC365770   | REET II     | 970                       | 0                         |
| Roads (19001C)   |            |             | 75                        | 0                         |
| Arterial Major Maintenance                             | TC365940   | REET II     | 75                        | 0                         |
| Sidewalks and Pedestrian Facilities (19003F)           |            |             | 225                       | 0                         |
| Pedestrian Master Plan Implementation                  | TC367150   | REET II     | 225                       | 0                         |
| Total CRS funding to Transportation                    |            |             | 8,080                     | 5,607                     |

## **Transportation Operating Fund**

## **Table 3: Capital Improvement Budget Control Level Outlay**

|  | 2011        | 2012        |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Budget Control Level                     | Proposed    | Adopted     |
| Major Maintenance/Replacement            | 56,783,000  | 47,165,000  |
| Major Projects                           | 105,133,000 | 117,105,000 |
| Mobility-Capital                         | 34,030,000  | 22,603,000  |
| Subtotal                                 | 195,946,000 | 186,873,000 |
| Total Capital Improvement Program Outlay | 195,946,000 | 186,873,000 |

## **Seattle Streetcar**

## Peter Hahn, Director

### **Contact Information**

Department Information Line: (206) 684-7623

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

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

#### **Department Description**

The Seattle Streetcar is part of the Seattle Department of Transportation, with the specific purpose of operating and maintaining the South Lake Union line of the Seattle Streetcar. The South Lake Union line began operation in late 2007. Three modern streetcars serve 11 stops along the 2.6 mile line and connect thousands of people to new homes, jobs, and other public transit systems including Metro buses, Sound Transit buses, light rail, and the Monorail.

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

Ridership on the South Lake Union line of the Seattle Streetcar continues to exceed initial projections. Average daily ridership is currently projected to be 3,800 in 2011, accounting for increases due to occupation of several large development projects in the area. The streetcar is a vital part of many riders' daily commutes, and is being used because it is comfortable, quick, and reliable. The line is most popular during the morning and evening commutes, and during the lunch hour.

King County Metro Transit contributes 75% of the operating costs, net of farebox revenue. The City pays the remaining 25% to Metro for the operation of the Streetcar. For 2011-2012, a small budget adjustment is made based on the escalation of Metro's 2010 operating budget and the forecast farebox revenues.

Farebox return is expected to increase to 55% of operating costs. The City's direct costs and payments to Metro are offset by sponsorship funds and Federal Transit Administration grants. The initial start-up period was supported by an interfund loan authorized until December 2018 by Ordinance 122424 and amended by Ordinance 123102.

|  | Summit     | 2009      | 2010    | 2011     | 2012     |
|--|------------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|
| Appropriations                               | Code       | Actual    | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed |
| Streetcar Operations Budget<br>Control Level | STCAR-OPER | 1,992,969 | 651,372 | 611,716  | 628,723  |
| <b>Department Total</b>                      |            | 1,992,969 | 651,372 | 611,716  | 628,723  |
|  |            | 2009      | 2010    | 2011     | 2012     |
| Resources                                    |            | Actual    | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed |
| Other  |            | 1,992,969 | 651,372 | 611,716  | 628,723  |
| <b>Department Total</b>                      |            | 1,992,969 | 651,372 | 611,716  | 628,723  |

## **Streetcar Operations Budget Control Level**

#### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the Streetcar Operations Budget Control Level is to operate and maintain the South Lake Union line of the Seattle Streetcar.

#### **Summary**

Reduce budget authority by \$40,000 to match projected operating expenditures, for a net reduction from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$40,000.

|                      | 2009      | 2010    | 2011            | 2012     |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------------|----------|
| Expenditures         | Actual    | Adopted | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed |
| Streetcar Operations | 1,992,969 | 651,372 | 611,716         | 628,723  |

### 2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Streetcar Fund

| Summit<br>Code | Source                        | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 431110         | FTA ARRA Funds                | 314,011         | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 439090         | Sponsorship Revenues          | 386,644         | 350,000         | 450,000          | 450,000          |
| 444900         | Farebox Recovery              | 75,284          | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 471010         | FTA 5307/5309 Funds           | 63,000          | 141,733         | 190,000          | 190,000          |
| Tota           | l Revenues                    | 838,939         | 491,733         | 640,000          | 640,000          |
| 379100         | Use of (Contribution to) Cash | 1,154,030       | 159,639         | (28,284)         | (11,277)         |
| Tota           | l Resources                   | 1,992,969       | 651,372         | 611,716          | 628,723          |

#### **Streetcar Fund**

|  | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2010<br>Revised | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>          | (1,930,306)     | (2,964,337)     | (3,095,693)     | (3,023,967)      | (2,995,683)      |
| Accounting and Technical Adjustments   | (11,357)        | 0               | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| Plus: Actual and Estimated Revenue     | 838,939         | 491,733         | 603,015         | 640,000          | 640,000          |
| Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures | 1,992,969       | 651,372         | 531,289         | 611,716          | 628,723          |
| <b>Ending Fund Balance</b>             | (3,095,693)     | (3,123,976)     | (3,023,967)     | (2,995,683)      | (2,984,406)      |

Through an interfund loan from the City's Cash Pool, the Streetcar Fund is authorized to carry a negative balance of approximately \$3.7 million by Ordinance 123102.

## **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, 92 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 were established through the period 2009-2010. New rates have been proposed for 2011-2012 to support the operating and capital service levels included in the 2011-2012 Proposed Budget.

## **Proposed 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 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 proposed 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 downtown. 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 2011-2012 Proposed Budget, the Executive has recommended 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 proposals 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 2011-2012 Proposed Budget and 2011-2016 Proposed 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 2011-2012 Proposed 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 also funded and will ensure reliable access to water stored in Chester Morse Lake so that enough water can be released into the Cedar River to maintain the supply of fresh drinking water in the region and sustain fish habitats. Funding is also proposed 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 2011 Endorsed CIP Budget.

The 2011-2012 Proposed 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 2011-2012 Budget proposes to restore some of the reductions made in 2010 and to add 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 (EAP) audit of SPU's wastewater and combined sewer system.

SPU's 2011-2012 Proposed 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 Proposed Budget 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.

The Proposed Budget addresses 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 Proposed 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 \$1.7 million and 8.5 FTE in the 2011-2012 Proposed Budget, the Drainage and Wastewater Fund's budget is approximately 8.8% 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 12.8% or \$2.19 a month in Drainage and 4% or \$1.87 a month in Wastewater Rates.

Solid Waste Fund. The Solid Waste Utility's 2011-2012 Proposed Budget and 2011-2016 Proposed 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 2011-2012 Proposed 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 proposes further savings of over \$750,000 and 7.5 FTE, 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 7.5% or \$2.45 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 PROPOSED BUDGET CHANGES

The specific strategies used in SPU's 2011-2012 Proposed 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 over \$3.9 million in O&M savings and abrogates 37 FTEs, 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 ten 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 item.

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. The City of Seattle's General Fund is facing a \$67 million shortfall. The 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes reductions for all General fund-dependent functions. SPU's 2011-2012 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 2011-2012 Proposed Budget includes proposals that restore 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:

- Payment of annual dues for 2011-2012 to 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.
- 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.
- 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 2011-2012 Proposed 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 2011-2012 Proposed 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 proposed 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.

Finally, tree planting services provided by City departments to Seattle residents are proposed to be consolidated in SPU. The City has a goal of increasing tree canopy to 30% citywide and to 33% in single family areas. Single family residential properties make up two-thirds of Seattle's land area and represent the majority of tree retention and planting potential. Currently tree planting resources are decentralized in several City departments, including Seattle City Light, the Department of Neighborhoods, and the Office of Sustainability and Environment. By consolidating resources in a single department, the City will offer more efficient incentive programs, and encourage community engagement while increasing tree canopy cover. Other funding sources (General Fund and Seattle City Light) will continue to contribute to this initiative after the reorganization.

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 2011-2012 Proposed 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.

Final estimates of SPU's internal and external overhead costs and their appropriate distribution across funds, along with other budget adjustments, resulted in a Proposed Budget for Drainage and Wastewater that exceeded by very roughly \$1 million the budget assumed in the Executive's earlier rate proposals, which were submitted to the City Council in June 2010. The Executive is working with the Council to ensure complete alignment between rates and budgets adopted for 2011-2012.

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

|   |          |             |              |              | SPU          |
|---|----------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|   | Summit   | 2009        | 2010         | 2011         | 2012         |
| Appropriations Drainage & Wastewater Utility                    | Code     | Actual      | Adopted      | Proposed     | Proposed     |
| Administration Budget Control Lev                               | vel      |             |              |              |              |
| Administration  |          | 12,179,907  | 12,393,279   | 13,918,854   | 13,906,807   |
| General and Administrative Credit                               |          | (8,686,881) | (10,451,203) | (10,816,551) | (10,922,149) |
| Administration Budget Control<br>Level                          | N100B-DW | 3,493,026   | 1,942,076    | 3,102,303    | 2,984,658    |
| Combined Sewer Overflows Budge<br>Control Level                 | t C360   | 0           | 24,171,960   | 17,806,875   | 25,769,534   |
| Control Structures Budget Control<br>Level                      | C310B    | 17,123,450  | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| <b>Customer Service Budget Control</b><br><b>Level</b>          | N300B-DW | 6,334,297   | 7,174,417    | 7,089,545    | 7,026,865    |
| Flooding, Sewer Back-up, and<br>Landslides Budget Control Level | C380     | 0           | 25,053,790   | 35,069,776   | 23,240,984   |
| General Expense Budget Control L                                | evel     |             |              |              |              |
| 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   | 36,959,008   | 38,698,313   |
| General Expense Budget Control<br>Level                         | N000B-DW | 188,179,436 | 191,882,360  | 215,390,698  | 219,794,078  |
| Landslide Mitigation & Special<br>Programs Budget Control Level | C335B    | 714,362     | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| Low Impact Development Budget<br>Control Level                  | C334B    | 945,732     | 0            | 0            | 0            |
| Other Operating Budget Control L                                | evel     |             |              |              |              |
| Field Operations  |          | 18,898,959  | 19,835,354   | 20,045,761   | 20,154,568   |
| Pre-Capital Planning & Developm                                 | ent      | 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   | 18,034,199   | 18,597,069   |
| Other Operating Budget Control<br>Level                         | N400B-DW | 40,110,961  | 46,279,706   | 49,418,240   | 50,228,922   |
| Protection of Beneficial Uses<br>Budget Control Level           | С333В    | 930,984     | 4,757,062    | 2,283,081    | 6,040,474    |
| Rehabilitation Budget Control<br>Level                          | C370     | 0           | 6,484,079    | 6,471,519    | 10,526,291   |

| Ammunuintinun  | Summit   | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|--|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Appropriations   | Code     | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| Sediments Budget Control Level                             | C350B    | 3,343,681   | 2,732,244   | 6,350,146   | 5,385,277   |
| Shared Cost Projects Budget<br>Control Level               | C410B-DW | 7,983,492   | 16,205,574  | 11,804,290  | 16,660,024  |
| Stormwater & Flood Control<br>Budget Control Level         | C332B    | 10,014,977  | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| <b>Technology Budget Control Level</b>                     | C510B-DW | 2,302,840   | 4,044,631   | 4,062,403   | 5,001,418   |
| Wastewater Conveyance Budget<br>Control Level              | C320B    | 7,543,170   | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| Total Drainage & Wastewater Util                           | lity     | 289,020,409 | 330,727,900 | 358,848,877 | 372,658,525 |
| <b>Solid Waste Utility</b>                                 |          |             |             |             |             |
| Administration Budget Control Lev                          | vel      |             |             |             |             |
| Administration   |          | 5,530,872   | 6,001,815   | 6,694,970   | 6,727,534   |
| General and Administrative Credit                          |          | (1,311,053) | (1,578,756) | (1,531,564) | (1,637,756) |
| Administration Budget Control<br>Level                     | N100B-SW | 4,219,819   | 4,423,058   | 5,163,406   | 5,089,778   |
| Customer Service Budget Control<br>Level                   | N300B-SW | 13,850,598  | 13,724,136  | 12,779,098  | 12,819,309  |
| General Expense Budget Control L                           | evel     |             |             |             |             |
| Debt Service   |          | 10,743,269  | 5,923,850   | 7,668,581   | 10,923,193  |
| Other General Expenses                                     |          | 83,359,705  | 102,797,491 | 101,560,376 | 104,539,324 |
| Taxes  |          | 20,320,538  | 18,970,770  | 18,357,000  | 18,971,000  |
| General Expense Budget Control<br>Level                    | N000B-SW | 114,423,512 | 127,692,111 | 127,585,958 | 134,433,518 |
| New Facilities Budget Control<br>Level                     | C230B    | 3,612,157   | 24,886,900  | 25,710,121  | 35,411,056  |
| Other Operating Budget Control L                           | evel     |             |             |             |             |
| Field Operations   |          | 10,353,768  | 11,641,715  | 11,761,008  | 12,061,224  |
| Pre-Capital Planning & Developm                            | ent      | 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   | 2,200,183   | 2,185,226   |
| Other Operating Budget Control<br>Level                    | N400B-SW | 12,451,900  | 13,951,057  | 14,888,315  | 15,164,376  |
| Rehabilitation and Heavy<br>Equipment Budget Control Level | C240B    | 9,809,787   | 5,358,950   | 262,140     | 270,504     |
| Shared Cost Projects Budget<br>Control Level               | C410B-SW | 2,135,326   | 1,875,959   | 1,860,260   | 2,295,274   |
| <b>Technology Budget Control Level</b>                     | C510B-SW | 1,742,897   | 1,745,411   | 1,415,282   | 2,138,175   |

| Appropriations Total Solid Waste Utility             | Summit<br>Code                       | 2009<br>Actual<br>162,245,997 | 2010<br>Adopted<br>193,657,583 | 2011<br>Proposed<br>189,664,580 | 2012<br>Proposed<br>207,621,990 |  |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Water Utility  |                                      |                               |                                |                                 |                                 |  |  |
| Administration Budget Control Lev                    | vel                                  |                               |                                |                                 |                                 |  |  |
| Administration                                       |                                      | 14,286,477                    | 14,108,697                     | 14,043,468                      | 14,131,359                      |  |  |
| General and Administrative Credit                    | t                                    | (9,479,308)                   | (11,299,777)                   | (9,906,163)                     | (9,912,397)                     |  |  |
| Administration Budget Control Level                  | N100B-WU                             | 4,807,169                     | 2,808,920                      | 4,137,305                       | 4,218,962                       |  |  |
| Customer Service Budget Control<br>Level             | N300B-WU                             | 9,625,465                     | 10,307,603                     | 10,221,542                      | 10,158,605                      |  |  |
| Distribution Budget Control Level                    | C110B                                | 19,760,493                    | 22,380,000                     | 20,491,716                      | 20,819,443                      |  |  |
| General Expense Budget Control L                     | General Expense Budget Control Level |                               |                                |                                 |                                 |  |  |
| 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                      | 36,561,293                      |  |  |
| General Expense Budget Control<br>Level              | N000B-WU                             | 234,185,147                   | 133,688,155                    | 134,771,812                     | 145,967,427                     |  |  |
| Habitat Conservation Program<br>Budget Control Level | C160B                                | 5,027,829                     | 9,626,951                      | 11,122,687                      | 4,236,695                       |  |  |
| Other Operating Budget Control L                     | evel                                 |                               |                                |                                 |                                 |  |  |
| Field Operations                                     |                                      | 21,683,133                    | 22,806,690                     | 23,113,803                      | 22,836,543                      |  |  |
| Pre-Capital Planning & Developm                      | ent                                  | 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                      |  |  |
| Other Operating Budget Control<br>Level              | N400B-WU                             | 42,784,467                    | 47,461,792                     | 47,143,454                      | 46,843,879                      |  |  |
| Shared Cost Projects Budget<br>Control Level         | C410B-WU                             | 16,357,280                    | 19,648,846                     | 15,047,995                      | 18,481,989                      |  |  |
| <b>Technology Budget Control Level</b>               | C510B-WU                             | 3,039,586                     | 4,633,861                      | 4,770,105                       | 6,067,119                       |  |  |
| Transmission Budget Control Leve                     | l C120B                              | 2,505,124                     | 3,173,000                      | 1,688,100                       | 3,024,443                       |  |  |
| Water Quality & Treatment<br>Budget Control Level    | C140B                                | 26,045,436                    | 21,657,059                     | 18,329,399                      | 8,115,120                       |  |  |
| Water Resources Budget Control<br>Level              | C150B                                | 7,853,605                     | 15,793,000                     | 6,516,169                       | 9,347,325                       |  |  |
| Watershed Stewardship Budget<br>Control Level        | C130B                                | 3,798,705                     | 1,634,978                      | 1,141,554                       | 896,831                         |  |  |
| Total Water Utility                                  |                                      | 375,790,306                   | 292,814,166                    | 275,381,838                     | 278,177,838                     |  |  |

|   | Summit       | 2009                 | 2010                | 2011                | 2012        |
|---|--------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Appropriations                            | Code         | Actual               | Adopted             | Proposed            | Proposed    |
| <b>Department Total</b>                   |              | 827,056,712          | 817,199,649         | 823,895,295         | 858,458,353 |
| Department Full-time Equiva               | lents Total* | 1,449.25             | 1,449.25            | 1,419.25            | 1,415.25    |
| * FTE totals are provided for information | 1 1 0        | es in FTEs resulting | from City Council o | r Personnel Directo | or actions  |

outside of the budget process may not be detailed here.

|                  | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Resources        | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| General Subfund  | 11,163,546  | 1,351,415   | 1,299,022   | 1,329,237   |
| Other            | 815,893,166 | 815,848,234 | 822,596,273 | 857,129,116 |
| Department Total | 827,056,712 | 817,199,649 | 823,895,295 | 858,458,353 |

## **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              | 2009       | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                   | Actual     | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| Administration                    | 12,179,907 | 12,393,279  | 13,918,854  | 13,906,807  |
| General and Administrative Credit | -8,686,881 | -10,451,203 | -10,816,551 | -10,922,149 |
| Total                             | 3,493,026  | 1,942,076   | 3,102,303   | 2,984,658   |
| Full-time Equivalents Total *     | 62.50      | 62.50       | 59.75       | 59.75       |

<sup>\*</sup>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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$101,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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.

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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.53 million.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Administration               | 12,179,907 | 12,393,279 | 13,918,854      | 13,906,807 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 62.50      | 62.50      | 59.75           | 59.75      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 proposed 2011-2012 rates and CIP.

|                                   | 2009       | 2010        | 2011            | 2012        |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Expenditures                      | Actual     | Adopted     | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed    |
| 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009   | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|--------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| 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      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

|                    | 2009       | 2010    | 2011     | 2012     |
|--------------------|------------|---------|----------|----------|
| Expenditures       | Actual     | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed |
| 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 proposed 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$88,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| 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     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|   | 2009   | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|---|--------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE                        | Actual | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| 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      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| 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  | 36,959,008  | 38,698,313  |
| Total                         | 188,179,436 | 191,882,360 | 215,390,698 | 219,794,078 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total * | 0.50        | 0.50        | 0.50        | 0.50        |

<sup>\*</sup>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 Proposed CIP.

|              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| 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. By convention, the contract estimates in the City's proposed budget do not include increases to King County rates that are anticipated to be passed through to Seattle customers. Legislation related to King County cost increases will be brought forward to City Council outside 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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$16.17 million.

|                              | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| 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        |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 \$4.98 million to provide sufficient appropriation for payment of taxes, including City Drainage and City Wastewater Public Utility Business Taxes.

|              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Taxes        | 32,067,961 | 31,978,028 | 36,959,008 | 38,698,313 |

## **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.

|   | 2009    | 2010    | 2011     | 2012     |
|---|---------|---------|----------|----------|
| Expenditures                            | Actual  | Adopted | Proposed | Proposed |
| 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.

|                        | 2009    | 2010    | 2011            | 2012            |
|------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Expenditures           | Actual  | Adopted | <b>Proposed</b> | <b>Proposed</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               | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                    | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Field Operations                   | 18,898,959 | 19,835,354 | 20,045,761      | 20,154,568 |
| 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 | 18,034,199      | 18,597,069 |
| Total                              | 40,110,961 | 46,279,706 | 49,418,240      | 50,228,922 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total *      | 262.00     | 262.00     | 262.75          | 262.75     |

<sup>\*</sup>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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$139,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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.

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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$210,000.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Field Operations             | 18,898,959 | 19,835,354 | 20,045,761 | 20,154,568 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 106.00     | 106.00     | 105.25     | 105.25     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

SPU

# 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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP.

|                                    | 2009    | 2010      | 2011            | 2012      |
|------------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Expenditures                       | Actual  | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed  |
| 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$44,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$173,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| 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     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 proposed 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 \$185,000 and create 1.0 FTE Planning and Development Specialist, Senior position to create an effective, consolidated tree planting outreach and incentive program with dedicated staffing. The funding includes \$75,000 in General Fund allocations previously budget in the Department of Neighborhoods and the Office of Sustainability and Environment, and a transfer of \$80,000 from Seattle City Light.

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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$63,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$2.73 million.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| Utility Systems Management   | 12,915,297 | 15,306,562 | 18,034,199 | 18,597,069 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 87.00      | 87.00      | 90.50      | 90.50      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                               | 2009    | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE              | Actual  | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| 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     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

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

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| 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      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| 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      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

**SPU** 

# **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.

|                            | 2009       | 2010    | 2011            | 2012     |
|----------------------------|------------|---------|-----------------|----------|
| Expenditures               | Actual     | Adopted | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed |
| 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed  |
| 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     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

**SPU** 

# **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.

|                       | 2009      | 2010    | 2011            | 2012     |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------------|----------|
| Expenditures          | Actual    | Adopted | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed |
| 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.

| Program Expenditures              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                   | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Administration                    | 5,530,872  | 6,001,815  | 6,694,970       | 6,727,534  |
| General and Administrative Credit | -1,311,053 | -1,578,756 | -1,531,564      | -1,637,756 |
| Total                             | 4,219,819  | 4,423,058  | 5,163,406       | 5,089,778  |
| Full-time Equivalents Total *     | 35.00      | 35.00      | 31.50           | 30.50      |

<sup>\*</sup>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 proposed, 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$44,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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.

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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$693,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Administration               | 5,530,872 | 6,001,815 | 6,694,970 | 6,727,534 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 35.00     | 35.00     | 31.50     | 30.50     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 proposed 2011-2012 rates and CIP.

|                                   | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures                      | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| 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 proposed 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$38,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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.

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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$945,000.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Customer Service             | 13,850,598 | 13,724,136 | 12,779,098      | 12,819,309 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 91.00      | 91.00      | 87.50           | 86.50      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

| Program Expenditures   | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |  |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
|                        | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |  |
| Debt Service           | 10,743,269  | 5,923,850   | 7,668,581   | 10,923,193  |  |
| Other General Expenses | 83,359,705  | 102,797,491 | 101,560,376 | 104,539,324 |  |
| Taxes                  | 20,320,538  | 18,970,770  | 18,357,000  | 18,971,000  |  |
| Total                  | 114,423,512 | 127,692,111 | 127,585,958 | 134,433,518 |  |

# **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 \$1.74 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 Proposed CIP.

|              | 2009       | 2010      | 2011      | 2012       |
|--------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Expenditures | Actual     | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed   |
| Debt Service | 10.743,269 | 5,923,850 | 7,668,581 | 10,923,193 |

# **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**

Increase budget authority by \$362,000 to provide funding for the renewal of the current yard and food waste composting contract with Cedar Grove, Inc.

Reduce budget authority by \$6.23 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 \$3.06 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 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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$1.24 million.

|                        | 2009       | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Expenditures           | Actual     | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| Other General Expenses | 83.359.705 | 102,797,491 | 101,560,376 | 104,539,324 |

## **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 \$614,000 to correspond to latest projections for payment of taxes, including City Solid Waste Utility Business Taxes.

|              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Taxes        | 20,320,538 | 18,970,770 | 18,357,000      | 18,971,000 |

## **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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| 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       |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

| Program Expenditures               | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| -                                  | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Field Operations                   | 10,353,768 | 11,641,715 | 11,761,008      | 12,061,224 |
| 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  | 2,200,183       | 2,185,226  |
| Total                              | 12,451,900 | 13,951,057 | 14,888,315      | 15,164,376 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total *      | 76.06      | 76.06      | 75.56           | 75.56      |

<sup>\*</sup>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.

The Mayor and the Council are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$60,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$119,000.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Field Operations             | 10,353,768 | 11,641,715 | 11,761,008      | 12,061,224 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 56.00      | 56.00      | 56.00           | 56.00      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

**SPU** 

# 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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP.

|                                    | 2009   | 2010    | 2011            | 2012     |
|------------------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------|----------|
| Expenditures                       | Actual | Adopted | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed |
| 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$19,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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 proposed rates and the proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$77,000.

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

• • • •

• • • •

---

---

<sup>\*</sup> 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$27,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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 \$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 proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$704,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Utility Systems Management   | 1,541,267 | 1,496,584 | 2,200,183 | 2,185,226 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 19.06     | 19.06     | 19.56     | 19.56     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

**SPU** 

## 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 Proposed CIP document.

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

**SPU** 

# **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 Proposed CIP document.

|                      | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures         | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed  |
| 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      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

| Program Expenditures              | 2009       | 2010        | 2011            | 2012       |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|
|                                   | Actual     | Adopted     | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Administration                    | 14,286,477 | 14,108,697  | 14,043,468      | 14,131,359 |
| General and Administrative Credit | -9,479,308 | -11,299,777 | -9,906,163      | -9,912,397 |
| Total                             | 4,807,169  | 2,808,920   | 4,137,305       | 4,218,962  |
| Full-time Equivalents Total *     | 99.60      | 99.60       | 95.60           | 95.60      |

<sup>\*</sup>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 proposed, 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 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$116,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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.

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 proposed CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$65,000.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Administration               | 14,286,477 | 14,108,697 | 14,043,468      | 14,131,359 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 99.60      | 99.60      | 95.60           | 95.60      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

|                                   | 2009       | 2010        | 2011       | 2012       |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures                      | Actual     | Adopted     | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| 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 proposed 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$102,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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 proposed CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$86,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| 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      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| 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      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

| Program Expenditures   | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                        | Actual      | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| 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  | 36,561,293  |
| Total                  | 234,185,147 | 133,688,155 | 134,771,812 | 145,967,427 |

# 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 Proposed CIP.

|              | 2009        | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|--------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures | Actual      | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| 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 proposed CIP.

|                        | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Expenditures           | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed   |
| 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    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Taxes        | 34,326,595 | 38,202,875 | 32,310,846      | 36,561,293 |

## **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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011       | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed   | Proposed  |
| 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     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

| Program Expenditures               | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012            |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| •                                  | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
| Field Operations                   | 21,683,133 | 22,806,690 | 23,113,803      | 22,836,543      |
| 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      |
| Total                              | 42,784,467 | 47,461,792 | 47,143,454      | 46,843,879      |
| Full-time Equivalents Total *      | 291.59     | 291.59     | 277.59          | 277.59          |

<sup>\*</sup>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 3.0 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, 1.0 FTE Capital Projects Coordinator position, and 1.0 FTE Water Pipe CC-WDM II 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.

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 proposed 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$161,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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.

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 proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$307,000.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Field Operations             | 21,683,133 | 22,806,690 | 23,113,803      | 22,836,543 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 131.00     | 131.00     | 128.00          | 128.00     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 proposed CIP .

|                                    | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures                       | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$51,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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 proposed CIP, for a net increase from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$175,000.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| 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     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 are in talks with the Coalition of City Labor Unions to identify mechanisms for reducing labor costs in the face of the City's strained financial situation. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions result in a ratified agreement and commensurate savings for non-represented positions in 'step-in-grade' classifications are applied, this program will achieve \$72,000 in savings. If negotiations with the Coalition of City Labor Unions do not result in an agreement that allows the City to achieve these savings, the Mayor will transmit additional reductions or strategies to address this shortfall to the Council.

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 proposed CIP, for a net decrease from the 2010 Adopted Budget to the 2011 Proposed Budget of approximately \$514,000.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| Utility Systems Management   | 15,512,308 | 16,745,203 | 16,230,741      | 16,332,095 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 134.09     | 134.09     | 125.09          | 125.09     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011            | 2012       |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed   |
| 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      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| 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     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011            | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | <b>Proposed</b> | Proposed  |
| 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      |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012      |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual     | Adopted    | Proposed   | Proposed  |
| 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     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 repair and upgrade water transmission pipelines 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010       | 2011      | 2012      |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted    | Proposed  | Proposed  |
| Water Resources              | 7,853,605 | 15,793,000 | 6,516,169 | 9,347,325 |
| Full-time Equivalents Total* | 12.00     | 12.00      | 12.00     | 12.00     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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 Proposed CIP document.

|                              | 2009      | 2010      | 2011      | 2012     |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Expenditures/FTE             | Actual    | Adopted   | Proposed  | Proposed |
| 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     |

<sup>\*</sup> 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<br>Code | Source  | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|----------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 408000         | Capital Grants and Contributions (excluding donated assets) | 4,775,179       | 5,579,898       | 4,923,250        | 3,073,250        |
| 437010         | Call Center Reimbursement from SCL                          | 1,605,083       | 1,771,877       | 1,676,405        | 1,688,806        |
| 443210         | GIS CGDB Corporate Support (N2408 and N2418)                | 788,093         | 788,093         | 1,148,267        | 1,171,233        |
| 443510         | Wastewater Utility Services                                 | 185,549,161     | 184,057,294     | 191,166,650      | 195,863,814      |
| 443610         | Drainage Utility Services                                   | 58,135,991      | 59,228,823      | 66,379,957       | 73,535,738       |
| 443691         | Side Sewer Permit Fees                                      | 862,089         | 1,160,425       | 862,089          | 862,089          |
| 443694         | Drainage Permit Fees  | 196,505         | 414,521         | 196,505          | 196,505          |
| 469990         | Other Operating Revenues                                    | 151,896         | 97,325          | 159,582          | 162,774          |
| 469990         | Transfer from Construction Fund                             | 38,177,017      | 59,092,577      | 57,418,859       | 63,425,475       |
| 479010         | Operating Grants  | 300,076         | 309,611         | 300,076          | 300,076          |
| 485400         | Other Non Operating Revenue                                 | 242,217         | 0               | 0                | 0                |
| 543210         | GF - Various GIS & Eng Svcs (N4303 & N2418)                 | 661,521         | 1,088,947       | 956,305          | 979,665          |
| 543210         | GIS Maps & Publications (N2409 and 2419)                    | 157,619         | 157,619         | 157,619          | 157,619          |
| 543210         | Parks & Other City Depts. (N4405)                           | 1,126,276       | 1,126,276       | 502,112          | 511,053          |
| 543210         | SCL Fund (N4403)  | 235,404         | 235,404         | 417,525          | 419,176          |
| 543210         | SDOT Fund (N4404)   | 3,692,608       | 3,692,608       | 1,630,363        | 1,670,771        |
| 705000         | General Subfund Transfer In Restore<br>Our Waters           | 103,481         | 106,761         | 183,896          | 187,574          |
| 705000         | GF Reimbursement of Abandoned Vehicles                      | 51,769          | 51,383          | 52,411           | 53,459           |
| 705000         | Technical Adjustments                                       | 0               | 0               | 960,000          | 991,400          |
| Total          | Revenues  | 296,811,983     | 318,959,442     | 329,091,872      | 345,250,477      |
| 379100         | Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital                      | (7,791,575)     | 11,768,458      | 29,757,005       | 27,408,048       |
| Total          | Resources   | 289,020,408     | 330,727,900     | 358,848,877      | 372,658,525      |

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

| Summit |  | 2009        | 2010        | 2011        | 2012        |
|--------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Code   | Source                                   | Actuals     | Adopted     | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| 408000 | Other Nonoperating Revenue               | 1,294,888   | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 416457 | Transfer Fee                             | 1,294,888   | 1,806,842   | 0           | 0           |
|        |  | 77,520      | 1,800,842   | 0           | 0           |
| 416458 | Transfer Fee - Out City                  |             | •           | 202.572     | -           |
| 437010 | Operating Fees, Contributions and grants | 981,660     | 400,000     | 382,573     | 0           |
| 443710 | Commercial Services                      | 43,876,850  | 53,391,629  | 49,396,341  | 49,156,322  |
| 443710 | Residential Services                     | 71,638,049  | 85,375,465  | 93,391,820  | 99,703,623  |
| 443741 | Recycling and Disposal Station Charges   | 11,554,963  | 11,989,267  | 12,752,087  | 12,827,084  |
| 443745 | Comm'l Disposal (Longhaul) Charges       | 388,000     | 628,511     | 476,360     | 476,360     |
| 469990 | Other Operating Revenue                  | 155,229     | 301,488     | 0           | 0           |
| 481200 | Transfers from Construction Fund         | 14,600,168  | 32,400,000  | 23,505,342  | 32,384,827  |
| 485400 | Gain (Loss) on sale of capital assets    | (392,905)   | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 516456 | Landfill Closure Fee                     | 4,133,286   | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 516457 | Transfer Fee - In City                   | 3,817,263   | 3,425,448   | 3,950,780   | 3,925,254   |
| 705000 | Call Center Reimbursement from SCL       | 1,159,702   | 1,771,877   | 1,676,405   | 1,688,806   |
| 705000 | GSF - Transfer In - Aband'd Vehicle      | 51,769      | 51,383      | 52,411      | 53,459      |
|        | Calls                                    |             |             |             |             |
| 705000 | KC Reimb for Local Hzrd Waste Mgt        | 2,418,262   | 2,418,261   | 2,418,262   | 2,418,262   |
|        | Prgm                                     |             |             |             |             |
| Tota   | l Revenues                               | 155,754,703 | 193,960,171 | 188,002,382 | 202,633,997 |
| 379100 | Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital   | 6,491,293   | (302,589)   | 1,662,198   | 4,987,993   |
| 317100 | becrease (merease) iii working Capitai   | 0,471,293   | (302,389)   | 1,002,196   | 4,701,773   |
| Tota   | l Resources                              | 162,245,996 | 193,657,582 | 189,664,580 | 207,621,990 |

### 2011 - 2012 Estimated Revenues for the Water Fund

| Summit        |  | 2009        | 2010         | 2011        | 2012        |
|---------------|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Code          | Source                                 | Actuals     | Adopted      | Proposed    | Proposed    |
| 408000        | GF Lane Related Payments               | 10,246,113  | 0            | 0           | 0           |
| 408000        | Other Non-Operating Revenue            | 3,719,589   | 0            | 243,300     | 246,342     |
| 408000        | Reimbursement for NS activities        | 734,409     | 0            | 180,104     | 182,355     |
| 437010        | Operating Grants                       | 2,001,339   | 0            | 0           | 0           |
| 443410        | Retail Water Sales                     | 130,272,378 | 139,498,906  | 141,204,240 | 157,282,204 |
| 443420        | Water Service for Fire Protection      | 5,670,084   | 5,895,700    | 6,635,300   | 7,390,816   |
| 443420        | Wholesale Water Sales                  | 48,280,764  | 47,500,000   | 47,200,000  | 47,672,000  |
| 443450        | Facilities Charges                     | 173,259     | 200,000      | 173,259     | 346,518     |
| 443450        | Tap Fees                               | 5,263,816   | 7,000,000    | 4,000,000   | 4,050,000   |
| 461110        | Build America Bond Interest Income     | 0           | 0            | 2,135,334   | 2,135,334   |
| 462500        | RentalsNon-City                        | 429,576     | 381,913      | 391,461     | 401,247     |
| 469990        | Other Operating Revenues               | 1,709,287   | 2,652,706    | 1,897,186   | 1,944,615   |
| 479010        | Capital Grants and Contributions       | 3,154,167   | 3,349,911    | 3,142,832   | 3,143,548   |
| 481200        | Public Works Loan Proceeds             | 3,000,000   | 9,000,000    | 0           | 0           |
| 481200        | Transfers from Construction Fund       | 67,705,678  | 87,381,012   | 57,759,482  | 45,612,930  |
| 481200        | Withdrawal from Redemption Fund        | 93,000,000  | 0            | 0           | 0           |
| 485400        | Proceeds on sale of capital assets     | 4,726,259   | 0            | 0           | 0           |
| 543970        | Inventory Purchased by SDOT            | 732,191     | 393,984      | 740,540     | 755,351     |
| 587000        | Op Transfer In - Rev Stab Subfnd - BPA | 1,099,162   | 800,000      | 80,761      | 0           |
| <b>505000</b> | Acct                                   | 0           | 1 500 000    | 1 422 700   | 0           |
| 587000        | Op Transfer In - Rev Stab Subfund      | 0           | 1,500,000    | 1,433,700   | 0           |
| 705000        | Call Center Reimbursement from SCL     | 1,726,044   | 1,825,570    | 1,727,205   | 1,739,981   |
| 705000        | GF Reimb Abandoned Vehicles            | 48,893      | 52,940       | 53,999      | 55,079      |
| Total         | Revenues                               | 383,693,007 | 307,432,642  | 268,998,702 | 272,958,321 |
| 379100        | Decrease (Increase) in Working Capital | (7,902,701) | (14,618,476) | 6,383,135   | 5,219,517   |
| Total         | Resources                              | 375,790,306 | 292,814,166  | 275,381,837 | 278,177,838 |

## **Drainage and Wastewater Fund**

|   | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2010<br>Revised | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Operating Cash at<br>End of Previous Year | 20,760,152      | 9,300,000       | 23,524,844      | 12,600,733       | 9,151,720        |
| Plus: Actual and Estimated<br>Revenue     | 296,811,983     | 318,959,442     | 313,534,365     | 329,091,872      | 345,250,477      |
| Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures    | 289,020,409     | 330,727,899     | 332,272,112     | 358,848,876      | 372,658,524      |
| CIP Accomplishment Assumptions            | 0               | 0               | (8,472,271)     | (8,384,809)      | (9,262,400)      |
| Accounting and Technical Adjustments      | (5,026,882)     | 12,347,983      | (658,635)       | 17,923,181       | 18,085,686       |
| <b>Ending Total Cash Balance</b>          | 23,524,844      | 9,879,526       | 12,600,733      | 9,151,719        | 9,091,759        |

### **Solid Waste Fund**

|   | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2010<br>Revised | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Operating Cash at<br>End of Previous Year | 14,033,102      | 7,438,133       | 3,872,212       | 6,954,985        | 11,466,062       |
| Plus: Actual and Estimated<br>Revenue     | 155,754,703     | 193,960,171     | 172,871,837     | 188,002,382      | 202,633,997      |
| Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures    | 162,245,997     | 193,657,582     | 193,687,940     | 189,664,580      | 207,621,990      |
| CIP Accomplishment Assumptions            | 0               | 0               | (12,808,621)    | (2,924,780)      | (4,011,501)      |
| Accounting and Technical Adjustments      | (3,669,596)     | (1,014,410)     | 11,090,254      | 3,248,494        | 3,203,731        |
| <b>Ending Total Cash Balance</b>          | 3,872,212       | 6,726,312       | 6,954,984       | 11,466,061       | 13,693,301       |

### **Water Fund**

|   | 2009<br>Actuals | 2010<br>Adopted | 2010<br>Revised | 2011<br>Proposed | 2012<br>Proposed |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Operating Cash at<br>End of Previous Year | 7,211,244       | 15,000,000      | 8,193,588       | 7,080,178        | 7,042,350        |
| Plus: Actual and Estimated<br>Revenue     | 383,693,007     | 307,432,642     | 283,119,863     | 268,998,702      | 272,958,321      |
| Less: Actual and Budgeted Expenditures    | 375,790,306     | 292,814,166     | 297,250,519     | 275,381,838      | 278,177,839      |
| CIP Accomplishment Assumptions            | 0               | 0               | (17,144,471)    | (7,910,772)      | (7,098,897)      |
| Accounting and Technical Adjustments      | (6,920,356)     | (24,299,704)    | (4,127,225)     | (1,565,465)      | (1,547,113)      |
| <b>Ending Total Cash Balance</b>          | 8,193,589       | 5,318,772       | 7,080,178       | 7,042,349        | 7,374,616        |