BUDGET

Jan 1976 - Jan/June, 1976

Jan/June, 1976

Unrecorded Subject File

Jan 1976 -

CENTRAL FILE

Budget
6/30

JUN 30 1976

via Mayor Uhlman

The Honorable Wayne Larkin
Councilmember
Seattle City Council
Seattle, Washington

Dear Mr. Larkin:

Confirming the telephone conversation between your assistant, Ms. Susan Reese, and George Fies of our office, we will disregard your letter of June 16, 1976, requesting a current status report of the long-range plan for the spending of the Transit Fund of the Engineering Department. It is our understanding that Councilmember Tim Hill has cancelled this assigment.

Very truly yours,

Sgd Paul A. Wiatrak

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

GEF:pm
cc: Mayor Uhlman
21G

Information	
Concurrence Prior to Signature	
[illegible] 6/29/76	
[illegible] 29 June 76	

Budget
6/30

June 29, 1976

RE: General Fund Loan Repayment

Honorable City Council
City of Seattle
Seattle, Washington

Via: Mayor Wes Uhlman

Honorable Members:

The purpose of this letter is to request the following increased expenditure authorization in the 1976 Budget of the Seattle Engineering Department:

Fund	Dept	Category	Basub	Object	Title	Amount
501	030	1300	543.30	7100	Principal	$575,000
501	030	1300	543.30	7200	Interest	8,600

The increased authorization in object 7100 is necessary for the department to retire a portion of the $1,000,000 General Fund loan to the Engineering Operating Fund. The $575,000 will be derived from the Solid Waste Utility through a loan from Seattle banks as authorized by ordinance #105573 (see letter of 6/22/76, RE: Solid Waste Increased Expenditure Authorization). The remainder of the loan ($425,000) is to be paid over a four year period beginning in 1976. The initial payment of $125,000 is budgeted in the 1976 Budget.

It was anticipated that the $575,000 portion of the loan would be repaid prior to January 1, 1976, so the required interest was not budgeted in the 1976 Budget. The $8,600 increased authorization in object 7200 is to pay this additional interest cost through the Engineering Operating Fund from interest income derived from the Solid Waste Utility.

If you require additional information, please contact the Financial Management Section of Management and Planning (ext. 2381).

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R.R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

TRL:lg
cc: C.T. Criscola

Copy: Solid Waste Utility

Budget

6/29

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

June 29, 1976

Kathy Scanlan, OMB

T. R. Lorenz

1977 Proposed Budget

Forwarded herewith is the Department's Personnel Packet and Data Processing Plan as part of our 1977 Budget submittal. Additional portions of the Proposed Budget will be forwarded for your review as they are completed and the entire submittal will be made available as soon as the Maintenance Management System can be translated into a line item budget in the Maintenance and Operations Program.

If you have any questions, contact me at 2381.

TRL:smh
Attachment

Budget
6/30

June 25, 1976

Honorable Wes Uhlman
Mayor
City of Seattle

Attention: Walter R. Hundley, Director
Office of Management and Budget

Dear Mayor Uhlman:

Attached is the 1977 Operating Budget submittal of the Seattle Engineering Department. Per OMB's instructions, the General Fund request is 90.4% of the adjusted 1976 General Fund budget level.

Two additional demands for General Fund monies have matured during 1976--each of which has been handled separately. First, 1977's traffic control operation for the Domed Stadium will cost approximately $119,400. This is a newly budgeted and, now, on-going expense. Second, the initial expenditure of General Fund ($561,700) for the purchase and installation of the remaining 5,784 replacement parking meters has not been budgeted. We have recommended, in a separate appropriation request, that these meters be purchased prior to September 30, 1976, to take advantage of the manufacturer's guaranteed price. The supplemental budget contains a request of $674,470 to highlight the fact that if a separate General Fund appropriation is not adopted, the cost of the replacement program will increase by approximately $112,770.

This year's budget submittal contains all of the financial data requested by OMB. It also contains narrative amplification of activities which are reshaping the products and processes of the department. The program plans, evaluative criteria and budget issue narratives examine the special concerns of the department and OMB.

Finally, it should be noted that the proposed budget is balanced. The variable overhead rates currently in effect are sufficient to meet 1977 projected overhead costs given the proposed staffing level. Any surplus in overhead recoveries will be applied to 1975 underrecoveries and to offset the impact of any further decline in the direct labor base. The current emphasis on workload planning, manpower scheduling, reorganization, etc. will continue in 1977, to insure congruous staffing and funding levels.

Very truly yours,

Sgd Paul A. Wiatrak
PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

Concurrence Prior to Signature	
RRP	

LAG:smh
Attachment

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

MEMORANDUM

June 28, 1976

To: All Budget Analysts

From: Bob Cowan Bob

Subject: Solid Waste Collection/Disposal Charges; Outstanding General/Emergency Fund Loans

In your review of 1977 Budget requests, you should assure that provision is made for estimated Solid Waste Collection/Disposal Charges and repayment of debts to the General and Emergency Funds. These items are summarized below.

Solid Waste Collection/Disposal Charges

Traditionally, the City has paid for solid waste collection/disposal for municipal facilities via an appropriation (lump sum) in Finance-General (1976 amount of $78,000). The State Auditor, in his 1974 report, found this to be unacceptable in a finding which is attached, in which it is stated that direct billing would be implemented in 1976 for all services rendered.

To insure that sufficient funds are available in 1977 to provide for these charges, you should insure that the following departmental budgets include the amounts as indicated. NO FUNDS FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION/DISPOSAL WILL BE BUDGETED IN FINANCE-GENERAL IN 1977.

Building	$18,830
DCD	680
L/CA	65
Engineering	29,070
Fire	7,435
General Services	3,090
Health	14,900
Human Resources	745
Library	6,775
Light	4,310
Police	1,670
Water	540
Parks	34,360
Human Rights	240

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
GB=		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
JUL 7 8 55 AM '76

Also attached are copies of the Engineering letter regarding this subject and some notes compiled by OMB.

General/Emergency Fund Loans

To amortize debts owed to the General and Emergency Funds based on agreements in 1974, you should insure that sufficient funds are provided in departmental budgets as indicated to repay principal and interest as noted below:

General Fund Loans

	Principal	Interest
General Services	$ 10,000	$ 1,650
Engineering Operating	100,000	15,000
Building Operating	50,000	---
Parking Commission	5,000	---
Solid Waste	---	---

Emergency Fund Loans

Design Commission	$ 4,500	---
Housing/Abatement Revolving	10,000	---
Parking Commission	2,000	---
Industrial Insurance	50,000	4,000

If you have any questions on this, see me during your budget review.

RVC:mr

Attachment

cc: Mayor Wes Uhlman
Superintendent Al Petty
Paul Schell
Virginia Galle
Paul Wiatrak
Frank Hanson
Gary Bloomquist
Dr. Lawrence Bergner
Curt Green
Ron Dubberly
Gordon Vickery
Robert Hanson
Ken Lowthian
Dave Towne
Vivian Caver
Jack Driscoll

Budget
6/24

June 22, 1976

RE: Solid Waste Increased
Expenditure Authorization

Honorable City Council
City of Seattle
Seattle, Washington

Via: Mayor Wes Uhlman

Honorable Members:

The purpose of the letter is to request the following increased expenditure authorization in the 1976 Budget of the Solid Waste Utility:

Fund	Dept.	Category	Basub	Object	Title	Amount
450	032	3100	534.40	3700	Public Utility Services	$4,633,000
450	032	3100	534.40	7100	Principal	525,800

The increased authorization in object 3700 is necessary for the utility to meet the cost of collection contracts in 1976. At the time the 1976 Budget was prepared, it was decided to budget only that amount necessary to cover collection costs for the first three months of the year; or $1,042,700. Now that the contracts for the full year have been finalized, it has been determined that the total collection cost will amount to $5,675,700 in 1976.

The increased cost is to be recovered via revenue derived from ordinance #105544 which increases certain garbage and rubbish collection and disposal charges as of July 1, 1976.

The increased authorization in object 7100 is necessary to allow sufficient authorization in the 1976 operating budget of the Solid Waste Utility to repay an outstanding loan of $575,000 to the Seattle Engineering Department Operating Fund of which $49,200 is already budgeted leaving an additional requirement of $525,800.

The funds to repay the loan will be derived from the $2,100,000 loan from Seattle banks as authorized by ordinance #105573.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R.R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

TRL:lg
cc: G.B. Fairbanks
C.T. Criscola

Budget

Engr C.F.

MSC:mlk
6-2-76
E.N

ORDINANCE 105621

AN ORDINANCE relating to and providing for payment of certain costs and expenses incurred by various City Departments in 1975; increasing expenditure allowances by reappropriation and transfer, making appropriations from the Central Freeway Municipal Garage Improvement Fund (1972) and from the Sewer Fund, making reimbursable appropriations from the Emergency Fund and declaring the emergency therefor, and ratifying and confirming prior expenditures.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That the unexpended and unencumbered balances in the following designated Objects of Expenditure for identified Projects and Program Categories in the 1975 Budgets of the indicated Departments are hereby abrogated and decreased in the amounts indicated and reappropriated and transferred to the designated Projects, Program Categories, and Objects of Expenditure in said Budgets in the amounts indicated as follows:

POLICE DEPT

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT
From:	104064	010	001	2200	1110	$352 475 00
To:	104064	010	001	1100	1110	112 000 00
					3900	320 00
				2200	3800	150 300 00
					6400	20 000 00
				3100	2200	20 00
				3200	3800	350 00
				3300	6400	5 900 00
				3400	2510	640 00
				3400	6400	2 400 00
				4200	2510	515 00
				4300	3190	10 000 00
				4400	1110	200 00
					3330	450 00
				5200	6400	1 200 00
				5300	1110	3 900 00
					3800	380 00
				5400	1110	1 200 00
					3800	14 300 00
					6400	27 500 00
				5500	2200	900 00
						352 475 00 Total

Copies:
Park Dept - Central Freeway Park
M1 - Interlaken Dr E
Sewer Rehab
Ord 104609 (See Sec. 4)

CSS 19.2

ENGINEERING DEPT

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	030	501	1100	3190	$ 4 000 00	
				1200	6400	50 00	
				1400	1110	6 000 00	
					3190	63 000 00	
				1500	2200	3 000 00	
				2100	3190	3 235 00	
				2200	1110	45 000 00	
				2300	3190	6 000 00	
				2400	3800	2 500 00	
				2500	3190	2 300 00	
				2600	1110	26 000 00	
				2700	2200	3 000 00	
				2900	1110	29 000 00	
				5100	3190	33 000 00	
				6100	1110	48 185 94	
						274 270 94	Total
To:	104064	030	501	1100	1110	6 163 37	
				1200	3190	3 134 18	
				1300	1110	24 229 69	
				1500	1110	9 341 72	
				2100	1110	3 235 00	
				2300	1110	6 171 95	
				2400	1110	4 487 73	
				2500	1110	59 701 98	
				2700	1110	50 108 13	
					6400	2 661 19	
				2800	3800	11 145 04	
				5100	1110	52 179 90	
				8100	1110	5 348 26	
				9100	1110	36 362 80	
						274 270 94	Total

SEWER UTILITY

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104329	031	371	95083000	3190	630 34	Total
To:	104054	031	371	71652700	3190	630 34	Total
From:	104064	031	440	4100	3192	26 000 00	Total
To:	104064	031	440	4100	1110	26 000 00	Total

SEATTLE CENTER

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	040	114	2100	1110	$ 225 00	
				2200	3190	1 850 00	
				3700	1110	45 350 00	
				2300	2100	1 925 00	
				3200	1110	600 00	
				3400	1110	2 300 00	
						52 250 00	Total

CSB 19.2

SEATTLE CENTER (continued)

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
To:	104064	040	114	1100	1110	225 00	
					3190	1 850 00	
				2300	3190	1 925 00	
				2200	1110	9 175 00	
				2500	1110	6 075 00	
				3100	1110	6 500 00	
				3300	1110	600 00	
				3400	2100	2 300 00	
				3500	1110	10 000 00	
				3600	1110	13 000 00	
				3900	1110	600 00	
						52 250 00	Total

ARTS COMMISSION

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	041	515	50000	1110	$ 1 181 09	
				95248000	3190	19 266 12	
				80000	3190	6 557 74	
						27 004 95	Total
To:	104064	041	515	95213000	3190	1 181 09	
				60000	3190	19 266 12	
				50000	1110	1 363 04	
				60000	3190	2 411 30	
				70000	3190	553 40	
				50000	6400	2 230 00	
						27 004 95	Total

PUBLIC HEALTH

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	050	508	2700	1110	$ 34 749 45	
				2500	1110	26 843 86	
				3100	1110	26 788 69	
				3300	1110	554 01	
		050	508	4500/95163000	2200	20 33	
						88 956 34	Total
To:	104064	050	508	1100	3190	4 313 35	
				1500	6400	291 50	
				2200	3190	19 156 17	
				2700	2200	27 870 35	
				2700	6400	2 274 25	
				3100	3190	26 788 69	
				3300	3190	554 01	
				4500	3190	7 687 69	
				4500/95163000	6400	20 33	
						88 956 34	Total
From:	104220	050	199	95036200	1110	80 00	Total
To:	104220	050	199	95036100	1110	80 00	Total

CSB 19.2

PARK DEPT

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	060	102	1100	1110	$ 21 626 88	
					3190	5 583 82	
				1200	1110	41 021 01	
					2200	1 700 63	
				1300	1110	19 163 98	
				1400	6400	7 174 50	
				1500	1110	61 916 33	
				2200	1110	8 552 74	
				2100	6400	10 000 00	
						176 739 89	Total
To:	104064	060	102	1100	2200	3 619 98	
				1200	3190	503 83	
					6400	149 11	
				1300	3190	8 500 00	
				1400	1110	21 231 62	
				1400	3190	22 800 99	
				1500	2200	50 456 06	
					3190	18 105 97	
				2200	3190	2 641 59	
				3100	1110	877 40	
					2200	924 11	
				2200	6400	10 000 00	
				1400	2200	35 239 17	
				1500	6400	1 690 06	
						176 739 89	Total
From:	101999	060	199	93150200	3190	231 77	Total
To:	101999	060	199	93156000	3190	231 77	Total
From:	105126	060	318	11504	3190	878 19	Total
To:	98999	060	318	11502	3190	878 19	Total
From:	104064	060	509	90000	2200	700 00	Total
To:	104064	060	509	90000	3140	700 00	Total

LIBRARY

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	070	104	1100	1110	$ 37 800 00	
				3200	1110	61 030 00	
						98 830 00	Total
To:	104064	070	104	1100	2100	115 00	
				1200	1110	6 150 00	
					2100	15 00	
				1300	2100	1 150 00	
				1400	1110	3 200 00	
					2200	3 750 00	
					3800	18 000 00	
				2200	1110	43 600 00	
				2300	1110	2 025 00	
					2200	1 300 00	

CBS 19.2

LIBRARY (continued)

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
To:	104064	070	104	2400	1110	16 650 00	
					3190	75 00	
				3100	3190	5 00	
				3400	2200	45 00	
				3500	6400	2 750 00	
						98 830 00	Total

EXECUTIVE DEPT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT & BUDGET

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	102447	102	119	92040000	1120	$ 16 467 04	Total
To:	103547	102	119	94249000	1120	1 635 45	
	103547	102	119	94275000	1120	14 831 59	
						16 467 04	Total

PERSONNEL

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	103	505	2100	1110	$ 12 768 00	Total
To:	104064	103	505	2100	3190	12 768 00	Total

EXEC. CITIZENS SERVICE BUREAU

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	104	001	1300	2200	$ 185 00	Total
To:	104064	104	001	1300	1110	185 00	Total

EXEC. I.G.A.

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	105	001	1400	3140	$ 11 000 00	Total
To:	104064	105	001	1400	1110	11 000 00	Total

EXEC. OFFICE OF POLICY PLANNING

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	107	001	6100	3190	$ 11 000 00	
				6200	3190	2 200 00	
				6300	2100	2 500 00	
					6400	2 500 00	
						18 200 00	Total
To:	104064	107	001	6100	2100	2 000 00	
					6400	9 000 00	
				6200	2100	2 200 00	
				6300	3190	5 000 00	
						18 200 00	Total

CBS 19.1

COMPTROLLERS

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	130	001	1100	1110	$ 5 950 00	
				1300	1110	4 360 00	
					2100	2 331 00	
						12 641 00	Total
To:	104064	130	001	1100	3900	$ 5 950 00	
				1200	1110	4 360 00	
					2100	2 331 00	
						12 641 00	Total

TREASURERS

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	140	001	1100	3190	$ 30 00	Total
				1200	3800	70 00	Total
To:	104064	140	001	1100	2100	$ 30 00	
				1200	2100	70 00	
From:	104064	140	510	1300	3200	1 010 00	Total
To:	104064	140	510	1300	2100	1 004 00	
					6400	6 00	
						1 010 00	Total

LICENSES & CONSUMER AFFAIRS

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	160	001	1200	3190	$ 3 907 61	Total
To:	104064	160	001	1200	1110	1 850 20	
				1300	1110	76 06	
				1400	1110	1 981 35	
						3 907 61	Total

LAW DEPT

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	170	001	1200	1110	$ 144 43	Total
To:	104064	170	001	1100	3900	81 53	
				1300	3900	62 90	
						144 43	Total

CIVIL SERVICE

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	180	001	1400	1110	$ 4 050 00	
				1200	2100	300 00	
					3150	1 700 00	
						6 050 00	Total
To:	104064	180	001	1100	1110	5 950 00	
				1400	2100	100 00	
						6 050 00	Total

EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	190	601	1100	3110	$ 1 050 00	Total
To:	104064	190	601	1100	1110	1 050 00	Total

HUMAN RIGHTS

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	200	001	1300	1110	$ 1 530 00	Total
To:	104064	200	001	1100	3900	952 00	
				1200	1110	425 00	
					3900	75 00	
				1300	2510	78 00	
						1 530 00	Total

GENERAL SERVICES

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	230	503	2300	3500	$ 25 500 00	
				4200	3900	4 000 00	
				5100	3600	1 275 00	
				5200	3900	39 500 00	
						70 275 00	Total
To:	104064	230	503	2300	2400	25 500 00	
				4200	1110	4 000 00	
				5100	1110	1 275 00	
				5200	1110	39 500 00	
						70 275 00	Total

DEPT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	102462	240	119	93247200	6500	$ 445 00	Total
To:	102415	240	119	93225000	6500	445 00	Total
From:	104064	240	511	1200	3190	9 550 00	
				1300	2200	2 000 00	
				1400	2100	90 00	
					3190	464 00	
				2100	1110	12 373 00	
				2200	1110	9 548 00	
				2500	3190	13 925 00	
						47 950 00	Total
To:	104064	240	511	1200	1110	4 650 00	
					2100	2 000 00	
					6400	2 900 00	
				1300	6400	2 000 00	
				1400	1110	4 000 00	
				2100	2100	2 025 00	
					3190	20 000 00	
				2200	2100	600 00	
				2500	1110	9 500 00	
					2100	275 00	
						47 950 00	Total

MUNICIPAL COURTS

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	302	001	1200	1110	$ 23 600 00	
					6200	11 310 00	
						34 910 00	Total
To:	104064	302	001	1200	3500	23 600 00	
		303	001	1300	3900	11 310 00	
						34 910 00	Total

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	380	513	4100	1110	$ 100 00	
				4200	3800	415 00	
				4300	3800	1 375 00	
				1100	3190	25 100 00	
				1400	3800	200 00	
						27 190 00	Total
To:	104064	380	513	4100	3190	100 00	
				4200	2200	415 00	
				4300	2200	315 00	
				5100	1110	420 00	
					3800	640 00	
				1100	1110	22 900 00	
					6400	2 200 00	
				1400	1110	200 00	
						27 190 00	Total
From:	105781	380	320	104781	6500	13 170 00	Total
To:	101066	380	320	20650300	6500	13 170 00	Total

WATER DEPT

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	400	430	2100	1110	$ 12 000 00	
				2300	3190	94 000 00	
				3300	2290	209 453 00	
				4200	1110	61 460 00	
				4300	2200	950 00	
				5200	1110	900 00	
					2200	319 00	
				5300	2200	1 718 00	
				5400	1110	9 200 00	
				6300	2290	91 470 00	
				6400	1110	1 035 00	
				6300	6400	26 700 00	
						509 205 00	Total

CBB 19.1

WATER DEPT (continued)

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT
To:	104064	400	430	1100	1110	$ 2 800 00
					3330	1 900 00
				1200	1110	5 800 00
					3330	1 500 00
				2200	1110	75 000 00
					2100	9 200 00
					3190	113 500 00
				2300	1110	10 300 00
					2170	2 110 00
				2600	1110	7 028 00
					6300	550 00
				2700	2190	250 00
				3300	1110	965 00
					3330	46 500 00
				3400	3700	38 050 00
				4100	1110	1 700 00
					6300	60 00
				4300	3330	950 00
				4400	2200	19 500 00
					4290	40 200 00
				5100	1110	1 200 00
					3210	19 00
				5300	4290	1 718 00
				5400	4290	9 200 00
				6100	1110	6 400 00
				6200	1110	2 500 00
					3110	5 070 00
				6300	1110	7 500 00
				6400	2290	1 035 00
				7100	3110	96 500 00
					7220	200 00
						509 205 00 Total

LIGHT DEPT

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT
From:	104064	500	410	1200	0110	$511 575 00
					0450	50 158 00
				1300	0110	54 907 00
				1400	0660	82 736 00
				2100	0340	174 750 00
				2200	0300	75 681 00
				3200	0110	4 876 00
				3300	0110	6 000 00
				4100	0110	21 000 00
				4200	0110	38 000 00
				5100	0110	232 000 00
				5200	0110	30 300 00
				7000	1040	333 000 00
				9000	0310	47 000 00
						1 661 983 00 Total

CSS 19.1

LIGHT DEPT (continued)

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
To:	104064	500	410	1100	0110	$449 533 00	
					0310	30 432 00	
					1030	31 610 00	
				1200	0310	50 158 00	
				1300	0220	13 196 00	
					1030	41 711 00	
				1400	0270	82 736 00	
				2100	0460	174 750 00	
				2200	0110	74 876 00	
					0220	805 00	
				3200	1040	4 876 00	
				3300	0660	6 000 00	
				4100	0470	5 000 00	
					1040	16 000 00	
				4200	0220	5 000 00	
					0470	33 000 00	
				5100	0320	19 000 00	
					0470	134 000 00	
					1010	79 000 00	
				5200	0360	3 500 00	
				5300	0110	2 900 00	
					0360	2 500 00	
					0450	400 00	
				5300	1030	21 000 00	
				7500	1040	333 000 00	
				9000	0110	25 000 00	
				9000	0450	22 000 00	
						1 661 983 00	Total

BUILDING DEPT

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	102833	800	502	6502	1110	$ 133 16	
	104064	800	502	1200	1110	41 822 19	
				1300	1110	10 397 57	
				1400	1110	15 845 02	
				2100	1110	18 622 86	
					3900	1 398 97	
				2300	2200	1 418 29	
				3100	1110	51 34	
				3200	2200	202 56	
				3300	1110	3 761 67	
				3400	1110	14 161 12	
				3600	3900	539 58	
				3700	1110	1 768 48	
				3800	3190	18 068 09	
				4100	2200	1 520 43	
				4100	6400	316 64	
				2300	1110	1 999 62	
						132 027 59	Total

CBS 18.2

BUILDING DEPT (continued)

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
To:	104064	800	502	6517	1110	$ 133 16	
				1300	3190	1 997 57	
				1400	3190	59 666 83	
				2100	2200	98 97	
				2200	1110	40 799 00	
					6400	1 300 00	
				2300	3200	11 710 76	
				3100	2200	51 34	
				3200	1110	202 56	
					6400	3 761 67	
				3400	2200	1 373 80	
				3400	6400	203 63	
				3600	1110	539 58	
				3700	3900	1 768 48	
				4100	1110	6 198 54	
					3190	2 221 70	
						132 027 59	Total

FINANCE GENERAL

	ORD.	DEPT	FUND	PROGRAM/PROJECT	OBJECT	AMOUNT	
From:	104064	900	001	3190	3190	$ 1 225 01	
To:	104064	900	001	3114	3110	985 75	
				3200	3200	239 22	
				4115	4100	04	
						1 225 01	Total

Section 2. That to effectuate the transfers authorized in Section 1 hereof, the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants.

Section 3. That in addition to the appropriation made for the construction of the Central Freeway Parking Garage by Ordinance 102601, the sum of Thirty-five Thousand Dollars ($35,000) is hereby appropriated for such purpose from the Central Freeway Municipal Garage Improvement Fund (1972), and the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants and make the necessary transfers.

Section 4. That in addition to the appropriation made for the Interlaken Drive East sewer relocation study by Ordinance 104609, the sum of Eight Thousand Six Hundred

CSS 19.2

Forty-six Dollars ($8,646) is hereby appropriated from the Sewer Fund as a utility expenditure not contemplated in the 1975 Budget of the Sewer Utility; and the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants and make the necessary transfers.

Section 5. That to provide for certain reimbursable construction expenses incurred by the Building Department, in 1975 the sum of Four Hundred Twelve Thousand Dollars ($412,000) is hereby appropriated from the Emergency Fund to be reimbursed by the appropriation and transfer hereby made and authorized as of January 1, 1975, of a like amount from the Building Department Operating Fund, and the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants and make the necessary transfers.

Section 6. That to provide for certain expenses incurred by the Design Commission in 1975, the sum of Five Hundred Seventy-three Dollars and Ninety-Six Cents ($573.96) is hereby appropriated from the Emergency Fund to be reimbursed by the appropriation and transfer hereby made and authorized as of January 1, 1975 of a like amount from the Design Commission Operating Fund; and the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants and to make the necessary transfers.

Section 7. That expenditures in accordance with the appropriations and transfers made and authorized by this ordinance prior to the effective date hereof are hereby ratified and confirmed.

Section 8. WHEREAS, the appropriations herein made are to meet actual necessary expenditures of the City for which insufficient appropriations have been made due to causes which could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time of making the 1975 Budget; Now, Therefore, in accordance

with RCW 35.32A.060, by reason of the facts above stated and the emergency which is hereby declared to exist, this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon the approval or signing of the same by the Mayor or passage over his veto, as provided by the Charter of the City.

PASSED by three-fourths vote of all the members of the City Council the 14 day of June, 1976, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 14 day of June, 1976.

President of the City Council

Approved by me this 18 day of June, 1976.

Mayor

Filed by me this 18 day of June, 1976.

ATTEST: _____
City Comptroller and City Clerk

By: _____
Deputy

(SEAL)

Published _____

CSB 19.2

Budget

Seattle City Council

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
JUN 22 12 44 PM '76

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
WGV		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
PAW		

Sam Smith
President of the Council
625-2455

George E. Benson
Chairman
Transportation Committee
625-2441

Tim Hill
Chairman
Finance Committee
625-2438

Paul Kraabel
Chairman
Planning & Urban Development Committee
625-2447

Phyllis Lamphere
Chairman
Intergovernmental Relations Committee
625-2436

Wayne D. Larkin
Chairman
Utilities Committee
625-2443

John R. Miller
Chairman
Parks & Public Grounds Committee
625-2451

Randy Revelle
Chairman
Public Safety & Justice Committee
625-2445

Jeanette Williams
Chairman
Human Resources & Operations Committee
625-2453

June 16, 1976

Paul Wiatrak
City Engineer
City of Seattle
Seattle, Washington 98104

Dear Paul:

Councilman Tim Hill, Chairman of the City Council's Finance Committee, has delegated budget responsibilities to Councilmembers regarding the 1976 Second Interim Budget Review to take place between July 26 and 30, 1976.

One of my assignments is to prepare a detailed report regarding the current status of the long-range plan for the spending of the Transit Fund of the Engineering Department. My presentation is scheduled to take place on July 29, 1976 at 10:30 a.m. Accordingly, I would appreciate your office providing me with a status report in writing on the aforementioned subject. Please submit in writing the subject report no later than Monday, July 12.

My office will be getting in touch with you in the near future to schedule any necessary preliminary meetings that may be required. I am informing you of this request at this time in order to give your Department as much lead time as possible so as to aid Department in the preparation of the summary report. Thanking you in advance for your cooperation in this regard.

Sincerely,

Wayne

WAYNE D. LARKIN, Chairman
Utilities Committee
Seattle City Council

WDL:svc

P.S. Please plan on joining me on July 29 at 10:30 a.m. in the City Council Chambers for the above presentation.

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

MEMORANDUM June 7, 1976

To: All Department Heads

From: Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director Walter R. Hundley by RC

Subject: City Council Statement of Issues and Policies for the 1977 Budget and 1977-82 Capital Improvement Program

x Policy
x CIP

Attached for your review are copies of a letter from Mayor Uhlman to the City Council and a memorandum from the Directors of the Offices of Management and Budget and Policy Planning to Mayor Uhlman on the 1977 Statement of Issues and Policies (SIPS). Both of these documents reflect a basic Executive position on the SIPS, and I strongly encourage each of you to review these documents in their entirety, with particular reference to those areas which affect your departments.

If you have any questions concerning these documents, please feel free to contact your budget analyst or me.

WRH:RVC:mr

Attachment

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
JUN 10 8 30 AM '76

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
bc PAW		
PMB		
AEM		
RKP		
WEPS		

JGR
WGV

Your City, Seattle

Office of the Mayor
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

May 21, 1976

The Honorable Sam Smith, President
and Honorable Members
The Seattle City Council
The City of Seattle

Dear President Smith and Members:

I have reviewed the City Council's adopted 1977 Statement of Issues and Policies for the 1977 Budget and 1977-82 Capital Improvement Program, as have the directors of the Offices of Management and Budget and Policy Planning whose agencies are most directly affected by it. Because the 1977 "SIPS" addresses the mutual goal of the Executive and Legislative Branches to continue to improve the City's budgetary and policy setting processes, it is a most important statement, and deserves a full and clear response.

At the outset, I must state that SIPS raises a number of critical issues of procedure and substance concerning the respective roles of the Executive and Council in the preparation of the operating and capital budgets this year. In many of its specific statements and requests and in its overall thrust, SIPS has implications which I find most disturbing, and which regretfully require me to strictly limit the extent of Executive participation in the Council's Second Interim Budget Review.

There are three measures which I have applied in interpreting SIPS and gauging the proper Executive response. They are (1) the division of Executive and Legislative responsibility for preparation of the budget as established by RCW 35.32A and practice over the past several years; (2) the accountability of OMB, OPP, and departments to the Mayor in the preparation of budgets and policies; and (3) the structure and limits of Executive budget and policy processes as constrained by time, capacity, and resources.

Taking each in turn, state law establishes as the Mayor's responsibility the preparation of the budget and supervision of its execution through his budget director. In establishing "how (the Council) desires the Executive to respond in preparing the Budget and CIP," SIPS clearly runs the risk of trespassing upon this Executive province. Compliance with the myriad requests in SIPS would have the Executive presenting to the Council analyses and recommendations which constituted substantial portions of the proposed budget fully two months before it is normally due. Further, it would place the Council at the time of its Second Interim Budget Review in the position of

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

passing upon or formulating policy and financial instructions to the Executive in preparing the Executive budget.

More directly, compliance with SIPS in its present form would clearly have the Council directing major portions of the activities of OMB and OPP; in and of itself, SIPS would be a virtually full work program for OMB. The requests in SIPS do not take into account the tasks which these agencies have already been assigned, but more importantly SIPS tend to obscure their roles and status as Executive agencies which exist to assist me in carrying out my duties as chief executive officer. If their basic accountability to me in the preparation of the budget is undermined, then inevitably, my accountability to the public and the Council for the proposed budget is undermined. This is not to suggest that the assistance of OMB and OPP is not available to the Council; it has been in the past and I will continue to make it available in the future.

If these fundamental concerns did not prevent me from responding more positively to SIPS, sheer timing and mechanics would. As I stated earlier, compliance would require in real terms either a two month compression or truncation of the Executive budget preparation process. The Council is requesting some 18 separate major reports bearing directly on the proposed budget, to be presented at a point when OMB would have reviewed fewer than half of the departments' budgets. The SIPS document itself came two weeks after the supplemental budget letters were sent to departments by OMB, which would have been the proper forum for some of the requests. Therefore, compliance would require adding new work to an already overburdened schedule which has OMB staff at their most intense activity, performing preliminary analyses and reviewing departmental requests. Further, even if production were possible, I would not have the ability at the time of the Second Budget Review in late July to consider my recommendations in the context of the City's overall budget needs and constraints.

In this last regard, I have directed OMB to follow the established budget preparation schedule, which the Council has had for several months, and I have instructed them that reviewing departmental requests and formulating their recommendations to me is their highest priority activity. On this basis the Budget Director has advised me that neither he or the Program Budget Manager or the Financial Economist will be able to participate in the Second Budget Review. I have similarly directed OPP to follow its current work program for the CIP and other planning, and to not make commitments for operating budget related activities unless I so authorize. The attached memorandum from Walt Hundley and Woody Wilkinson explains in greater detail the extent to which they will be able to respond to SIPS requests.

I am also instructing departments to cooperate as much as possible in the Interim Budget Review, responding to queries about current status, progress, evaluation, etc. I further intend that departments not speculate about the 1977 Executive Proposed Budget during the Interim Review since OMB and I will not have thoroughly reviewed the budget requests.

I will close by saying that I am personally disappointed at not being able to respond more favorably to SIPS. I share the Council's desire to build greater opportunity in the City's budgeteting process to identify, analyse, debate, and decide the key policies which should govern our limited operating and capital resources to best meet the community's needs. I share the Council's frustration with the pressure and pace under which both major policy and financial minutiae must be juggled in the current process. And I believe that the solutions to these problems can only be reached through Executive/Legislative cooperation in designing and carrying through refinements to the current budget process.

Avoiding the kinds of difficulties and lost opportunities which have been addressed here should be one of our highest priorities in looking forward to 1977 and the process for 1978. Our goal should be to develop a budget policy process which surfaces for both branches the key issues at the earliest possible stage in the budget process, as was done with Statements of Legislative Intent in adopting the 1976 Budget; which permits full discussion and agreement upon mutual concerns or policies before April in order that they could be treated in the preparation of the proposed budget; and which establishes clear and reasonable tasks upon which each branch could organize and prioritize its resources and time for preparing and reviewing the budget.

The Executive is prepared to participate with the Council and assist in developing such improvements. It is my sincere hope that difficulties such as those reflected in this letter can be avoided in the future.

Sincerely,

Wes Uhlman
Mayor

WU:wco

Attachments

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

Walter R. Hundley, Director
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

May 21, 1976

TO: Honorable Wes Uhlman, Mayor

FROM: Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director and
R.W. Wilkinson, Jr., Director, Office of Policy Planning

RE: Statement of Issues and Policies for the 1977 Budget and 1977-82 Capital Improvement Program

The Offices of Management and Budget and Policy Planning have reviewed the above referenced Council Issues Statement (SIPS) and are jointly preparing this memorandum to advise you of our thoughts on the document. OMB and OPP concur that the SIPS represent an attempt to further open lines of communication between the Legislative and Executive branches, a move we encourage and applaud. On that basis, we believe that the SIPS represents a positive step in a much longer term process.

At the same time, both OMB and OPP must express serious concern over the general tenor and tone of the SIPS. We are concerned about the timing of the SIPS and the directive nature of the document, as well as many of the specific issues. We will address each of these in turn.

Timing of the SIPS

While I am sure you are aware of your statutory responsibilities for budget preparation as Mayor, under RCW 35.32A, we would like to briefly review these responsibilities and lay out for you the timetable for 1977 Executive budget preparation. We are doing this to lay out the basic framework established for budget preparation, particularly the timing of that preparation, and because that timetable has a definite impact upon not only the timing of the release of the Issues Statement, but on later sections of this memorandum as well.

Under the provisions of RCW 35.32A.020 and RCW 35.32A.030, responsibility for preparation of the budget and supervising its execution is vested with the Budget Director under your direction. Departmental budget preparation requirements are clearly laid out in RCW 35.32A.030, including the requirement that all Departments submit to you revenue and expenditure estimates in such detail and form and at such time as you may prescribe. Under this statute, you are required to submit to the City Council the proposed budget not later than 90 days prior to the beginning of the ensuing fiscal year.

To meet these statutory responsibilities, the Office of Management and Budget was created and it established a timetable and process for Executive budget preparation which extends over a fourteen month period for every fiscal year. While the approximate timetable is laid out in the Budget Manual, we would like to recap that schedule and expand upon part of it. We would like to relate this to preparation of the 1977 Budget.

November-December, 1975
OMB begins preparation of the 1977 revenue/expenditure forecast based on the Adopted 1976 Budget.

January, 1976
OMB finalizes 1977 revenue/expenditure forecasts and begins preliminary Budget Manual preparation based on tentative budget guidelines. You are briefed on projected 1977 budget status.

February, 1976
Second Mayoral review of 1977 budget status, finalization of budget guidelines and intense preparation of the Budget Manual.

March, 1976
Finalization and printing of Budget Manual, preparation of budget forms and supplemental budget letters.

April, 1976
Distribution of Budget Manual, forms and other required information. Analysts work with Departments on preparation of Organization Memoranda, Organization Charts and budget letter issues.

May-June, 1976
OMB work program period and Departmental request preparation. Analysts work closely with Departments in budget preparation, specifically in the areas of budget format and issue analysis.

July-August, 1976
OMB's most intense work period. OMB pre-hearings and Departmental hearings following OMB budget review and analysis. Particularly during this period, but during other phases of the cycle as well, you are kept constantly informed of the progress on the budget. On average, you spend approximately six hours per week in briefings with OMB staff on the status of the budget. To give you some idea of the extent of OMB commitment to budget review and analysis, we have attached a copy of Budget Manual pages 020:10 and 020:11, identifying

the projected OMB pre-hearing and hearing schedule for July and August, 1976. We would emphasize that the pre-hearings and hearings are the culmination of OMB's review process, following hours of work and meetings and substantial correspondence between OMB analysts and Department staff.

September, 1976
Final Mayoral review of the Budget, Mayor's "Court of Last Resort", and preparation of the Proposed Budget document and supplemental budget documentation for submittal to the City Council.

October-November, 1976
City Council review and public hearings on the Proposed Budget. OMB works closely with the Council in explaining the Budget and supplemental budget documentation, providing responses to Council requests and working with Council staff in finalizing the Adopted Budget. We might note that during the Council's review of the 1976 Budget, OMB provided responses to over 200 Council requests for information, generally on a 24-48 hour turnaround. Each of these requests involved research by OMB analysts, preparation of the response and often an explanation of the review and findings.

OMB also prepares supplemental or revised Proposed Budgets during October and November as a result of labor settlements or changes in revenue/expenditure forecasts.

OMB provided the Council for the 1976 Budget, six volumes of material, and this does not include the basic Budget document nor the copies of the Departmental requests provided to the Council.

Please remember that during this entire time, OMB must also supervise the execution of the 1976 Budget, meet its own project work program and respond to Council requests for information and analysis of pending legislation.

We have gone through this process of laying out the Executive Budget cycle for two reasons: first, we are concerned that the final Statement was not provided until April 12, 1976 -- two weeks after Executive Supplemental Budget letters were sent to Departments -- and, second, we are very concerned that the Council is requesting that you present, between July 26 and July 30, a substantial portion of your Executive Budget. With regard to the

first concern, while OMB and OPP had copies of many drafts of the Issues Statement, many of them were substantively changed in the Council review process, and as a result, in some areas OMB was uncertain as to the Council's position and excluded many items from Departmental budget letters. While this is not an insuperable problem, earlier transmission of the Issues Statement would have enabled OMB and OPP to clearly address these issues in the budget letters.

The second area is of much more concern to us, as the Issues Statement requests that OMB and/or OPP prepare or participate in the preparation of 18 separate reports which bear directly on the 1977 Proposed Executive Budget at a point in time when you have reviewed less than half the Departmental budgets and have had virtually no opportunity to provide the Executive overview necessary to balance and prioritize the competing demands of all City Departments for scarce resources. This is particularly true in a year when you have directed OMB to take certain administrative actions to reduce the 1976 Budget expenditures and have asked all General Fund supported City Departments to submit basic budget requests for 1977 at 90% of 1976 Adopted Budget levels.

We do not intend through these comments to categorically reject the Issues Statement. Such a suggestion would be counterproductive to our mutual goal of increased Executive/Legislative discussion of policy responsibilities, be it in the area of Budget development or other concerns. You have offered the assistance of OMB and OPP to the Council many times in areas of mutual concern, and we are sure you will continue to do so in the future. We had hoped, however, that the Issue Statement would provide us with a process of identifying those areas of mutual concern and providing the combined weight of the Executive and Legislative to issue review in preparing the Budget. Further, the Issues Statement should provide a process by which the Council organized and prioritized its own resources -- auditing, analysis and review -- in advance of receiving the Proposed Budget. In its present form, we feel the Issues Statement goes far beyond a reasonable or practicable number of identified issues for comprehensive review and analysis, and does not prioritize the use of Council resources in these areas.

Specific Issues Statement Issues

Before addressing specific issues in the Statement, we must express some concern over the preamble to the document for we believe our previously stated concerns are reflected by the statements in the preamble.

In one section of the preamble, it is stated that the purpose of the Issues Statement:

> . . . .is to provide advance notice and guidance to the Mayor and City Departments as to what the City Council perceives to be the most important policy and program issues to be dealt with and how it desires the Executive Branch to respond in preparing next year's Budget and CIP. (Emphasis added.)

Later, a reason for the Second Interim Budget Review is given as:

> . . . .(the Council hopes to improve the Budget and CIP process by establishing a basis for earlier policy exchange and issue identification between the Executive and Legislative Branches.

We do not believe that "policy exchange and identification" are a precursor to "how it (the City Council) desires the Executive Branch to respond in preparing next year's Budget and CIP," nor a work program for OMB and OPP.

Cross-Departmental Issues and Policies

1. Uncertain Federal Revenues. OMB has provided the City Council (much to OMB's chagrin at times) with ongoing briefings regarding City budgetary matters, if you have deemed such briefings of critical importance. OMB cannot, however, one-half way through its review process, present a report as requested which may bear no relationship to later reality -- either on the revenue side or the expenditure side.

2. Productivity in City Government. OMB is presently in the process of reviewing a preliminary Personnel report on personnel appraisal systems. Following completion of the Executive review and the formulation of an Executive recommendation, we feel this should be forwarded to the Council. Similarly, any Executive proposal for a Merit Pay System or Executive Compensation Plan should be forwarded to the Council as soon as that proposal is finalized.

3. New Programs and Staffing. OMB will not be prepared to present to the Council any information on proposed new programs until the entire budget review process is completed.

4. General Fund Balance. OMB will provide you with recommendations on the use of "excess" General Fund balances, and we believe your proposal in this area should be presented with the Budget on October 1st.

5. Taxation and Fees

   a. OMB and Licenses and Consumer Affairs, as an ongoing part of the License Code revision, are reviewing all of these areas. Upon completion of those sections, based on the adopted schedule, requests for appropriate legislative changes will be made.

   b. OMB forwarded to the Council two years ago a report on this subject. OMB's work plans do not contain this element.

6. Implementation of Adopted Plans and Policies. OPP is in the process of preparing "policy abstracts" for the referenced documents which will be forwarded to the City Council when completed. Neither OMB nor OPP feel that the preparation of instructions to Departments on preparing their budgets is appropriate. Policy issues relating to existing policy plans or directives should be surfaced throughout the Executive budget process and will be referred to you for your decision.

7. Housing Functions. Within the Building Department budget letter, issues were identified for budgetary review which should address the financial implications of the performance of City housing functions and sources of funds to support those functions. OMB will not be prepared in July, however, to present this review and further believes it inappropriate to do so at that time. This should be accomplished in the Budget review process.

   We might note that at least from OMB's perspective, if the Council audit of the Housing Conservation Division in the Building Department is to be a useful tool for policy determination, it should be multi-departmental in scope and should address the issues identified here.

8. Environmental Management. The organization of environmental functions is subsumed in the larger SEPA issue and development of program recommendations will be dictated by the progress of the Task Force (which is the lead agency) on that issue.

9. CETA Jobs. As a statement of Council intent, we have no comment.

10. City Office Space. OMB and the Building Department have consistently provided the City Council with information and recommendations based on City Council time schedules and are presently awaiting further Council deliberations on this matter.

11. Improvements in Budget Documentation

a. 1978 Revenues and Expenditures. OMB is in the process of developing a recommendation on this area.

b. Supplemental Budget Detail. OMB intends to provide this information, but probably in a handwritten format to provide documentation for IFS input.

c. Actual Performance. OMB intends to provide this information.

d. Annual Salaries. OMB is investigating the possibility and desirability of this move.

e. Detailed Organization Charts. OMB projects that the provision of detailed charts containing all of the information required will add up to 300 pages to the Budget. It is not OMB's intent at the present time to add this to the Budget, as it is redundant of most information required in the Departmental Budget requests.

12. Improvements in the CIP Process and Documentation. In general, process improvements intended to correct problems with last year's CIP have been made in the 1977 process. OPP has not, however, made a recommendation to you on how to handle the development of an "unfunded CIP".

13. Compliance with State BARS Requirements. The Budget Director has stated the Executive position with regard to this matter.

Departmental Issues and Policies

1. Police Department

a. Crime Priorities. Police, OMB and OPP/LJPO have been in discussions regarding reflecting this policy in the Police budget. Neither OMB nor the Department will be prepared to discuss how the 1977 Budget will address these priority crimes in July.

b. Patrol Operations. (1 and 2). Neither OMB nor the Department will be prepared to describe recommended management/operational changes as a result of the Patrol Manpower Study or alternative 1977 Budgets based on 50% vs. 40% 2-man cars in July.

c. Precinct Stations. The CIP Policy Paper will discuss the Precinct Station issue and will contain a recommendation to you on how the City should proceed.

2. Fire Department

a. Manpower Deployment Study. As stated in the 1976 Adopted Budget, results of the Manpower Deployment Study will be available to affect the 1977 Budget process. Neither OMB nor the Department will be prepared to indicate to you in July, however, if any stations and/or engine companies will be recommended for decommission in the 1977 Budget.

b. Fire Clean-Up. OMB and the Department will review this area in the context of the Budget.

c. Office of Emergency Services. OMB will review the operation of the OES in the Budget process.

3. Parks and Recreation Department

a. Zoo Fee. If the Executive proposes a zoo fee for 1977, the requested information will be provided as documentation of such a request, when that request is made. We might note that with the exception of items (3) and (6), OMB has provided this information to the Council for two consecutive years.

b. Arthur Young. This area will be covered in the 1977 Budget.

c. Sicks Stadium. The City Council is holding the ultimate disposition of Sicks Stadium in abeyance until a firm bid for purchase has been received.

d. Forward Thrust and Population Changes. The CIP will treat a large number of Parks capital issues, including a discussion of a process for the reprogramming of Parks Forward Thrust.

4. Executive Department

a. OPP:

(1) Citizen Participation
OPP is proceeding on the development of an Executive Citizen Participation Policy, per discussions with the Mayor's Office, OMB, DHR/CSC, and the

Council. A policy recommendation will be submitted to the Council on June 28th after your review.

(2) CIP Transference
In the development of its own 1977 Budget, OPP will review the placement and structure of a number of the functions assigned to it, including the CIP. However, OMB and OPP now view transfer of the CIP to OMB as one of the options OPP will be considering.

(3) Legislative Audit
OPP will consider the findings of the Legislative audit in the preparation of its budget, but its flexibility to incorporate such findings is severely restricted by the fact that the audit will be completed after submission of the proposed budget to OMB.

(4) Policy Abstracts
OPP will prepare the "Policy Abstracts" requested by the Council, but cannot undertake any other activity described on page 4; Item 6.a. Further discussion is necessary with the Council and their staff to refine the format and content of these abstracts, and any Council evaluation of OPP performance in this regard should reflect such understandings.

(5) Intergovernmental Relations Committee
Intergovernmental Relations Committee Chairman Lamphere has requested such recommendations be presented to her committee on May 31, along with a salary review of the two professional positions in IGA performed by Personnel/Civil Service. OPP is working to this date rather than the Second Interim Budget Review.

b. Personnel/Civil Service:

(1) Performance Appraisal and Executive Compensation
Personnel and OMB are currently reviewing a Performance Appraisal System proposal. Following Executive review and the formulation of an Executive recommendation, this will be forwarded to the Council. A similar procedure will be followed with respect to an Executive Compensation Plan.

(2) Civil Service Improvements.
This is an ongoing area of concern and review by both Personnel and OMB.

c. OMB:

(1) Data Processing Limitation
The Data Processing Plan, with all proposed City expenditures, will be presented to the Council with the Proposed Executive Budget.

(2) Interlocal Agreement
OMB/MIS and the County are reviewing a draft Interlocal Agreement on data processing. Upon completion of this review, negotiations on finalizing the document will begin, prior to review by both Executives and both Councils.

d. Purchasing:

(1) Purchasing Audit
Review of this audit took place in the First Interim Budget Review.

5. Building Department

(1) and (2). Report on property inventory system and a complete inventory of general municipal properties. OMB has received a property inventory systems analysis from the Building Department and is presently reviewing the proposal. OMB and the Building Department will provide a written status report on these areas for the Second Interim Review.

6. Engineering Department

a. Task Force Report. OMB and Engineering will provide a written status report on EFIS, but neither will be prepared to discuss staffing or organizational changes in the Engineering Department for 1977 at the Second Interim Review. It should be noted that this was the position of OMB at the time the Task Force resolution was initially adopted.

b. Resource Recovery Project. SWAP staff will continue to provide the City Council with briefings on an ongoing basis on the status and progress of the project.

7. Finance Department

a. Comptroller:

(1) IFS Status and (2) Audit Program Status
OMB/MIS and the Comptroller will provide a written status report on IFS at the Second Interim Review. Questions on the audit program should be directed to the City Comptroller.

8. Human Resources

a. Departmental Transfers. While OMB and the Department are constantly exploring ways in which Departments and programs can be run more efficiently and effectively, no directives have been given to those agencies to explore the dismantling of either DHR or any other City Department. At this time, OMB does not intend to propose the transfer of programs to any other agency from DHR.

We might note a couple of points in this area. First, the Division of Human Services in the Health Department, to which the aging division is suggested for transfer, is a County-only agency, not funded in any way by the City. And second, with regard to the youth employment programs transfer to Personnel/Civil Service, OMB proposed this once, it was rejected by the City Council, and the Executive and DHR now agree that this program belongs in DHR.

9. City Light - Rate Increases

All of the areas covered will be addressed in the context of the Rate Increases and Budget Review or the CIP. However, in items (a), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), the requested information may or may not be presented in the requested format. For example, in item (b), OMB will certainly review and analyze potential employee reduction plans, with an emphasis on the areas covered. However, "preparation and implementation of an employee reduction plan for 1977" may or may not be accomplished, contingent on the recommendations of OMB and City Light to you.

10. Law Department - Codification

This is an object of concern to OMB, and will be reviewed in the context of the Executive Budget preparation.

11. Health Department

Review of King County assumption of administrative responsibility for the Health Department is an ongoing work project of both OMB and the King County Budget Office. A progress report will be made in the context of the 1977 Proposed Budget.

12. Seattle Center

a. Organizational Structure and b. Cost Accounting System. Both of these areas will be reviewed in the context of Budget preparation, and the Budget or supplemental documentation will address the results of those reviews.

13. General Services

a. Fleets and Shops. This will be covered in the Budget.

b. Telephone charges. OMB will review this area in the context of Budget preparation.

WRH/RWW/RVC/dj

020:10

JULY, 1976

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
12 Board of Ethics Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 9:30 Board of Public Works Pre-Hearing 10:00 - 11:00	13	14 CSB Pre-Hearing 10:00 - 11:00	15 Board of Ethics Hearing 9:00 - 10:00 Board of Public Works Hearing 10:30 - 12:00	16 DCD Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:30 Water Pre-Hearing 1:30 - 4:00
19 CSB Hearing 9:00 - 10:30 Law Pre-Hearing 2:00 - 4:00	20 Personnel/ Civil Service Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:30 DHR Pre-Hearing 1:30 - 3:30	21 Purchasing Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:00	22 Parks Pre-Hearing 1:30 - 4:00	23 Law Hearing 9:00 - 11:30 DCD Hearing 1:30 - 4:30
26 Police Pre-Hearing 8:30 - 11:30 Water Hearing 1:30 - 4:30	27 Comptroller Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:00 Treasurer Pre-Hearing 1:30 - 3:00 Retirement Pre-Hearing 3:30 - 4:30	28 Personnel/ Civil Service Hearing 9:00 - 12:00 Engineering Pre-Hearing 1:30 - 4:30	29 DHR Hearing 9:00 - 11:30 Purchasing Hearing 2:00 - 4:00	30 Women's Rights Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 10:00 Human Rights Pre-Hearing 10:30 - 12:00

029 Tentative Pre-Hearing and Hearing Schedule - The following indicates the dates on which OMB anticipates discussion of departmental Budget Requests. This schedule is for planning purposes and is subject to change, but tentatively identifies pre-hearing and hearing dates:

AUGUST, 1976

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
L/CA 2 Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:00	Police Hearing 3 1:00 - 5:00	Parks Hearing 4 8:30 - 12:00	Municipal Court 5 Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:30 Comptroller Hearing 1:30 - 4:30	Treasurer 6 Hearing 9:00 - 10:30 Engineering Hearing 1:00 - 5:00
Women's Rights 9 Hearing 9:00 - 10:30 Human Rights Hearing 10:30 - 12:00 Fire Hearing 1:00 - 5:00	Building 10 Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 12:00 Retirement Hearing 1:30 - 3:00	Seattle Center 11 Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:00 Health Pre-Hearing 1:30 - 4:30	Light 12 Pre-Hearing 8:30 - 11:30 L/CA Hearing 2:00 - 4:30	Library 1 Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:30 Municipal Court Hearing 1:30 - 4:30
OPP 16 Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:30	General Services 17 Pre-Hearing 8:30 - 11:00 Arts Commission Pre-Hearing 2:00 - 4:00	18 Health Hearing 1:00 - 5:00	Building 19 Hearing 8:30 - 12:00 Seattle Center Hearing 1:30 - 4:30	Public Defender 2 Pre-Hearing 9:00 - 11:00 Light Hearing 1:00 - 5:00
23 Library Hearing 1:30 - 4:30	24 OPP Hearing 9:00 - 12:00 General Services Hearing 1:00 - 4:30	25 Arts Commission Hearing 9:00 - 11:00 020;11	26 Public Defender Hearing 10:00 - 12:00	2

030 Forms and Format - Following each section of the Budget Manual are samples of the forms and/or format that departments are to use in preparing Budget Requests. The Sample Budget, section 900, shows examples of completed forms and the sequence of presentation to OMB. Forms are available from OMB; formats require departments to use 8½x11 white paper and to type the required heading and information.

Information from the Position Information Control System (PICS) is presented to departments on OMB FORM #3, Position Detail Worksheet. PICS is the official source of currently authorized positions.

The Integrated Financial System is the source of information for expenditure data. The information is provided on the Expenditure Detail Worksheet, OMB FORM # 4. This worksheet will not be a "turnaround" document for the 1977 Budget Request. Instead, to accommodate the Base and the supplement requirements, OMB FORM #44 will be submitted. Departments should use the worksheet (#4) as an internal document and prepare expenditure requests on FORM #44.

Forms and Use - The necessary forms and their uses are as follows:

OMB FORM NO. 1a, DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET SUMMARY - a brief narrative from the departmental view;

OMB FORM NO. 1b, DEPARTMENTAL EXPENDITURE AND PROGRAM SUMMARY - a summary by objects of expenditure and program structure;

OMB FORM NO. 2, PROGRAM PLANS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA - Use as many copies of this form as needed, but do not use this form for miscellaneous justification or explanation of personnel or expenditures; format of this form is outlined in detail in Part III of this manual;

OMB FORM NO. 3, POSITION DETAIL WORKSHEET - This is the PICS worksheet (See Appendix I-A);

OMB FORM NO. 44, EXPENDITURE DETAIL REQUEST - Footnote any significant increases or decreases in line items; this is the IFS printout. (See Appendix I-A)

OMB FORM NO. 5a, REVENUE ESTIMATE PROJECTION - Use as many copies of this form as needed;

OMB FORM NO. 5b, UNEXPENDED FUND BALANCE ESTIMATE - Use this form and footnote rationale;

Budget

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

May 28, 1976

6-1

Kathy Scanlan - OMB

Lynn Guttmann

Proposed 1977 Position Reductions

The following is a summation of the programs and associated positions which are in the 1976 operating budget, but are currently expected to not be included in the 1977 operating budget:

1. Organization: Program Category 1400 - Administrative Technical Support
   Fund Sources: CIP
   Reductions due to workload and funding deficiencies.

   1 Engineering Aide
   1 Specialist, Civil, Asst. II (May be filled on an as needed basis depending upon CIP workload)

2. Organization: Program Category 1500 - Street Use & Franchise Utility
   Fund Sources: General Fund and Sewer Fund
   WOFAC Recommended Reductions:

   1 Clerk, Intermediate - Converting to automated billing procedures, and part-time or contractural employment may be used to meet peak situations.

   1 Spec. Engr. Civil Asst. I - Some part-time needs may occur
   1 Spec. Engr. Field Asst. I
   4 Spec. Engr. Field Asst. II - Some part-time needs may occur
   2 Spec. Engr. Field Asst. III

   These reductions should produce a General Fund savings of $45,360 during 1976.

3. Organization: Program Category 2000 - Maintenance and Operations
   Fund Sources: CIP and reimbursable accounts
   General Note: This position listing is subject to change pending the outcome of the Maintenance Management System Study.

   A. Reductions in equipment pool and asphalt operations are, for the most part, related to Asphalt Paving programs in which the section will no longer participate owing to SB 2143 legislation.

   <u>Pool Operation</u>:
   2 Operators, Construction and Maintenance Equipment, Sr.
   1 Operator, Construction and Maintenance Equipment, Jr.
   1 Oiler
   1 Driver, Heavy Truck

   <u>Asphalt Paving Operations</u>:
   1 Operator, Construction and Maintenance Equipment, Sr.
   2 Operators, Construction and Maintenance Equipment, Jr.
   4 Drivers, Truck (general)
   2 Rakers, Asphalt
   1 Laborer, Utility

Req verbal
LAG

B. 1 Engineer, Asst. Civil III - Position presently vacant.

C. Stabilize and Seal Coat program has eliminated the need for unimproved road surface maintenance needs in the City. However, the loss of two patrol graders and four dump trucks will affect SMD's capability in snow control response.

2 Operators, Construction and Maintenance Equipment, Jr.
4 Drivers, Dump (general)
1 Laborer, Maintenance
1 Laborer, Utility
6 Laborer, General

D. Reductions in concrete paving are owing to a projected loss of reimbursable work, i.e., utility restoration. This is a work reduction which the section is presently confronting:

1 Foreman, Street Maintenance I
1 Cement Finisher
3 Truck Drivers (general)
2 Laborers, Maintenance

4. Organization: Program Category 5100 - Traffic & Transportation
Fund Sources: CIP & CSF

1 Intermediate Clerk
2 Asst. Civil Engr.
1 Engr. Aide

5. Organization: Program Category 6100 - Construction Management
Fund Sources: CIP
Reductions due to reduced workload and WOFAC recommendations.

2 Chainman, Survey
2 Chief, Survey Party, Senior
1 Engineer, Civil Assoc.
1 Specialist, Engr. Civil Assoc.
1 Specialist, Field Engr. Assoc.
3 Specialists, Field Engr. Asst. II
1 Instrumentman, Survey

6. Organization: Program Category 9100 - Engineering Design Division
Fund Sources: CIP
Redactions due to shifting workload and reorganization.

1 Engineer, Asst. Civil I
1 Engineer, Student (8 mos.)
1 Specialist, Engr. Civil Asst. II

From the information now available, it is the intent of the Engineering Department to either leave these positions vacant, if they are currently vacant, or to vacate them at the beginning of 1977. During this period of funding constraints, each request to fill a position vacancy will include a statement regarding the import and organizational rationale for the request.

No annualized 1976 dollar savings have been correlated with the planned 1977 position reductions. This is not an ommission, but an effort to highlight that,

B. 1 Engineer, Asst. Civil III - Position presently vacant.

C. Stabilize and Seal Coat program has eliminated the need for unimproved road surface maintenance needs in the City. However, the loss of two patrol graders and four dump trucks will affect SED's capability in snow control response.

2 Operators, Construction and Maintenance Equipment, Jr.
4 Drivers, Dump (general)
1 Laborer, Maintenance
1 Laborer, Utility
6 Laborer, General

D. Reductions in concrete paving are owing to a projected loss of reimbursable work, i.e., utility restoration. This is a work reduction which the section is presently confronting:

1 Foreman, Street Maintenance I
1 Cement Finisher
3 Truck Drivers (general)
2 Laborers, Maintenance

4. Organization: Program Category 5100 - Traffic & Transportation
Fund Sources: CIP & CSF

1 Intermediate Clerk
2 Asst. Civil Engr.
1 Engr. Aide

5. Organization: Program Category 6100 - Construction Management
Fund Sources: CIP
Reductions due to reduced workload and WOFAC recommendations.

2 Chainman, Survey
2 Chief, Survey Party, Senior
1 Engineer, Civil Assoc.
1 Specialist, Engr. Civil Assoc.
1 Specialist, Field Engr. Assoc.
3 Specialists, Field Engr. Asst. II
1 Instrumentman, Survey

6. Organization: Program Category 9100 - Engineering Design Division
Fund Sources: CIP
Redactions due to shifting workload and reorganization.

1 Engineer, Asst. Civil I
1 Engineer, Student (8 mos.)
1 Specialist, Engr. Civil Asst. II

From the information now available, it is the intent of the Engineering Department to either leave these positions vacant, if they are currently vacant, or to vacate them at the beginning of 1977. During this period of funding constraints, each request to fill a position vacancy will include a statement regarding the import and organizational rationale for the request.

No annualized 1976 dollar savings have been correlated with the planned 1977 position reductions. This is not an ommission, but an effort to highlight that,

given the adopted service levels, the currently projected attrition related savings of General Fund will be consumed within the department during 1976. Two factors necessitate the expenditure of currently budgeted General Fund:

(1) In March, the department adjusted the internal overhead rate: the average overhead rate was raised from 68.7% to 75.4%. This difference must be absorbed by source funds. If additional funds are not available, payments for services must be reduced to meet payments for overhead expenses. A downward spiral then ensues, in which personnel are laid off to save source funds, but this in turn reduces the amount of overhead funds generated. The spiral continues downward until a balance is achieved between the number of personnel and the overhead expenses. In this process, services are reduced, personnel are laid off; morale and production suffer. To avoid this spiral effect, the General Fund "savings" associated with the staff reductions in Street Use and Franchise Utility have, in part, been earmarked for absorbing overhead rate increases.

It is interesting to note that the overhead rate increases are generally related to the increased costs of fringe benefits.

DEPARTMENTAL OVERHEAD PERCENTAGES

	Actual 1973	Actual 1974	Actual 1975	Jan.-Feb. Actual 1976
Fringe Benefits	39.23%	41.97%	46.30%	52.02%
Admin. & Misc.	20.57%	22.92%	25.64%	21.20%
Total	59.80%	64.89%	71.94%	73.22%

In 1975, all retroactive salary payments were an overhead cost. Percentages less retro pay would have been:

Fringe Benefits	46.30%
Admin. & Misc.	22.71%
Total	69.01%

Note the steady increase in fringe benefit costs since 1973. Also, Admin. & Misc. expenses have declined since 1974 and are now running at about 6/10 of a percent above the level experienced in 1973.

(2) The other significant demand for General Fund relates to the difference between the equipment rates stipulated in the 1976 Budget Manual and the actual 1976 billings for leased equipment. The actual rates are approximately 29.4% higher than the budgeted rates. In the attached memo, Joe Ralph estimated that this situation would produce a shortfall of $35,000. A major portion of the General Fund "savings" will have to relieve this deficit, if service levels are to remain stable.

If you need any additional information, please call me.

LAG:lg
Attachment
cc: M-Staff

Budget
5/19

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

May 18, 1976

Kathy Scanlan, OMB

T.R. Lorenz

Transmittal of SED Program Plans

Transmitted herewith are two (2) copies of the Department's Program Plans for the years 1975 - 1976 - 1977. The plans do not include any of the activities performed by Maintenance and Operations.

The plans identify desired service levels for 1977 and do not include any departmental reductions which will be identified in the Department's 1977 Supplemental Budget request.

If you have any questions, contact me at ext. 2381.

TRL:lg

Budget
5/3

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

May 3, 1976

E. L. Kidd - Comptroller Attention: June Smith

L. A. Guttmann

Department Budget Summary (Year-End 1975) Fund 316 Arterial Development Fund

Your attention is invited to the following discrepancy:

Ordinance No. 103350 dated June, 1974, abandoned $86,600 of unexpended funds appropriated by Ordinance No. 99921 dated May, 1971, and relating to the improvement of 15th Avenue N. W.

The Budget summary referred to above reflects that a balance of $4,490 remains available under Ordinance No. 99921.

REC:mh

Budget
4/29

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

April 28, 1976

City Comp
E.L. Kidd Attn: June Smith

L.A. Guttmann

Department Budget Summary (Year-end 1975) Fund 316 Arterial Development Fund

Your attention is invited to the following descrepancy:

Ordinance No. 104451 dated April 2, 1975 abandoned the unexpended funds in the appropriation made by Ordinance 99950 relating to landscaping for S. Dakota and S. Alaska Streets.

The Budget summary referred to above reflects that a balance of $12,138 remains available under Ord. 99950.

REC:lg

Budget

4/28

April 22, 1976

Re: 1976 Budget Reductions, Traffic Operations

Councilman George E. Benson
Transportation Committee
Seattle City Council

Via Mayor Wes Uhlman

Dear Councilman Benson:

The 1976 budget provided for a reduced level of service in several areas of Traffic Operations. These areas included reduced sign maintenance, reduced crosswalk painting, and reduced guardrail maintenance. These reductions were selected after a careful study of the hazards involved and all reductions that would have resulted in a safety problem were rejected. None of the reductions involved our annual repainting of center lines and lane lines. Our normal paint season is just underway and we anticipate the repainting of all center lines during the next few months.

In the area of sign maintenance, the reduction in service is primarily concerned with informational and residential parking signing. As an example, we are repairing damaged street name signs where possible, but not replacing destroyed or stolen units. We are also limiting our replacement of residential parking control and parking time limit signs. These signs are only replaced if an investigation reveals that a hazard would result without them.

We are presently involved in the preparation of our 1977 budget and a Maintenance Management Program. In both of these areas, we are evaluating the cost of full scale maintenance and the restoration to pre-1976 levels of service.

With regard to reprograming funds to traffic control activities, we believe certain of our signing and channelization activities should be eligible for A.C.S.F. funding. These relate to where a "change, i.e., betterment" is being made, for example, installation of a "load zone" sign where none existed. These funds could not be used to replace "in kind" an existing old "load zone" sign, as we would consider this a maintenance activity. Until we determine the extent of eligibility, we cannot determine

what the impact will be on the capital programs. It should not be severe, however, this is our prime source of matching funds.

Your specific inquiries are being addressed in the development of our 1977 performance budget - the preliminary submission for which is scheduled for the end of June.

If we may delay response concerning the financial costs for these activities until that time, we will have considerably improved our ability to answer objectively.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Sgd Paul A. Wiatrak

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

CTM:ksl
cc: Mayor Wes Uhlman

Concurrence Prior To Signature	
PAW	
AEM	
WGV	
JGR	
CTM	
REO	

Perhaps we should add something to explain Mr B's concern re $ painting. i.e. last year was an abnormal year & not all $ we slipped due to weather not lack of funds (also due to paint machine?)

Budget

4-22 ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

April 21, 1976

W.R. Hundley, Budget Director Attn: Kathy Scanlan

A.E. Maronek

SED Revised Organization Memorandum

Attached you will find the Engineering Department's revised OM which identifies and describes the program and goal structure for 1977. As prescribed in the Budget Manual the OM is in two parts: Departmental Summary and Program Detail.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Lynn Guttmann or Tom Lorenz at ext. 2381.

TRL:lg
Attachment

Budget

Mr. Paul Wiatrak

Seattle
Board of Public Works

Betty L. McFarlane, Executive Secretary
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
PAW		
JGR		
AEH		

Re: General Services Vehicle Lease Rates

Mr. W. R. Hundley, Director
Office of Management and Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

We have learned today that a memorandum has been written by you indicating the need for an outside consultant to audit General Services accounting and management efficiencies. A task force meeting was set up for tomorrow.

Tomorrow morning is the meeting of the Board of Public Works task force which is presently compiling and reviewing information on the same subject for report back to the Board of Public Works. So that there is no duplication of efforts we would recommend that the user departments' input be utilized by the consultant in his review of General Services.

We would appreciate being filled in on your plans as soon as possible so that we may know what direction to take.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

Betty L. McFarlane

Betty L. McFarlane
Executive Secretary

Orig: GSD
Copy: Equip Rental

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
APR 15 9 11 AM '76

BLM:mn

cc: Gary Bloomquist
Board of Public Works Members
City Light
Engineering Department
Police Chief
Task Force

GSD

Board of Public Works Department, 303 Municipal [illegible]
Board of Public Works: Paul A. Wiatrak, P.E., Chairman [illegible]
Kenneth M. Lowthian, Supt. of Water [illegible]

Budget
4/15

G. Bloomquist, Director, General Services Department

J. G. Ralph
Principal Assistant City Engineer
Vehicle Fleet Lease Rates

April 15, 76

Reference: Letter, Board of Public Works Department, dated 4-1-76

This regards the recent inquiries by the committee on lease rates through the Board of Public Works.

Following review of the information which you provided the committee at its last meeting, and considering the involvement of my staff in the rate setting procedures, I am satisfied that the lease rate methodology employed by G.S.D. is sound, and the data used, credible.

In terms of unbudgeted expenses, the impact to this Department does not appear to be of a magnitude comparable to other City users, although it is a matter which must be confronted internally and resolved in the most appropriate manner.

My staff is presently developing some recommendations which I hope may favorably impact the cost of vehicle maintenance in the near future. I will transmit this information to you upon completion.

Aside from the budget implications, prompted by the 1976 lease rates, I would like to comment on several aspects of related issues raised during B.P.W. meetings.

1. Billing for C.E.T.A. Labor - Billings to user departments for the cost of C.E.T.A. labor used in fleet maintenance is, in my opinion, clearly inappropriate. This policy has apparently been in effect since March of 1975 and has never been formally communicated to this Department.

   Supervisory costs and on-the-job training for C.E.T.A. personnel, as with the Emergency Employment Act (E.E.A.), are understood to be matching costs borne by the organization benefitting from C.E.T.A. employees. Your supervisory costs - as indicated in several of your communications about rate setting, are completely assumed in overhead calculations applied to your MTD shop rate, leasing overhead, and Department overhead allocations to each of your revenue centers.

   MTD supervision - whether directed to routine activities or to C.E.T.A. employees - is supposedly "funded" through overhead sources.

   The only invoice received by this Department which clearly indicated use of a C.E.T.A. employee, was billed at the 1975 standard shop rate, rather than at an "average rate" as you implied. (Item 14, B.P.W. Issues Statement.)

Yellow: General Services Dept
Copies: Budget
Equip Rental

During July of last year, our two Departments exchanged voluminous written discussion over our concern about large increases to fleet maintenance costs. Two conclusions reached at that time were:

1) S.E.D. had been furnished erroneous labor and materials percentage increments for 1975 thereby making our own estimates significantly overstated; and

2) That even though the S.E.D. fleet was static between 1974-75, the Department's use of Fleets and Shops services increased, and consequently, so did the expenses.

Actually, 1975 costs (Kind Codes A-F) were $146,000, or 20% above 1974's experience - far below our original dismal prospectus - but twice that of your calculations (memo, July 7, 1975, Attachment I, p. 2, table 1.1).

The year-end figures make me question whether or not the inclusion of C.E.T.A. labor in the billings significantly aggravated those costs.

2. Item 5, (b) of the B.P.W. Issues: Following transfer of E. R. and R. equipment to G.S.D., we have noticed a sharp rise in special maintenance billings. Our observations are that some routine or unscheduled maintenance work is being billed as special maintenance (please refer to the attached invoice). This should be corrected.

3. I am most interested in a clarification of the statement that G.S.D. has moved from a "fully funded to revolving fund for equipment". The attachment dated 4-1-76 (Doolittle to File) should be expanded.

Previous to 1970 (or 1966-1970), G.S.D. apparently was able to maintain replacement reserve solvency using a straight-line depreciable basis against acquisition costs, plus an 8% surcharge. I can only surmise that the 8% surcharge revenues collected from users who maintained a large owned fleet (e.g., S.E.D., City Light), and whose equipment was replaced through their own accumulated reserves rather than by G.S.D.'s Operating Fund, provided the flush condition during this period. Certainly, the cash difference between replacement costs and cumulative depreciation on in-service costs had to come from some source.

Excluding consideration of the E. R. and R. vehicles, why hasn't G.S.D. modified its rate recovery basis to one which considers replacement costs?

Your 1975-1976 lease rates for Non-E. R. and R. vehicles now include factors of 20% and 8% against the annual straight-line depreciation recovery. Surely, this posture promises a reversal of your deficit cash flow - for Non-E. R. and R. vehicles City-wide.

I would appreciate your comments on the above subjects. Thank you.

REO:ksl
Att.
cc: J. B. Randall
R. E. Orton

Concurrence Prior To Signature	

CITY OF SEATTLE
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES
MOTOR TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

ACCIDENT		DAMAGE

GE TO 1

ESTED BY [illegible]

START DATE (12 16)

JOB NO. (17-21)

SHOP FOREMAN

(22 27) 1[illegible]

LIC. NO. D23085

MAKE [illegible]

SPEEDOM C 2161

LOCATION (2-3)

EQUIPMENT REPAIR ORDER (5-11) H 04923

(58) REASON FOR REPAIR 1

2 3 4 5 6 7

(59) PRIORITY

(60-67) SYSTEM

WORK INSTRUCTIONS

[illegible] CONTINUED ON WORK ORDER #H04990

[illegible]

LF [illegible]

[illegible]

CONTINUED ON WORK ORDER # #H 4990

LABOR

NAME	HOURS	AMOUNT
Platt CETA	2.0	
BoxRZ	6.0	

(52 54) AM TOTAL HOURS 8.0

(55-57) ES TOTAL HOURS

COMP DATE (68 72) 12 26 75

MATERIALS USED

QUAN.	DESCRIPTION	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT

TOTAL PER ADDITIONAL SHEET

SERVICE CHARGES:

OUTSIDE WORK	(73 80)	O	
MATERIAL	(28 33)	M	
LABOR	(34 39)	L	128 —
SERVICE CHARGE	(40 45)	S	
TOTAL	(46 51)	T	

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

Walter R. Hundley, Director
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
AEM		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
Am Paw		

April 14, 1976

Mr. Paul Wiatrak, P.E.
City Engineer
Seattle Engineering Department
The City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Wiatrak:

As you are aware, the City is facing serious fiscal problems in 1977, and as a consequence OMB is considering reduced levels of General Fund support to departments in 1977 and seeking additional revenue sources to balance the budget.

The two major tax sources at the local level over which the City can exercise some control are the General Business and Occupation Tax and the Utility Business and Occupation Tax. OMB is investigating the possibility of increasing the General Business and Occupation Tax and/or the Utility Business and Occupation Tax and is requesting that in your budget submittal you consider the following alternatives for applicable B&O tax rates:

Solid Waste:

Alternative 1:
Present tax rates (8%)

Alternative 2:
Increased tax rate (9%)

Sewer:

Alternative 1:
Present tax rate (8%)

Alternative 2:
Increased tax rate (9%)

As part of your budget submittal, these alternatives should be considered. For your budget submittal you should include the following for both the present tax rate structure and the alternatives listed above:

1. Record of 1974, 1975 and 1976 (to date) tax payments by month;

2. Estimated City B&O total tax liability, for 1976 and 1977;

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
APR 16 12 03 PM '76

3. Estimated impact on potential utility rate increases and the timing of those increases.

This information should be presented on OMB Form 2 in the appropriate program categories with separate forms for each alternative. OMB Forms 1 should only show departmental summary for the existing tax rates. Your budget analyst will be available to assist you if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Walter R. Hundley

Walter R. Hundley
Budget Director

WRH:RVC:mr

PAUL A. WIATRAK, CITY ENGINEER

Seattle
Board of Public Works

Betty L. McFarlane, Executive Secretary
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
APR 14 8 18 AM '76

April 13, 1976

Re: Issues and Concerns -
1977 Budget Submittals

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
~~PAW~~		
M-STAFF		

Mr. Walter R. Hundley, Director
Office of Management and Budget
Attention: Mr. Steve Williams,
Budget Analyst

Gentlemen:

We have received your communication of March 30, identifying issues and concerns which should be addressed in 1977 budget submittals.

This department understands the revenue constraints facing the City in 1977 and will do everything possible to continue to maintain our operation in a frugal, but productive, manner. We intend to look into increasing our contract administration fees from $4.00 to $5.50 a day as you suggested. This should replace approximately $80,000 annually to the General Fund and will continue to be charged against public works projects, if approved.

We have directed our Office of Cable Communications to continue keeping records so that the charges to others for our services may be determined. Contracts with others are increasing, and provide much support to our budget. Revenues from our CATV franchises are continually going up, and presently exceed $100,000 annually.

Street Use permit fees are based upon administrative costs, which include our services as well as the Engineering Department's. Therefore, the General Fund is reimbursed for our entire budget.

We point out that the workload of the Department this year has increased; not decreased, as projected in your letter. The number of public works projects is 50% over last year at this point in time. Work in other areas of the Board of Public Works' jurisdiction has also increased--i.e., management and supervision of public streets, public utilities, buildings, and the permit activity involved, therein.

Board of Public Works Department, 303 Municipal Building, Seattle, Washington 98104, (206) 583-2040

Board of Public Works: Paul A. Wiatrak, P.E., Chairman, City Engineer, David E. Towne, Supt. of Parks and Recreation, Kenneth M. Lowthian, Supt. of Water, Gordon Vickery, Supt. of Lighting, Alfred Petty, Supt. of Buildings.

Jan/June, 1976

The Department efficiently accomplishes a heavy workload, with a minimum of staff. As we indicated in our 1975 Annual Report, over 100 communications a week over and above the material presented to the Board of Public Works in regular sessions, are produced. These communications do not require Board action, but responses are necessary to inquiries, complaints, requests for reports from other departments, etc.

We will do everything we can to accomplish this increased workload with the present number of positions approved in the budget.

Yours very truly,

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

Betty L. McFarlane

Betty L. McFarlane
Executive Secretary

BLM/jw

cc: Board of Public Works Members

Seattle City Council

ROUTING | DATE | INITIAL
ACTION
AEM
INFORMATION

April 12, 1976

Sam Smith
President of the Council
583-2367

George E. Benson
Chairman
Transportation
Committee
583-2357

Tim Hill
Chairman
Finance Committee
583-2356

Paul Kraabel
Chairman
Planning & Urban
Development Committee
583-2364

Phyllis Lamphere
Chairman
Intergovernmental
Relations Committee
583-2355

Wayne D. Larkin
Chairman
Utilities Committee
583-2358

John R. Miller
Chairman
Parks & Public
Grounds Committee
583-2365

Randy Revelle
Chairman
Public Safety &
Health Committee
583-2359

Jeanette Williams
Chairman
Human Resources &
Judiciary Committee
583-2366

STATEMENT OF

ISSUES AND POLICIES FOR THE 1977 BUDGET AND 1977-82 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM*

One-hundred years ago, when the City of Seattle was slightly less than a quarter-of-a-century old, its total level of annual expenditures was $13,000. Now, counting capital and operating expenditures, the total is around $380 million. City responsibilities and activities have expanded tremendously and grown more complex. Relationships within City Government, with other public agencies, and with the private sector have multiplied, comprising a vast array of resource allocation requirements and decisionmaking processes. Inflation at levels unknown in recent history has created a strong upward pressure on costs, at a pace outstripping the City's revenue growth. Thus, the challenge of delivering City services demands not only increasing resources but determination, sophistication and creativity as well.

As the City of Seattle begins preparation of the 1977 Annual Budget and the 1977-82 Capital Improvement Program (CIP), the City Council is setting forth in this Statement its major concerns and preliminary policy directions. This is to provide advance notice and guidance to the Mayor and City departments as to what the City Council perceives to be the most important policy and program issues to be dealt with and how it desires the Executive Branch to respond in preparing next year's Budget and CIP.

The two upcoming Interim Budget Reviews (April 26-30, and July 26-30, 1976), in addition to reviewing the status of the current Budget and CIP, will be used for the first time as a forum for discussing next year's Budget and CIP in advance of their formal submittal to the Council by the Executive Branch. There are two major reasons for doing so. Next year there is a real possibility of major short-falls in Federal revenues and the need for large-scale reductions in City services; if this happens, it will necessitate more in-depth review and consideration of major programmatic and fiscal options than in previous years. Also, the Council hopes to improve the Budget and CIP process by establishing a basis for earlier policy exchange and issue identification between the Executive and Legislative Branches.

---

* Adopted by Resolution 25196, attached.

Copy: CIP

APR 16 11 53 AM '76
SEATTLE ENG DEPT

Eleventh Floor, Municipal Building, Seattle, Washington 98104

Individual Councilmembers have been assigned responsibilities for next year's Budget and CIP and for following up on the issues and policies contained in this Statement. During the First Interim Budget Review (April 26-30), this Statement will be reviewed with the Office of Management and Budget, the Office of Policy Planning, and affected departments. At the same time, the Council will follow up on the "Statements of Legislative Intent" from the 1976 Budget, take up appropriate items of the Council's 1976-77 Work Program, review the status of City fund balances, and consider individual personnel requests.

During the Second Interim Budget Review (July 26-30), the Council will review, in addition to other items, progress on this Statement, containing requests of the Executive Branch to respond specifically to various issues and policy statements. Meanwhile, individual Councilmembers have the responsibility to refine policy and program issues for the Budget and CIP in their assigned areas. In this manner, the Second Interim Budget Review will produce a refined list of policies and priority issues for the 1977 Budget and CIP, as well as accomplish a review of this year's Budget and other current concerns.

This Statement should not be viewed as final or all encompassing. Between now and when the Budget and CIP are submitted to the Council, other issues will undoubtedly emerge and some identified here may be resolved. Moreover, the Council has the responsibility to review and approve a Budget embracing <u>all</u> City programs and activities.

Issues and policies in this Statement are divided into two major categories: (1) "Cross-Departmental," i.e., those affecting more than one department or of City-wide concern (pp 3-8); and (2) "Departmental," i.e., those issues pertaining to individual departments (pp 9-14). Not all City departments and issues are listed, only those which will receive the most attention during the upcoming Budget and CIP. Following the two sections of issues and policies are: (1) the "Schedule for 1976 Interim Budget, 1977 Budget, and 1977-82 CIP Reviews" (pp 17-19); (2) Agenda for the First and Second Interim Budget Reviews (pp 17-19); (3) 1977 Budget Review Assignments (p 20); and (4) the Council's 1976 Legislative Audit Program (pp 21-22).

CROSS DEPARTMENTAL ISSUES AND POLICIES

1. Uncertain Federal Revenues. Potential shortfalls in Federal revenues, if all occur, would cause major reductions in City services in 1977. This is due to the possibility that Congress may not re-enact General Revenue Sharing (GRS) and major parts of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) ending in 1976. The City depends to a greater extent on the former than the latter, with GRS representing over 9% of General Fund expenditures in 1975. The City's CETA payroll is currently equal to only about 6% of the operating Budget, but layoffs of CETA-funded personnel might begin as early as April of this year if enabling legislation is not renewed soon. Also ending in 1976 is the legislative authority for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grants, currently $1.3 million to the City of Seattle; but there is little doubt that Congress will grant new authority this year.

   If these potential shortfalls do occur, or the probability increases that they will, the Mayor is requested by the Second Interim Budget Review to present to the Council alternative contingency plans describing ways in which the 1977 Budget could accomodate these revenue gaps. Contingency plans should address options with respect to both revenue sources and service reductions.

2. Productivity in City Government. Increased productivity and efficiency in City government will be among the highest priorities in the 1977 Budget. Costs of providing City services, though dampening slightly compared to last year, continue to increase faster than revenues. Therefore, every effort must be made to maintain vital City services more effectively and efficiently.

   a. The Council will carefully scrutinize proposed departmental budgets, and marginal programs will be reduced substantially or eliminated.

   b. The Council requests the Mayor to submit by the Second Interim Budget Review a report on the feasibility (including legislative or regulatory changes needed) of implementing personnel appraisal and merit pay systems for all City employees. At the same time, the Council wishes to review an executive compensation plan (as called for in Resolution 25065, 10/27/75) and proposals for additional work measurement studies, to be implemented in 1977.

   c. Possibilities for cost savings through consolidation of related functions and elimination of duplication should be pursued aggressively. Among areas to be examined are housing, environmental management, and human resources.

3. New Programs and Staffing.

   a. No new General Fund programs will be approved for 1977 unless: (1) they have high potential for increasing productivity and efficiency, or (2) they are mandated by Federal, State, or other local governments. Any proposed new programs meeting these requisites should be presented to the Council during the Second Interim Budget Review to allow sufficient time for Council consideration.

b. In the case of new programs which are mandated by other governments (e.g., State Environmental Policy Act), every attempt shall be made to recapture City costs through grant reimbursements or service fees.

c. No new general fund administrative or managerial positions will be approved for 1977, unless they contribute demonstrably to increasing productivity or efficiency, or they are mandated by other governments, or they are necessitated by emergencies. This does not pertain to position changes based on job reclassification studies.

4. General Fund Balance. The 1975 excess General Fund balance shall be reserved and not be utilized as revenue in the 1977 General Fund budget.

5. Taxation and Fees

a. During the Second Interim Budget Review, the Council will review and possibly modify both the Business and Occupation and Admission tax structures. This review will be based upon the 1975 task force study of the B & O tax and upon a study of the admissions tax by OMB and the Department of Lincenses and Consumer Affairs which was requested by the Council in the 1976 Budget's "Statement of Legislative Intent."

b. During the Second Interim Budget Review, the Office of Management and Budget is requested to identify for the Council: (1) fees for which the costs of administration and/or regulation exceed fee revenue, and (2) other services or activities for which fees do not presently exist but are appropriate.

6. Implementation of Adopted Plans and Policies. The City has recently adopted, or will soon adopt, the following plans and/or policies which should provide policy direction to departments in preparing selected areas of next year's Budget and CIP:

-- 1976 Housing and Community Development Policy Plan (Resolution 25113)

-- 1977 Criminal Justice Plan (Resolution 25184, adopting Part I)

-- 1976 Comprehensive Aging Plan

-- Resolution 25159 and Ordinance implementing the State Environmental Policy Act

-- Downtown Parking Resolution 24957

-- Downtown Concept Plan

-- Shoreline Master Program

-- Growth Strategies and Policies

-- Energy 1990

-- Stadium Resolution 25180

Each of these, to a varying degree, has potential for policy impact on the Budget and CIP. Some were prepared and adopted to qualify for a Federal or State program. However, that does not vitiate their usefulness and applicability to setting program and spending priorities generally. The question we as a City must answer is: How can our City Budget and CIP support and implement these plans and policies?

The Office of Policy Planning (OPP) is requested to prepare, in cooperation with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), instructions for individual departments as to how their proposed operating budgets and capital improvement programs for next year should support the above-listed plans and policies. "Policy Abstracts" (described in the joint OPP-Council Staff Proposal, "Comprehensive Policy Plan," January 1976) for those plans and policies should also be prepared for use by the Council in reviewing the Budget and CIP. Both of these items should be presented to the Council just prior to the Second Interim Budget Review.

Clearly, some departments have more opportunity than others to bring their resources to bear in support of the above listed plans and policies. Nevertheless, the Council expects that each department's Budget and CIP will, to the extent possible and appropriate, support these adopted plans and policies. This will be a major standard in evaluating next year's Budget and CIP.

7. Housing Functions. Presently, the City performs housing-related functions in at least three separate departments: Community Development (Residential Projects Division), Building (Housing Conservation program), and OPP (housing analysis and planning in the Physical Planning and Urban Design Division). This disparate organization of housing functions poses questions about managerial and operational cohesiveness and whether the program represents a rational, effective configuration. OMB is requested to present to the Council by the Second Interim Budget Review an analysis of housing functions, including (1) program structure, objectives, and budgets; (2) organization and staffing patterns; (3) interrelationships among the three departments; (4) 1976 program activities and results; and (5) justification for the existing program structure or recommendations for program restructuring, including possible consolidation.

8. Environmental Management. An ordinance implementing locally the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) will be enacted before the 1977 Proposed Budget is submitted to the Council. For consideration during the 1977 Budget review, OMB and OPP are requested to prepare a report describing: (1) the total environmental management program in the City; (2) composite program objectives, organizational structure and budget for 1977; (3) the division of responsibilities and coordination among City departments, and between the Executive and Legislative Branches; and (4) the additional

costs imposed by SEPA and how they are to be funded or recaptured. In particular, the report should describe: (1) the future relationship between the Environmental Management Program in the Department of Community Development and the Environmental Review Program in the Building Department, and (2) steps taken to correct administrative procedures in order to minimize the City's future risk of legal and financial liability under SEPA.

9. CETA Jobs. Consistent with policy goals of the King-Snohomish Manpower Consortium -- the local prime sponsor of CETA, in which Seattle is a member -- City departments shall attempt to limit the time of incumbency in CETA-funded positions to 18 months. This goal is intended to move persons into regular employment, provide others with job opportunities, and lessen local dependence on Federal funding.

10. City Office Space. The Council anticipates that OMB and the Building Department will make a revised proposal for consolidated City office space during the First Interim Budget Review.

11. Improvements in Budget Documentation. In the Council's "Budget Issues and Policies Statement" for the 1976 Budget (dated 2/24/75) and in a follow-up memo ("Desired Format Changes in the 1976 Budget," 3/14/75), several improvements in Budget documentation were requested by the Council. The 1976 Budget incorporated some but not all of those requested changes. For its review of the 1977 Budget, the Council requests that the following additional information be provided:

    -- Estimated 1978 revenues and expenditures -- by Department, Program category, and Grand Object of Expenditure -- giving a longer-term perspective to annual Budget decisions.

    -- Supplemental Budget detail in final form when received by the Council. OMB modifications to detailed budget submittals of departments should be noted before they are transmitted to the Council. Much Council time is wasted because supplementary Budget information does not include OMB changes.

    -- Information on actual performance relative to evaluative criteria listed in the 1975 and 1976 Budgets.

    -- Individual personnel position salaries in annual instead of monthly figures.

    -- Detailed organization charts for each departmental division, indicating functions performed, positions, salaries, and funding sources.

12. Improvements in the CIP Process and Documentation. Based on earlier communication to OPP from the Council,* listed below are perceived problems and requested solutions regarding the CIP process, including documentation. Some project-related CIP issues appear in the next major section of this Statement dealing with Departmental Issues, but most will be identified after the CIP is submitted to the Council on August 1.

* Letter dated 1/9/76, from Tim Hill to R.W. Wilkinson, OPP.

a. Problem: The design description of some projects in the 1976 CIP document did not depict the true design which the particular department will construct (e.g., the Tennis Center) or adequately define project elements (e.g., the Zoo).

Solution: The design concept of major CIP projects should be approved by the Council before detailed design work is begun. OPP should also review thoroughly the design elements of each project prior to forwarding any appropriation request to the Council, whether as a part of a comprehensive CIP document or separately.

b. Problem: Total cost figures for some projects merely represent money presently available, not what long-term projects will ultimately cost.

Solution: Departments should clearly indicate estimates of what can be purchased for the available amount of money. If a desired project design will cost more than the funds available, this too should be clearly indicated.

c. Problem: Departments frequently commit the City to a certain course of action through contractual negotiations or citizen participation efforts before the Council reviews the CIP document, separate appropriation request, or is even notified informally (e.g., committing 80% funding of the 5th Avenue LID with FAM money).

Solution: No commitments should be made to either potential contractors or citizen groups before OPP and the City Council approve such actions.

d. Problem: Potential projects which could be implemented if funds were made available are not readily identifiable.

Solution: OPP should work with all departments in developing an "unfunded CIP," separate from the regular CIP, which indicates unmet funding needs and priorities based on criteria approved by the Council.

e. Problem: The estimated inflation rates applied to long-term CIP projects differ among departments.

Solution: OPP should work with all departments in establishing realistic inflation rates. Seemingly, these rates would differ among departments and projects only to the extent that they would be affected by differential increases in the cost of materials.

f. Problem: No approved, final 1976-81 CIP was published, apparently because no funds remained for printing. This makes it extremely difficult for citizens, public officials, and others to know what the City's capital activities and plans are.

Solution: A low cost printing job should be done on the proposed 1977-82 CIP, leaving funds for a better quality printing job on the approved CIP.

13. Compliance with State BARS Requirements. It is the intent of the City Council that the City achieve compliance with State BARS (Budget Accounting and Reporting System) as soon as possible. The Council's Finance Committee will be monitoring the City's progress toward this goal during the remainder of 1976 and in 1977.

DEPARTMENTAL ISSUES AND POLICIES

This section identifies issues and/or states legislative policies regarding the Budget and, to a more limited extent, the CIP for individual City Departments. The Council requests the Executive Branch to address all of these issues and policies in the proposed Budget and CIP documents. Many of the items listed below will be taken up by the Council during the upcoming Interim Budget Reviews. Accordingly, the Office of Management and Budget and City departments are requested to provide progress reports and other information as indicated.

1. Police Department

   a. Crime Priorities. The priority crimes identified in Submission I of the 1977 Criminal Justice Plan and adopted by the City Council shall receive priority attention in the Police Department in 1977. Accordingly, the proposed 1977 Budget for the Department shall reflect these priorities, describing changes to be made in the Department's organization, staffing, and operations in order to address problem statements contained in Submission I of the Plan and in order to support strategies and projects described in Submission II. OMB and the Department are requested to brief the Council during the Second Interim Budget Review on how the 1977 Budget will address these priority crimes. (See Resolution 25184.)

   b. Patrol Operations. OMB, OPP and the Department are requested to describe during the Second Interim Budget Review:

      (1) Recommended management and operational changes resulting from Patrol Manpower Utilization Study; and

      (2) Alternative 1977 Budgets based on 50% and 40% 2-man cars.

   c. Precinct Stations. If the Executive Branch intends to place on the Fall 1976 ballot a bond issue for new police precinct stations, the Council, before approving such a proposal, will want a comprehensive report on the long-range policy and plans of the City with respect to the future size, functions, organization and manpower development of the Department. This report should be completed in time for the CIP review in August and September.

2. Fire Department

   a. Manpower Deployment Study. Based on the results of the manpower deployment study, OMB and the Department should indicate by the Second Interim Budget Review if any stations and/or engine companies will be recommended for decommission in the 1977 Budget.

b. Fire Clean Up. Examine the alternatives of recapturing costs for fire clean up and salvage services or abandoning these services.

c. Office of Emergency Services. Evaluate the cost/benefit of the Office. Identify past and future emergency preparedness activities.

3. Parks and Recreation Department

a. If the Executive Branch intends again to propose a zoo fee for 1977, the City Council requests for its review during the Second Interim Budget Review key factors, including but not limited to: (1) additional net revenues to be generated; (2) possible groups of people to be exempt from the fee (e.g., children, elderly, and low-income citizens) and foregone revenues; (3) program impacts if the zoo fee is not approved; (4) additional zoo services or facilities to be provided if the fee is approved; (5) costs of fee administration and collection; and (6) cost-reduction alternatives considered in lieu of a fee.

b. Describe how the recommendations contained in the Arthur Young work measurements study of facilities and grounds maintenance will be implemented in 1977.

c. Based on the consultant's study of Sick's Stadium and subsequent analyses, make specific recommendation on the disposition of that facility by the First Interim Budget Review.

d. To ensure minimum accomplishment of the Parks Forward Thrust Plan approved by the voters, first priority in capital programming and legislative appropriations shall be given to "named" projects, second priority to projects-in-progress. Until supplemental funding is assured, no projects should be expanded nor should new projects be undertaken. (See Legislative Audit Report, "Parks and Recreation Forward Thrust Program," October 22, 1975; review during CIP process.)

e. Provide an analysis of the implications of the decline and changes in Seattle's population for the Parks' capital program? For example: should the City be building any more playgrounds in view of the rapid decrease in the school-age population? (CIP review.)

4. Executive Department

a. Office of Policy Planning

(1) A review and discussion of the Citizen Participation "White Paper" will take place during the First Interim Budget Review.

(2) Examine the desirability and feasibility of transferring responsibility for developing the City's Capital Improvement Program to OMB in 1977, integrating the capital and operating Budgets in 1978, and centralizing monitoring of all CIP projects.

(3) Analyze the implications of incorporating Legislative Audit recommendations in the 1977 Budget.

(4) Review, during the Second Interim Budget Review, OPP progress on applying adopted plans and policies (see item 6, Cross Departmental Issues section) to Budget and CIP, and on preparing "Policy Abstracts."

(5) Evaluate, during the Second Interim Budget Review, progress made by the Intergovernmental Relations Division in improving our State lobbying effort.

b. Personnel/Civil Service

(1) Provide proposals for a Citywide performance appraisal system and an executive compensation plan by the Second Interim Budget Review.

(2) Examine means of improving and streamlining the Civil Service certification process, including: the validity, fairness, and accessibility of employment testing; delays in the processing of Requests for Certification; and the availability of persons on Civil Service registers to apply for job vacancies.

c. Office of Management and Budget

(1) Total data processing expenditures should approximate 2% of the combined General Fund and Utility Budgets in 1977.

(2) Provide a status report, during the First Interim Budget Review, on the interlocal agreement with King County for sharing of data processing resources.

d. Purchasing

(1) A review of the Purchasing Department procurement procedures and Legislative Audit will be conducted during the First Interim Budget Review.

5. Building Department

During the Second Interim Budget Review, status reports should be presented to the City Council by the Office of Management and Budget indicating progress in establishing:

(1) a property inventory system, and

(2) a complete inventory of general municipal properties. It is also the intent of the Council that the Executive Department coordinate efforts of the various City departments to develop a surplusing policy and system for municipal property.

6. Engineering

a. Provide a plan in the 1977 Budget for implementing the recommendations of Task Force on capital project management. The Task Force Report will be discussed during the Second Interim Budget Review, and according to Resolution 25149, will include the following topics:

(1) engineering cost standards;

(2) policies and procedures regarding outside contracting of engineering services;

(3) status of Engineering Fiscal Information System; and

(4) engineering organization and staffing levels.

b. Report on progress in resource recovery and resulting cost reductions in Solid Waste Utility.

7. Finance Department

a. Comptroller

(1) Provide a status report on the Integrated Financial Information System (IFS) during the Second Interim Budget Review.

(2) Provide a status report on the implementation of the Comptroller's audit program, during the Second Interim Budget Review.

8. Human Resources

a. Examine the feasibility of effecting programmatic transfers to associated departments and offices, such as:

(1) youth employment programs to the Personnel/Civil Service Department,

(2) handicapped services to Personnel/Civil Service Department or to the Health Department; or eliminating the function,

(3) the aging division to the Mayor's Office or the Health Department's Division of Human Services,

(4) Spinning off the childcare division as a non-profit agency.

9. City Light

The 1977 Budget for City Light will be reviewed by the City Council concurrently with the City Light rate increase hearings beginning in August. As supporting documentation for that review, the Council requests City Light, in cooperation with OMB and OPP, where appropriate, to:

a. Identify and analyze sufficient expenditure reductions throughout the Department's budget to minimize the 1977 rate increase and to assure that a greater proportion of operating revenues will be available to fund future capital improvements;

b. Carefully analyze and evaluate the numbers of personnel and funding levels in the following Program Categories: Planning and Management Control (1100), Operational Administration (1300), Consumer Services and Marketing (2100), and Research and Pre-Design (2200);

c. Reassess the City's undergrounding program, especially the neighborhood LID undergrounding, in light of City's experience since 1968 and possible new circumstances in the future;

d. Complete current studies of the appliance repair and water heater rental programs and present a full range of analyzed alternatives for Council consideration, including alternatives to make both programs self-supporting, through charges that place the burden of funding the programs on those who benefit most directly from them;

e. Analyze the Department's program for responding to customer calls about electrical malfunctions and develop alternatives for fully or partially funding the program through service charges to the direct beneficiaries of the program;

f. Analyze the consumer advisory services programs and present alternatives for fully or partially funding them through service charges to the direct beneficiaries of the programs;

g. Thoroughly reassess the total costs and benefits of keeping the Georgetown and Lake Union steam plants for meeting future power needs and develop alternative programs and schedules for possible phasing out of the two plants;

h. Prepare and implement an employee reduction plan for 1977, emphasizing reductions in administrative and management support through the extended application of the Department's Work Management System; and

i. Examine and report on the feasibility of meter-reading and self-billing by homeowners as a cost-savings device.

10. Law Department

Provide a status report on the codification of City Law (by the Second Interim Budget Review.

11. Health Department

Evaluate and report on the feasibility of King County assuming the total responsibility for administration, with the City purchasing services under contract.

12. Seattle Center

a. Evaluate the effectiveness of the present Seattle Center organizational structure and investigate the possibility of consolidating certain administrative units.

b. Evaluate the implementation of the Cost Accounting System and Manpower Deployment Study to assure relevant and timely data is obtained which can be compiled to justify future operational and maintenance costs and program requests.

13. General Services

a. Explain and document large cost increases in Fleets and Shops, particularly large-scale equipment maintenance. How do costs compare with private sector?

b. Provide a status report, during the Second Interim Budget Review, on General Services' telephone charges to other City departments.

CJ:ga

(Getzel, 4/12/76)

SCHEDULE FOR

1976 INTERIM BUDGET, 1977 BUDGET, AND

1977-82 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM REVIEWS

By April 12	Council reviews and adopts "Statement of Issues and Policies for the 1977 Budget and 1977-82 CIP;" Councilmembers assigned responsibilities for following through on items contained therein and for 1977 departmental Budget reviews.
April 26 - 29	First Interim Budget Review (See Agenda)
July 26 - 30.	Second Interim Budget Review (See Tentative Agenda)
July 30.	Council agrees on tentative list of priority programs and issues for decisions in 1977 Budget and 1977-82 CIP: individual Councilmembers' assignments reviewed and finalized.
August 1.	OPP submits 1977-82 CIP to Council.
August 15.	Detailed work program and schedule for 1977 Budget and CIP adopted.
September 2, 9, 16, 23, 30.	Council (i.e., Budget Committee) review and tentative adoption of CIP on exception basis. Presentation of Legislative Audit reports by Council staff.
October 1.	Mayor submits Proposed 1977 Budget to Council, along with finalized Budget detail.
October 7.	OMB briefs Council on Proposed Budget.
October 14, 18.	Council reviews 1977-78 revenue estimates prepared by OMB and Council staff; Council adopts a revenue estimate for 1977.
October 25, 28, 29, and November 15 - 23.	Council reviews actual performance vs. 1975-76 evaluation criteria for priority programs and other programs reviewed by Council staff. Council considers and votes on recommended program changes.

November 24.	Council votes finally on Budget and CIP. Councilmembers submit proposed "Statements of Legislative Intent" for Budget and CIP.
November 29.	Final vote on Budget and CIP ordinances. Council reviews and adopts "Statements of Legislative Intent" for 1977 Budget and 1977-82 CIP. Evaluation survey questionnaire on Budget and CIP process distributed to Councilmembers for completion.
December 16.	Evaluation survey results distributed to Councilmembers.

BG:ga

1976 First Interim Budget Review

April 26 - 29, 1976

Agenda

		Responsible Party	Time
1.	Revenues and Expenditures and the Status of Fund Balances	OMB	4/26 - 9:00 a.m.
2.	The Future Use of Sick's Stadium	Miller Parks and Recreation Department	4/26 - 10:30 a.m.
3.	The Legislative Audit of City Purchasing	Hill Audit Staff	4/27 - 10:30 a.m.
4.	Procedure for Council Review of the King County Comprehensive Alcoholism Plan and Drug Abuse Plan	Williams	4/27 - 3:30 p.m.
5.	Review of OPP's Citizen Participation White Paper	Williams	4/28 - 11:00 a.m.
6.	Review of the Municipal Court's Magistrate Program	Hill Municipal Court	4/28 - 3:30 p.m.
7.	Increased staffing for Office of Urban Conservation	Kraabel DCD	4/29 - 8:30 a.m.
8.	Review of the City's Harbor Patrol Function (Police/Fire Department Responsibility)	Revelle OMB, SFD, SPD	4/29 - 9:00 a.m.
9.	Status Report on the interlocal agreement with King County for the sharing of data processing resources	OMB	4/29 - 10:30 a.m.
10.	Status Report on Department Compliance with Legislative Intent Statements	Council with OMB	4/29 - 1:30 p.m.
11.	1977 Annual Budget Review	Council with OMB	4/29 - 3:30 p.m.

(Getzel, 4/12/76)

1976 Second Interim Budget Review

July 26 - 30, 1976

Tentative Agenda

1. Revenues and Expenditures
   - To date
   - Multi-year projections
   - Contingency plans if GRS and/or CETA are not extended
   - Evaluation of the City fee structure and the B & O and Admissions taxes
2. Police Department
   - Changes resulting from the Manpower Utilization Study
   - Alternative 1977 budgets based on 50% and 40%, 2-man cars
   - The relationship of staffing, organization, and operations to the priorities described in the 1977 Criminal Justice Plan
3. Property Management
4. Task Force Report on the Engineering Department's Capital Project Management
5. Personnel/Civil Service
   - the validity and fairness of testing
   - Executive compensation plan
   - City-wide performance appraisal system
   - Processing Requests for Certification
6. Status report on the codification of City Law

7. Duplication of housing functions between OPP, DCD, and the Building Departments

8. The long-range plan for the spending of the Transit Fund

9. Review of the 1977-79 Data Processing Plan

10. The Fire Department Manpower Development Study and the possible decommissioning of stations and/or engine companies

11. Executive progress in fulfilling the intent of the Council's "Statement of Issues and Policies for 1977 Budget and 1977-82 CIP" (including OPP progress in applying adopted plans and policies to the Budget and CIP, and in preparing "Policy Abstracts")

12. Comptroller's Office

    - Status report on the implementation of IFS

    - Status report on the implementation of an audit program

13. Status report on progress made by the Intergovernmental Relations Division in improving our state lobbying effort.

14. Status report on General Services' telephone charges to other City departments

BG:ga

1977 Department Budget/CIP Review Assignments

Kraabel

Community Development
Building

Lamphere

Parks and Recreation
Public Health

Hill

Police

Miller

City Light (rate hearings and operating budget)
Retirement System
Board of Public Works
Board of Ethics

Smith

General Services
Licenses and Consumer Affairs
Water

Williams

Library
Human Resources
Human Rights
Personnel/Civil Service
Women's Rights

Larkin

Engineering (and Solid Waste Utility budget and rate hearings)
Law
Municipal Court

Revelle

Fire

Benson

Seattle Center
Arts Commission
Finance Department
Finance General

Audit Staff

Revenues
Department Programs not covered by Councilmembers

(Jones, 4/12/76)

THE SEATTLE CITY COUNCIL'S

1976 LEGISLATIVE AUDIT PROGRAM

1. BURGLARY REDUCTION

Evaluation of resource allocation, effectiveness and efficiency of the City's various burglary reduction activities, within both the Seattle Police Department (SPD) and experimental programs funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). Since the Law and Justice Planning Division of the Office of Policy Planning is engaged in detailed evaluation of the LEAA programs, this audit will concentrate its evaluation on burglary reduction activities within the SPD. With respect to LEAA programs, the audit will assess independently their evaluations and attempt to determine whether their performance warrant City funding after Federal/State grant support terminates.

Assigned Councilmember: Mr. Hill

Lead Auditor: Dave Anthony Estimated Staff Days: 260

2. HOUSING CODE ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Determination of the degree to which the City's Housing Code administration and enforcement activities contribute to: (1) the protection and the promotion of essential public health and safety, and (2) the conservation and rehabilitation of single- and multiple-family housing stock. This audit will also provide the basis for determining, during the 1977 Budget deliberations, the proper functions and personnel/funding levels of the Building Department's Housing Conservation Division.

Assigned Councilmember: Mr. Kraabel

Lead Auditor: Lauraine Brekke Estimated Staff Days: 100

3. OFFICE OF POLICY PLANNING

Performance review of the Office of Policy Planning since its inception in late 1974. The audit will examine OPP's various functions, their relationship to other City departmental functions, the allocation of staff resources, the output of the Office and the impact of OPP on City policy making. Special attention will be devoted to providing the City Council with improved information for 1977 Budget decisions.

Assigned Councilmember: Mr. Kraabel

Lead Auditor: John Greer Estimated Staff Days: 100

4. COMMUNITY SERVICE CENTERS

Performance evaluation of the Community Service Center Program. This audit will determine cumulative City costs of the program, services provided, and actual benefits received by citizens in order to provide the Council evaluative information for deciding whether the program should be continued beyond June 30, 1976.

Assigned Councilmember: Mrs. Williams

Lead Auditor: Leroy Williams Estimated Staff Days: 30

5. EXPERT AND CONSULTANT SERVICE CONTRACTS

Determination of extent, nature, and cost of contracts for expert and consulting services throughout the City. The audit will determine on what basis decisions are made to engage consultants, who gets the contracts, the degree of contract competition, the adequacy of contract monitoring and control by the City, and whether perhaps the basic purchasing ordinance should be amended to include expert and consultant services.

Assigned Councilmember: Mr. Smith

Lead Auditor: Leroy Williams Estimated Staff Days: 40

STAFF DAY TOTAL 530

6. GENERAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT RATES

Only if time allows will this audit be undertaken. It will examine the competitiveness of rates with the private sector and determine whether cost savings could be achieved by more contracting with private firms.

Assigned Councilmember: Unassigned

Lead Auditor: Unassigned Estimated Staff Days: 90

CJ:ga

CJ:ga 4/12/76

RESOLUTION 25196

A RESOLUTION, adopting the "Statement of Issues and Policies for the 1977 Budget and 1977-82 Capital Improvement Program."

WHEREAS, Chapter 35.32A of the Revised Code of Washington provides that the Mayor of the City of Seattle is responsible for preparing the annual City Budget; and the City Council is responsible for considering the Budget and holding public hearings on it, may modify the Budget, and must adopt the Budget by ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the annual Budget and Capital Improvement Program of the City are important instruments for establishing and implementing City policies; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to set forth its major concerns and preliminary policy directions regarding the 1977 Budget and 1977-82 Capital Improvement Program, in advance of their preparation and submittal to the Council by the Executive Branch; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council adopts the "Statement of Issues and Policies for the 1977 Budget and 1977-82 Capital Improvement Program," as set forth in Exhibit One to this Resolution.

PASSED by the City Council the 12 day of April, 1976, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this 12 day of April, 1976.

President of the City Council

Filed by me this 12 day of April, 1976.

ATTEST:

City Comptroller and City Clerk

BY:

Deputy

Budget

Seattle City Council

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
AEH		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
~~PAW~~		
JGR/DWA		

2c + att

April 8, 1976

Sam Smith
President of the Council
583-2367

George E. Benson
Chairman
Transportation Committee
583-2357

Tim Hill
Chairman
Finance Committee
583-2356

Paul Kraabel
Chairman
Planning & Urban Development Committee
583-2364

Phyllis Lamphere
Chairman
Intergovernmental Relations Committee
583-2355

Wayne D. Larkin
Chairman
Utilities Committee
583-2358

John R. Miller
Chairman
Parks & Public Grounds Committee
583-2365

Randy Revelle
Chairman
Public Safety & Health Committee
583-2359

Jeanette Williams
Chairman
Human Resources & Judiciary Committee
583-2366

Mr. Paul Wiatrak
City Engineer
Seattle Municipal Building
Seattle, Washington 98104

Dear Mr. Wiatrak:

Enclosed is a copy of a list of costs for certain street marking and maintenance programs which have been deleted from the City's budget. As you know, I am interested in reinstating all, or at least some of these programs and I would appreciate your assistance in helping me find out how this might be done.

I am particularly concerned about the painting of the center stripe on all arterials and feeder streets. I believe that the City might be facing potential liability if an accident occurred in a street that is not sufficiently marked. As a result, I would appreciate it ~~if~~ you could isolate from the enclosed list the cost of striping all appropriate streets.

In a broader area, I would appreciate it if you could tell me whether the City Council could reprogram Capital Improvement Program funds or other funds provided for street construction or maintenance into the kinds of activity listed on the enclosure. What funds would be eligible for such reprogramming and what would be the impact of the reprogramming?

I would also appreciate your evaluation of the utility of reprogramming such funds to provide for a full-scale maintenance program such as that outlined in the enclosed list. Any newer estimates on the cost of such a program would be appreciated.

Thank you very much for your help in this matter.

Yours truly,

Geo. E. Benson

GEORGE E. BENSON, Chairman
Transportation Committee
Seattle City Council

GEB:jvc

Enclosure

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
APR 14 8 10 AM '76

Cost
$240,490

Source of Funding
General Fund

Impact	Activity #	Description	Cost
Restore	16089	Traffic Control, School Safety	$ 1,800
Restore	16337	Traffic Control, Records of Channelization and Marketing	$ 7,800
Restore	16066 16014 16139	Traffic Control, Operations Traffic Control, Signing Street Naming and Block Numbering Studies	$43,490
			53,090
Restore	15743 12666 12708	Revision and Maintenance of Regulatory Signs	$55,500
Restore	12625	Informational Signing	$ 9,000
Restore	13250	Street Name Signs	$ 8,500
Restore	15792	Fence and Guardrail Installation	$ 2,400
Restore	12682 15537	Maintenance of Informational Signs	$ 8,000
Restore	12690	Replacement of Damaged Signs	$54,000
Restore	12807	Maintenance of Crosswalks	$18,000
Restore	15503	Maintenance of Fences and Guardrails	$21,000
Restore	15529	Maintenance of Curb Markings	$11,000
			187,400

V. Gelder

Hill

Budget

4-8

April 7, 1976

Via Mayor Uhlman

Councilman Tim Hill
Chairman, Finance Committee
City Council
City of Seattle

Dear Sir:

As requested in your letter of March 17 to Mr. Walter Hundley, Office of Management and Budget, we submit the following list of organizations in which the Engineering Department or employees thereof have current memberships at the expense of the City:

Organization	No. of Memberships	Cost Per Year
Seattle Chamber of Commerce	1	$ 25.00
American Road Builders Association	1	25.00
American Concrete Institute	1	40.00
American Management Associations	1	80.00
Northwest Chapter Associated Public Safety Communications Officers, Inc.	1	25.00
National Safety Council	1	385.00
American Right of Way Association	6	195.00
Association for Systems Management	1	55.00
Transportation Research Board	1	177.00
American Water Works Association	2	65.00
Water Pollution Control Federation	2	45.00
*American Public Works Association	28	700.00
Association of Time-Sharing Users	1	60.00
American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers	1	100.00

*Twenty-eight is the minimum number of memberships for a city the size of Seattle. This includes five employees of the Water Department and two of the General Services Department.

Res 25015, passed 10-25-75, filed
Policy & Procedure System

Councilman Tim Hill
April 7, 1976

We have reduced the memberships in order to comply with Resolution No. 25015 and our budget restrictions.

Very truly yours,

Sgd Paul A. Wiatrak
PAUL A. WIATRAK, P. E.
City Engineer

HEL:jm

Concurrence Prior to Signature	
HEL	
WEPS	
AEM	

Budget

THE CITY OF SEATTLE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

MEMORANDUM

TO All Department Heads

FROM Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director Walter R. Hundley by RC DATE April 2, 1976

SUBJECT The Budget Manual Is Now A Permanent Document

The Budget Manual, as of the 1977 version, has become a permanent document. The new red loose-leaf binder system allows us to update and revise the Budget Manual each year without having to completely reprint an entirely new set of manuals. Thus, in April, 1977 we will send out only replacement and/or additional pages to this 1977 Budget Manual; this will then form the 1978 Budget Manual. Therefore, please tell each recipient of the 1977 Budget Manual in your department to keep this document and not discard it at the end of the 1977 budget preparation period.

WRH:LG:mr

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
~~PAW~~		
PMB		
aEM		
WGJ		

JGR
WEPS

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
APR 5 8 23 AM '76

Budget

Mr. Paul A. Wiatrak
City Engineer

THE CITY OF SEATTLE
BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS
DEPARTMENT

TO: All Board of Public Works Members and
Chief of Police R. L. Hanson

April 1, 1976

FROM: Betty L. McFarlane, Executive Secretary BLM

RE: VEHICLE FLEET LEASE RATES

The Committee on Vehicle Fleet Lease Rates met Thursday, April 1, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 303 of the Seattle Municipal Building.

Gary Bloomquist, Director of General Services, distributed a package to each Committee member and answered questions raised by the Committee in previous sessions. Each Committee member was asked to take the documents back to their departments for review. If some of the answers, etc., are still not clear or other specifics come to mind which are pertinent, they should be addressed directly to Gary and his staff.

Aside from management issues, the main problem which must be resolved immediately is the budget. The Committee asked that each Board department involved, including the Police Department, name a representative to get in touch with Gary Bloomquist as soon as this memorandum is received to set up an appointment with his staff. General Services and each individual department will work together to cut costs on both sides. This will ultimately bring forth a rate schedule and a system which will allow service performance at a level the City must provide within the budget available.

Each department, including General Services, is requested to bring its findings and recommendations to the Committee on April 15 at 9:00 a.m. in Room 303. This will enable the Committee to work from the reports and information compiled to bring forth a recommendation to the Board of Public Works by April 30, 1976.

BLM:mn

cc: Dicksy Winters - OMB
Al Clawson - Parks & Recreation Dept.
Ray Snyder - Parks & Recreation Dept.
John Randall - Engineering Dept.
Sgt. Don Harris - Police Dept., Fleet Control
Lt. M. Maxwell - Police Dept., Fleet Control
Gary Bloomquist - Director, General Services
Mike Pattucci - American Management Systems
Val Shultz - Lighting Dept.
Ed O'Sullivan - Lighting Dept.

Orig: General Services Dept
Copy: Equip Rental

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
AEH		
	✓	
INFORMATION		
PAW		
JGR		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
APR 2 8 57 AM '76

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

Walter R. Hundley, Director
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
WEM		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
~~PCW~~		
PMB		
JGR		
WGU		
WEPS		

March 30, 1976

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
APR 5 8 23 AM '76

Mr. Paul Wiatrak
City Engineer
Engineering Department
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Wiatrak:

The purpose of this letter is to initiate the 1977 budget preparation process by identifying for your consideration and review issues and areas within the Engineering Department which are of particular concern to OMB. These issues will provide the framework for our evaluation of your budget request and will undoubtedly be discussed in the Council Hearings next fall.

The implementation of the Department's recent reorganization, the development of the new management systems and the passage of SB 2143 all create a recognizably volatile state in which to develop a budget. However, a careful analysis of the identified issues, which enunciates the areas of uncertainty, will ease the review effort by this Office and the Council.

In addition to this correspondence, OMB will distribute by April 2nd the "1977 Budget Manual" which will set specific requirements for budget submissions. A second letter setting forth additional issues, if any, will be forwarded to the Department in April. The deadline for submission of budget requests to OMB is June 25th.

I. Funding Level

The continuing erosion of the City's financial base requires OMB to request that Departments submit budgets at 90% of their 1976 General Fund level. The Engineering Department's level is calculated as follows:

1976 Adopted General Fund	$7,128,297
+ Data Processing	103,697
+ Recurring Domed Stadium Operating Costs (etc.)	61,000
	$7,292,994
x	.90%
	$6,563,695

Departments are encouraged to submit prioritized supplemental budget requests up to 100% of the 1976 Adopted Budget.

While the general guidelines of the Budget Manual and the funding levels determined above call for submittal of a base budget request at 90% of your Adopted 1976 Budget, I would strongly emphasize that this level of support in 1977 is not guaranteed. The continuing fiscal problems of the City and the uncertainty surrounding the continuation of General Revenue Sharing and CETA may necessitate further reductions.

As I have noted in my message in the Budget Manual, non-renewal of General Revenue Sharing will require the City to budget all non-mandatory General Fund expenditures in 1977 at an average of 82% of adopted 1976 levels. After three years of budget reductions, to develop a 1977 budget at a further reduced level of support is a difficult task. Decisions on the allocation of resources should be based first on a review of anticipated savings from improved management systems. In addition, a careful analysis and prioritization of existing service levels will be mandatory. Decisions on the allocation of resources among these services should be based on programmatic lines rather than "across-the-board" cuts.

II. Program Planning and Evaluation

The scarcity of resources available to the City to meet its growing demands during the past few years has made it increasingly important for OMB to have solid justification for programs before expenditures are approved. The development of meaningful program plans and evaluation criteria continues, therefore, to be of critical importance to this Office.

I am asking you this year to emphasize the Engineering Division, Traffic and Transportation and Maintenance and Operations in your program planning effort. The program plans, budget and staffing requests for those areas of the Engineering and Traffic and Transportation Divisions which are supported by CIP projects should be based on the proposed CIP. In the pre-construction phase, staffing patterns should be developed from the Project Scheduling System forecasts. Careful attention should also be paid in the program plans to management improvements in the CIP process, with particular attention to those outlined in OMB's memo to the Mayor of January 28, 1976. (Although this memo dealt primarily with the Engineering Division, I expect that the same level of

attention will be directed to improving the CIP management process in Traffic and Transportation.) In the planning sections of the Traffic and Transportation Division, I would like to receive a detailed outline of proposed studies, with anticipated staffing requirements, completion dates, and utilization.

In the Maintenance and Operations Division, substantial descriptive work was done in 1975. I do not anticipate that this will need to be duplicated. Rather, I would like to see the new Maintenance Management System utilized to provide quantitative information regarding the Department's resource requirements for maintenance and the service levels which will be provided at given levels of expenditures.

In Administrative Services and Management and Planning I request that you update the 1976 effort by describing any changes in management techniques, including WOFAC, and changes in program emphasis between 1976-77 and by providing a list of special projects which you anticipate undertaking.

III. Budget Structure

The City budget is not a true program budget, but rather is based on organizational responsibility centers. Thus, ideally, a responsible manager could be identified for each Program and for each Program Category with Programs generally relating to Department Divisions and Program Categories to sections within Divisions. The importance of this concept becomes clear when combined with the program planning effort. The budget then becomes a contract between the City's funding agencies and a Departmental Manager for the delivery of defined services at a given cost.

The Engineering Department, in some respects, departs from this budgetary concept. A review of your current budget structure should consider: (1) the need to clarify the Department's organization structure in the Adopted Budget by bringing programs into line with the Department's Divisions and Categories into line with Divisional sections; (2) the need to portray the Department's reorganization; and (3) a potential change in the present Operations and Management Budget to an organizational, rather than a functional, portrayal which would be compatible with the Maintenance Management System.

The reverberations of a change in budget structure on the Department's accounting system may make it infeasible to implement a radical change in budget structure in 1977 given the

current status of EFIS. At a minimum, however, the Department's 1977 budget submittal should reflect the recent reorganization (i.e., move Fiscal Control to Management and Planning) and should include a review of the current structure with possible implementation in 1978.

The requirement to relate source funds to Program Categories and to identify the dollar value of overhead generated and used by each Category will remain the same. In addition, I would like to receive an element listing of General Fund and City Street Fund expenditures proposed in the budget. I would also like to have a listing of positions by Program Category that are funded by overhead.

IV. Administrative Staffing

As in previous years, administrative staffing patterns in all City Departments will be subject to careful scrutiny in 1977. In the Engineering Department, this necessarily implies the need to define projects in the Management Systems and Industrial Engineering Section of Management and Planning. In addition, in the 1977 budget, OMB will seek justification for the level of administrative support staffs that have been created in the Engineering Division and in Maintenance and Operations. Recent EFIS study reports have indicated the potential existence of duplication of effort between these staffs and Administrative Services and Management and Planning.

V. Revenues

Given the state of the City's financial picture, all fees charged by Departments should be reviewed periodically to assure that they are still recovering program costs. In the Engineering Department, special attention should be given to the charge for street use permits and to charges for reimbursable work in Operations and Maintenance.

Please provide a report on the experience in parking meter revenues and the impact experienced and anticipated from the parking meter replacement program.

In the area of new revenues, OMB remains concerned about the level of General Fund support in monumentation. The issue was raised too late last year to permit a good review of the feasibility of charging more monumentation work to capital projects. In addition, it might be possible to prepare an ordinance to charge the public for monumentation and mapping services.

VI. Specific Budget Issues

A. Management Systems Improvements

Substantial City resources have been devoted to providing improved management systems for the Engineering Department. Your 1977 budget submittal should reflect progress to date and anticipated through 1977 on WOFAC, EFIS, Maintenance Management System and the Project Scheduling System. A specific review of cost savings from the 1976 WOFAC efforts in Street Use and Franchise Utility, in Traffic and Transportation and in Fiscal Control should be included. In addition, OMB fully expects that the Maintenance Management System will produce the anticipated 5-10% reduction in maintenance costs in 1977. The EFIS project has also been projected to result in approximately a 5% reduction in Departmental accounting costs.

B. SB 2143

The enactment of SB 2143 has created substantial confusion regarding the use of City crews in various areas. Your 1977 submittal should include as definitive an analysis as possible of the impact of implementation of SB 2143 on Departmental Operations, staffing and costs. Where changes in Category budgets are the result of 2143, they should be clearly indicated in the analysis.

C. Maintenance

The focal points in the 1977 maintenance budget will include the status and funding of the stabilization and seal-coat program. The 1977 budget for the Arterial City Street Fund should reflect the program outlined in the Department's submittal to the City Council on March 3, 1976. In addition, it should reflect the subsidy to the 3" asphalt paving in the Duwamish Valley. Furthermore, the budget level should begin to reflect declining maintenance costs due to this program.

An analysis of the service impact of the 1976 Budget reduction in Traffic Shops and Field Operations should also be included which would document at a minimum the number of requests for signs and/or service that were not met because of the budget reduction. The landscape maintenance budget should also reflect the use of growth retardants.

D. Traffic and Transportation

In addition to the areas mentioned under the program planning section, the budget should include a review of the level of effort in the Support Section in traffic surveys and data collection. While these are important services, their level of City Street Funds support appears disproportionate to their utility, especially in view of a decline in transportation planning and improvement requirements. It must be emphasized that Maintenance and Operations continues to be a high priority area for funding. Therefore, the allocation of resources between Transportation Planning and Maintenance and Operations should continue to shift in favor of the latter.

E. Solid Waste

The proposed Solid Waste budget should include a review of possible implementation of the Management Information System developed by Arthur Young in 1973. A recent review of the proposal by this Office indicates that the system would provide vital information not currently being generated in a timely or readily accessible manner.

I would also appreciate receipt of a review of the status of drainage and leachate control efforts at Kent-Highland.

F. Materials Laboratory

The serious nature of the City's finances makes it necessary to review research and testing efforts. While not doubting the utility of the laboratory, its General Fund support, compared to other immediate service needs, should be reviewed.

G. Domed Stadium

Your budget request for 1977 should reflect the operation of the Domed Stadium. Please provide a compilation of 1976 costs experienced as of June 25, 1976, anticipated for the remainder of 1976 and anticipated during 1977.

Another difficult budget year is ahead of us. The decisions to be made by the Department in submitting your budget are not easy ones. OMB will provide any assistance you need.

Sincerely,

Walter R. Hundley

Walter R. Hundley
Budget Director

WRH:KS:dj

cc: Mayor Wes Uhlman

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Memorandum

Date March 29, 1976

To All Department Heads

From Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director

Subject Revenues

As you know from our discussion on Wednesday, the City is facing a bleak budget year in 1977. In order to insure that necessary and useful programs are not curtailed unduly, we will be trying to budget "closer to the wire", trying to squeeze as high a revenue projection as practical from each revenue source.

While the Office of Management and Budget has the information to do this for many major revenue sources (property tax, B&O tax, etc.), we do not have sufficient detail about many departmental revenues, particularly those involving fees and charges. George Pernsteiner of this office will be contacting each of you during the next few weeks in order to identify sources of department revenue, their size, the regularity of the revenue flow and some historical data about collections.

In addition, many of you have recurring reports which you use internally to monitor revenue collection progress. I would very much like to have OMB included in the distribution of these reports. They would be invaluable to us in our revenue forecasts. Several of you already are sending us such reports, a fact which we appreciate very much.

I know you share my concern over our 1977 budget prospects. Hopefully, if we can work together in the area of revenues, we will be able to put the outlook for 1977 into a clearer perspective.

Thank you.

WRH:GP:dj

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
AEM/LAG		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
WGV		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
MAR 31 11 34 AM '76

CSS 25.3 (Rev. 4/75)

Budget

PAUL A. WIATRAK, CITY ENGR.

THE CITY OF SEATTLE

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT

M E M O R A N D U M

March 24, 1976

To: Board of Public Works' Committee on Rates for Leased Vehicles

From: Betty L. McFarlane, Executive Secretary

Re: Extension of Time

The Board of Public Works had before it, in regular session today, the Committee's request for an extension of time to report its findings on the above rate increases.

The Board approved the extension until April 30, and felt that the offer from City Light to use its audit staff services would be very useful. The Board also felt that it was certainly appropriate for the Police Department to send a representative and sit with the Committee to provide their input.

As previously indicated in our memo of March 22, the Committee will meet in my office, Room 303, April 1, 1976, at 9:00 a.m. General Services is invited to attend at that time and answer some of the questions which were posed in our attached reports from user departments.

BLM/jw

cc: All Board of Public Works Members
Gary Bloomquist, Director of General Services
Lt. Maxwell, Fleet Control Division, Police Dept.
Al Clawson, Parks Dept.
Ray Snyder, Parks Dept.
John Shreve, Building Dept.
Dale Emerson, Water Dept.
Ed O'Sullivan, Lighting Dept.
Valdemar Schultz, Lighting Dept.

Orig: General Service Dept
Copy: Equip Rental

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
~~PAW~~		
AEM		
JGR		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
MAR 25 8 15 AM '76

Budget
3/10

Kathy Scanlan, Office of Management and Budget

J. G. Ralph, P.A.C.E. March 9 76

Maintenance Management System - 1977 Program Plan

We are attempting to develop a work plan to coincide with delivery of our 1977 Budget Request. The plan will feature most aspects of the Maintenance Management System - including the physical inventory, activity service levels, performance standards and anticipated productivity.

Assembly of this data in time for Budget submission will require considerable time and effort. Therefore, we would like to get some advance information as to allowable percentage increases in both supplies and equipment accounts. Can you help us?

In calculating labor costs for maintenance management purposes, our intention is to use current labor rates. Do you concur?

MDH/REO:clb
cc: Larry Grauberger
Rob Orton

Concurrence Prior To Signature	
JG-R	
DWA	
REO	
MDH	

Copy: Organization - Maint Management

Budget
(NLIH)

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

March 9, 1976

Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director Atten: Bob Jeam

A.E. Maronek

Position Information by Major Funds

The following is the Department's classification of positions as requested in your memo of March 2, 1976:

1) Positions funded by Utilities
   334 full time positions
   4 part time positions

2) Positions funded by Grants and CETA
   108 full time positions (102 CETA)
   3 part time positions (3 CETA)

3) Positions funded by other sources
   681 full time positions
   19 part time positions

In addition to those positions noted above, the Department also has 13 work study students and 1 municipal government intern.

The position classifications are based on the 1976 Adopted Budget. One additional position, which was authorized since the Budget was adopted, is included in the classifications. The totals include 105 authorized CETA positions.

The classification of positions is derived from source funds identified in the Department's 1976 Budget and the Water and Sewer CIPs and is simply a % of total funding applied to total authorized (funded) position strength. The numbers do not reflect the Department's current filled position level.

If you have any questions or require additional information, contact Tom Lorenz (ext. 2837).

TRL:lg

Budget
3/9

March 5, 1976

Reference: Letter February 27, 1976
State Audit
Examination No. 40980

Mr. John P. Harris
Corporation Counsel
City of Seattle

Dear Sir:

We have reviewed the State Examiner's comments regarding the Engineering Department Operating Fund financial reports and agree with his findings. The Department's accounting system and procedures are in the process of change and will be reflected in the 1975 statements.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P. E.
City Engineer

By
ARTHUR E. MARONEK, P. E.
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

CYC:jm

cc: Walter Hundley, Budget Director

Copy: Solid Waste Utility

Budget

3/5

W. R. Hundley, Director, O.M.B., Attention K. Scanlan

J. G. Ralph March 4, 76
Principal Assistant City Engineer
General Services Department Equipment Rates

I have reviewed the leased equipment billings for the month of January calculated at the 1976 rates determined by General Services and have discovered that the present rates are more than twice the percentage increase stipulated in the 1976 Budget Manual. The attachment outlines a specific comparison between 1975 and 1976 rates. Similar increases are evident throughout Sewer and Solid Waste Utilities.

I am speaking of the rates against automobiles, vans, and trucks owned by General Services as distinct from those of the heavy mobile equipment recently transferred by this Department under provisions of the Equipment Rental and Revolving Fund.

At best, the Engineering Department faces a funding shortfall approaching $35,000.

Although the differential is unbudgeted, our internal accumulative rates had to be established considering the new levels in order that the Engineering Operating Fund be guaranteed complete recovery of these expenses.

This is to say that the multitude of source funds supporting Operating Fund disbursements are bearing the immediate impact of this additional cost.

The magnitude of impact on source funds will not be readily known, but may well prove to be one encroachment upon our ability to balance 1976 expenditures and services against budget available.

I am forwarding this information as a matter of interest, and suggest that you may wish to pursue this matter with the appropriate General Services officials.

REO:ksl
Att.
cc: F. A. Wiatrak
H. T. Thornquist
G. B. Fairbanks
E. T. Criscola
A. E. Maronek
G. Bloomquist, G.S.D.

Concurrence Prior To Signature	
JGR	
REO	

Yellow: Budget
Copies: Equip Rental
General Services Dept

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Memorandum

Date March 3, 1976

To Paul Wiatrak, City Engineer, Engineering Department

From Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director WRH

Subject 1975 Carry-Over Request

All requested carry-overs (with the exception of the Solid Waste Utility) have been approved with the following exceptions:

General Fund

1550000	Aid to LID
10449500	Aid to LID 6656

CSF

20555500	Landscape Studies $2,000 Carried-over
20654700	102230 Inverness Slide
2065800	102707 Easement
2055400	Support for OPP ($38,000 Request)

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
MAR 8 10 37 AM '76

Due to the recent information developed by Price Waterhouse on the Solid Waste Utility's revenue situation for 1976, no carry-over of 1975 authorization will be approved. If there are additional budget requirements for the Utility during 1976, they will have to be handled by separate ordinances after we have a clear picture of the Utility's financial status.

I am also awaiting a carry-over request to fund the operating costs for the Engineering Department for the Domed Stadium. OMB has indicated to the Council that we will try to fund as many of these costs by carry-over and transfer as possible.

WRH:KS:dj

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
WEPS/EHW/Ras.		
JGR/GBF		
AEH/CTC/T Lowery		

Paul Paw

CSS 25.3 (Rev. 4/75)

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

Walter R. Hundley, Director
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
PAW		
WGV		
AEM/CTC/T Lorenz		

March 3, 1976

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Paul Wiatrak, City Engineer, Engineering Department
Woody Wilkinson, Director, Office of Policy Planning

FROM: Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director WRH

RE: Engineering Department Request for Carry-Over for Transportation Planning

I have reviewed the request of the Engineering Department to carry-over $38,000 in City Street Funds to provide support for OPP pursuant to the OPP/SED Memorandum of Agreement. The severe financial constraints on the CSF have necessitated a careful review of this request in light of potential other uses for these funds. After reviewing the proposal, I am not approving it for the following reasons:

1. OPP and SED have a large combined budget for this support already. SED has budgeted $25,558 in 1976 CSF for general concept planning outlined in the Agreement. OPP has encumbered $20,000 for specific SED work on the Central Waterfront Plan. (The encumbrance of the total $20,000 for SED work is, of course, contingent upon the resolution of other outstanding budget issues in OPP's 1975 budget.)

2. The lack of specificity of the General Transportation Plan and CBD Concept Plan - Phase II outlined in the Agreement create serious doubts as to the need for the work and possible duplication of earlier efforts.

I must recommend, in view of the City's financial constraints, that OPP and SED prioritize the use of currently encumbered and budgeted funds among those areas outlined in your Agreement.

WRH:KS:dj

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
MAR 8 10 37 AM '76

City of Seattle-Executive Department • Office of Management and Budget • Room 402 Municipal Building • Seattle, Washington 98104 • 583-5792

Budget
2/23

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

Feb. 20, 1976

Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director Att: Bob Jean

A.E. Maronek

1977 Budget Manual

RE: Your memo dated 1/27/76, same subject

In response to the above referenced memo, the following specific comments and recommendations are forwarded for your consideration in preparing the 1977 Budget Manual:

1. Re: Reclassifications, New Positions

   Should salary authorization for reclassifications and/or new positions be included in the department's budget submittal? The 1976 Manual states that "No upgrades, reclasses, or new positions will be allowed until reviewed by Personnel/Civil Service." It is recommended that the Budget Manual clearly define the procedure to be followed in budgeting for reclasses and/or new positions; specifically, salary and position authorizations should be included in the budget submittal together with the pertinent request forms.

2. Re: Expenditure Detail Justification

   How much line item justification is required? Should justification include only increases over the prior year or a total line item justification? Are there any benchmarks that can be used to determine the required level of line item justification for the 1977 Budget? It is recommended that the Budget Manual define the level of expenditure change which should trigger the inclusion of expenditure justifications and define the type of data that is needed for policy decisions.

3. Re: Increased Costs

   Increased costs are shown as a % in the 1976 Budget Manual. Wherever applicable, a base $ amount should be indicated. Some items which could include a base figure are fuel costs, telephone costs, automobile expenses.

4. Re: Personnel Changes

   Given the City's declining revenue situation and the fact that the work force is declining, is it necessary to justify decreases in personnel? The Department personnel summary should be sufficient to portray personnel trends. It is recommened that specific justification be required only in the case of personnel increases.

5. Re: Budget Line Item 5190 - Allocations and Transfers

   The line item is not defined anywhere in the Budget Manual and its proper use in budget preparation (if it should be used at all) is not clear. It is recommended that the intent and use of this line item be clearly defined in the Budget Manual.

6. Re: Budget Line Item 3110 - Expert and Consultant Services

This line item authorizes expenditures for "services performed on a non-recurring basis." Even though the expenditure is authorized in the budget, the services cannot be utilized without specific approval by the City Council. If it is legally possible to include the authority to engage experts and/or consultants in the budget, it is recommended that the proper procedures for inclusion of that authority be defined in the Budget Manual.

Considering the ever increasing volume of data required of the departments in preparing their annual budget submittal and the fact that following the submission, a substantial amount of additional justification has always been required, it would appear that the 1977 Budget Manual might emphasize the level of justification required in specific areas (or for specific line items). With reduced staff levels, this department is finding it increasingly difficult to meet the requirements set forth by OMB. In addition, the cost of producing the annual budget and the program plans supporting that budget is having a significant impact on the Department's administrative (overhead) burden.

One further point; since the Engineering Department is the prime user of revenues generated via the gas tax, it is requested that OMB & Engineering jointly verify gas tax revenue projections so that when our budget is submitted the projections will be in agreement with OMB's.

It is hoped that these recommendations and comments will be of value as you proceed with the preparation of the Budget Manual for 1977.

TRL:lg
cc: K. Scanlan, OMB

Budget

ASSISTANT CORPORATION COUNSEL

JAMES M. TAYLOR
GORDON F. CRANDALL
G. GRANT WILCOX
THOMAS J. WETZEL
ARTHUR T. LANE
CHARLES R. NELSON
LAWRENCE K. MCDONELL
J. ROGER NOWELL
JORGEN G. BADER
E. NEAL KING
JAMES B. HOWE, JR.
DONALD H. STOUT
MYRON L. CORNELIUS
PHILIP M. KING
RICHARD E. MANN
RICHARD S. OETTINGER
JAMES G. BLAIR
W. FREDERICK GREENLEE
WALTER L. WILLIAMS
ELIZABETH A. HUNEKE
CHARLES D. BROWN
DONA M. CLOUD

THE CITY OF SEATTLE

LAW DEPARTMENT

MUNICIPAL BUILDING • SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104
AREA CODE 206 TELEPHONE 583-2304

JOHN P. HARRIS, CORPORATION COUNSEL

CITY PROSECUTORS
ROBERT M. ELIAS
JACK B. REGAN
ROBERT B. JOHNSON
JOSEPH T. SCHLOSSER
ROSS A. RADLEY

CLAIMS MANAGER
V. L. PORTER

✓ February 27, 1976

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
att JGR/GBF		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
MAR 2 8 25 AM '76

Re: Examination No. 42371
City of Seattle
1/1/74 to 12/31/74
A.G. No. 40980

Mr. Paul Wiatrak
City Engineer
Seattle

x State Atty General

Dear Sir:

By letter dated February 19, 1976 the Attorney General of the State of Washington has requested our "information and possible further comments" as to certain findings in the above examination report, a copy of the relevant portions of which (pp. 15-16, 18-20) are enclosed herewith.

In order that we may prepare our reply to such request, we ask that you review the said examination report and inform us as to the facts involved in the matters referred to therein as follows:

"7. Improperly Stated Financial Report for the Engineering Department Operating Fund.

"9. Questionable Contracting and Use of City Personnel for Collection of Municipal Garbage."

Very truly yours,

JOHN P. HARRIS
Corporation Counsel

By James M. Taylor
JAMES M. TAYLOR
Assistant

JMT:mlk
Enclosure
cc: Walter Hundley, Budget Director

3/3 copy to WRN

Copy: Solid Waste Util

"Should a workman suffer a temporary total disability and should his employer at the time of the injury continue to pay him the wages which he was earning at the time of the injury, such injured workman shall not receive any payment pro ded in subsection (1) of this section during the period his employer shall so pay such wages."

RCW 51.32.090(6) provides further:

"In no event shall the monthly payments provided in this section exceed seventy-five percent of the average monthly wage in the state as computed under the provision of RCW 51.08.018."

RCW 51.32.060 provides a limitation on disability payments as follows:

"When the supervisor of industrial insurance shall determine that permanent total disability results from the injury, the workman shall receive monthly during the period of such disability:

"(16) In no event shall the monthly payments provided in this section exceed seventy-five percent of the average monthly wage in the state as computed under the provisions of RCW 51.08.018 . . . ."

Since the City of Seattle pays employees injured on-the-job at the rate of 80 percent of normal salary for the days not worked beginning with the sixth scheduled work day and ending with the two hundred fifty-fifth scheduled work day following injury, and since 80 percent of normal salary is in excess of the amount which would be due the employee from the state fund as authorized in RCW 51.32.060, paragraph (1) through (12) and (16), we submit for legal determination the following:

1. Is the lost-time benefit paid by the city to be considered an industrial insurance payment; a continuation of the employee's salary; or a combination of the two?

2. Does the city have authority to make temporary disability payments in excess of the amount authorized by RCW 51.32.060, paragraphs (1) through (12) and (16) in view of the language of RCW 51.32.090, paragraph (1) and (5) and the prohibition contained in RCW 51.32.090 paragraph (6)?

9. Questionable Contracting and Use of City Personnel for Collection of Municipal Garbage

Our review of municipal garbage collection contracts and use of city personnel to collect departmental garbage revealed a possible duplication of services.

The city's Solid Waste Utility contracted for the period April 1, 1973 through March 31, 1976 for collection of all residential and municipal garbage with General Disposal Corporation and United Waste Control Corporation. Contracted costs for 1974 were $2,048,331.12 and $1,944,758.40, respectively.

Specification submitted in the respective contracts is as follows:

> "1.0. General Description. The work to be performed consists of the complete collection from all residences and all other dwelling units as described in section 4.0 of Ordinance 90379, from all city-owned or operated buildings and property, of all garbage and rubbish accumulated in that portion of the city of Seattle . . . ." (Emphasis supplied.)

Although the contracts provided that all municipal garbage would be collected, we note that the following departments have subsequently contracted separately for collection services:

	Disposal Contractor
Fire Department	Seattle Disposal Co.
Building Department	Seattle Disposal Co.
Seattle Center	Seattle Disposal Co.
Water Department	Seattle Disposal Co.
Licenses and Consumer Affairs	Bayside Disposal Co.
Park Department	Bayside Disposal Co.

For example, during the year 1974 the Parks Department paid Bayside Disposal Company $14,715.75 for hauling garbage from Seattle parks.

In addition, the following departments have used city personnel to collect and transfer municipal garbage to the Solid Waste Utility's transfer stations:

	1974 Transfer Station Charges
Engineering Department	$18,259.75(1)
Park Department	11,938.29
Health Department	6,965.02
Department of Lighting	733.07
Public Library	208.97
Building Department	155.07
Human Resources	91.01
General Services	81.07
Fire Department	73.65
Community Development	53.75

(1) The transfer station charges quoted above do not include the named department's labor and equipment charges for hauling garbage to the transfer station.

We question the practices of city departments contracting separately for collection services already provided under the city's Solid Waste Utility contracts and also using city personnel to perform these services except where necessitated.

We recommend that city departments contract with the city's Solid Waste Utility for collection of all their garbage to insure that there is no duplication of services already provided for in the city's Solid Waste Utility contract.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The unappropriated fund balances of all major operating funds were maintained in a solvent position. The General Fund and the Park and Recreation Fund showed fund balance increases of $3,496,034.27 and $368,384.72, respectively. These increases were primarily due to the accrual of business and occupational taxes receivable at year-end, treated in previous years on a cash basis. The Arterial City Street Fund and the Building Department Operating Fund showed fund balance increases of $617,046.69 and $169,324.38, respectively. These increases were due to an excess of revenues over expenditures. The City-County Health Fund showed an increase of $341,792.51, in fund balance over the previous year, due primarily to larger General Fund and King County allocations. The City Street showed a substantial decrease in fund balance of $1,536,244.41, due partially to reduced state gas tax and Urban Arterial Trust revenues. Other fund balances showing significant decreases were the Seattle Center Fund - $179,189.62, Emergency Fund - $126,240.62, Library Fund - $66,568.74, and the City Property Assessment Redemption Fund - $55,573.77. These decreases are primarily due to an excess of expenditures over the revenues, however, we noted a $200,000.00 prior years adjustment in the Emergency Fund and large year-end increases in continuing appropriation reserves in the Library Fund.

Funds held by the City Treasurer on December 31, 1974 totaled $56,962,767.72 including $45,997,704.06 invested in the following securities:

United States Treasury Bonds, Notes and Debentures	$35,959,414.06
Commercial Bank Certificates of Deposit	9,678,290.00
Savings and Loan Certificates	280,000.00
Mutual Savings Banks	80,000.00
Total	$45,997,704.06

Note: The city has pledged $400,000.00 in U.S. Treasury Bonds as a security deposit for qualification as a self-insurer under the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1971 as contained in RCW 51.14.020, Section 2. These bonds, bearing interest at 6.375 percent and maturing August 15, 1984, are held in escrow with the Seattle-First National Bank in accordance with the January 14, 1973 agreement between the City of Seattle and the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries. This agreement is contained in Comptroller's File 275086 and was authorized by Ordinance No. 101715 dated December 21, 1972.

In addition to sustaining a $10,529.39 operating loss for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1974, the Design Commission Operating Fund was unable to meet their scheduled $5,000.00 payment on a $23,000.00 loan from the Cumulative Reserve Fund. We also note that at December 31, 1974, no payment has been made on a $10,000.00, 90 day loan from the Emergency Fund received November 30, 1968.

We reviewed the Design Commission Operating Fund's financial position at August 31, 1975 which shows a $677.92 net income from operations for the eight months then ended. Also, vouchers payable which include unpaid Community Development Department servicing charges for 1973, 1974 and 1975, exceed cash and accounts receivable. We note that $1,500.00 had been repaid on the Emergency Fund loan, while the scheduled 1974 and 1975 payments amounting to $11,000.00 plus interest, on the Cumulative Reserve Fund loan is in arrears.

The practice of a fund not paying for services rendered on its behalf amounts to receiving a loan without interest and is contrary to the provisions of RCW 43.09.210 which we previously quoted.

We recommend that the Design Commission review their operations to determine if expenses can be decreased and/or the hourly billing rate increased to provide sufficient income to meet obligations and repay outstanding loans.

7. Improperly Stated Financial Reports for the Engineering Department Operating Fund

We noted in previous examination reports that the city was publishing inaccurate financial statement figures for the Engineering Department Operating Fund. The city reported that the operations of the Engineering Department Operating Fund for the year ended December 31, 1974, resulted in a $164,617.95 net income in excess of expenses. Our review of the operations for the same period showed that the Engineering Department Operating Fund sustained a net operating loss of $275,018.00 or a difference of $439,635.95 from that reported in the city's annual report.

The department, as part of their year-end closing procedure, decreases the balance sheet account "Unbilled Accounts Receivable" by the amount of cumulative operating gain and increases the same account by the amount of inventories on hand at the end of the year. The net effect of this practice is to understate "Unbilled Accounts Receivable", "Inventories", and "Fund Balance".

The following is a comparison of the Engineering Department Operating Fund Balance Sheet at December 31, 1974, as presented in the city's annual financial report and as developed in our examination:

Engineering Department Operating Fund
Balance Sheet
December 31, 1974

Assets & Other Debits	City Annual Report	Examination
Cash	$ 706,215.26	$ 706,215.26
Billed Accounts Receivable	2,516,652.69	2,516,652.69
Unbilled Accounts Receivable	685,810.01	2,145,385.64
Inventories	503,758.24	480,038.49
Total Assets & Other Debits	$4,412,436.20	$5,848,292.08
Liabilities, Fund Balance & Other Credits		
Vouchers Payable	$ 600,157.31	$ 600,157.31
Accrued Wages Payable	754,423.55	754,423.55
Due General Fund	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00
Unencumbered Continuing Appropriations	44,213.10	44,213.10
Reserve for Encumbrances	1,474,887.26	1,474,887.26
Fund Balance	538,754.98	1,974,610.86
Total Liabilities, Fund Balance and Other Credits	$4,412,436.20	$5,848,292.08

We believe that the city's presentation of the financial position of the Engineering Department Operating Fund at December 31, 1974, is in violation of RCW 43.09.200 which requires a municipality's accounting system to "exhibit true accounts and detailed statements of funds collected, received, and expended for account of the public for any purpose whatever" (Emphasis supplied).

We called this condition to the attention of the Engineering Department in our previous audit report. During our current examination we noted that the financial statement figures were still inaccurate.

We remind city officials of the provisions contained in RCW 42.20.040 and provides that:

> "Every public officer who shall knowingly make any false or misleading statement in any official report or statement, under circumstances not otherwise prohibited by law, shall be guilty of a gross misdemeanor."

We recommend that the Engineering Department initiate changes in their accounting system and procedures to conform with the requirements of generally accepted accounting principles, that will in turn reflect true accounts for financial reports of the Engineering Department Operating Fund.

Fin Budget

Engr (15) C.7.

ORDINANCE 105375

AN ORDINANCE abrogating a portion of an appropriation from the Cumulative Reserve Fund made by Ordinance 105296 and reappropriating a like sum to increase certain accounts in the General Fund portion of "Supporting Fund Appropriations" in the 1976 Budget of the Engineering Department.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That to simplify the accounting of the City Comptroller and the Engineering Department, General Fund Accounts "5013 - Office Support" and "5029 - Maintenance Management System and Engineering Fiscal Information" are hereby increased in the sums of $71,120 and $32,577 respectively by abrogations and reappropriations hereby made and authorized of like sums from that certain appropriation heretofore made from the Cumulative Reserve Fund by Ordinance 105296 and the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants and make the necessary transfers;

PROVIDED, That nothing herein contained shall effect any allowance made for Object of Expenditure "3000 - Other Services and Charges" authorized in any Program Category of any Department by said Ordinance 105296.

(To be used for all Ordinances except Emergency.)

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty days from and after its passage and approval, if approved by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect at the time it shall become a law under the provisions of the city charter.

Passed by the City Council the 23 day of February, 1976, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 23 day of February, 1976

President of the City Council.

Approved by me this 26 day of February, 1976.

Mayor.

Filed by me this 26 day of February, 1976

Attest: E. L. Kirk
City Comptroller and City Clerk.

(SEAL)

Published

By J. F. Fenton
Deputy Clerk.

CSS 8.1.6

Budget

THE CITY OF SEATTLE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

MEMORANDUM

TO Paul Wiatrak, City Engineer

FROM Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director DATE February 19, 1976

SUBJECT Sign Replacement Policy - Inquiry of Councilman Benson

I am returning the attached letter to Councilman Benson which was prepared in response to his inquiry of January 16, 1976 regarding the Department's sign replacement policy. In light of the Mayor's recent decision against providing CDBG funds for traffic signs, it does not seem appropriate to respond to Councilman Benson with a copy of the Department's CDBG proposal.

WRH:KS:mr

Attachment

Copy: CDBG (cover memo only)

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
att WGV		
INFORMATION	✓	
~~PAW~~		
A.E.M		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
MAR 5 7 55 AM '76

Your
Seattle
Engineering Department

Paul A. Wiatr City Engineer
Wes Uhlman, ayor

RECEIVED
FEB 13 1976
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
& BUDGET

February 6, 1976

Via Mayor Wes Uhlman

The Honorable George E. Benson
Councilman
City Council
City of Seattle

Dear Councilman Benson:

This is in answer to your letter dated January 16, 1976 regarding our sign replacement policy.

Attached is a copy of a letter from Paul A. Wiatrak to R.W. Wilkinson concerning a Community Development Block Grant proposal to acquire sufficient funds to bring our sign replacement policy up to the 1974 funding level. If this grant is accepted, it should resolve your concerns.

We might add that our present policy does in some cases present an inconvenience for the public, however, if a safety hazard exists resulting from a missing sign, this sign is reinstalled immediately.

We trust this answers your question satisfactorily. If you have any further questions, please contact Barry Fairfax, (2760) of my staff, for assistance.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

by: W.G. van Gelder

W.G. van Gelder, P.E.
City Traffic Engineer

WLM:es
Attach.
cc: Mayor Wes Uhlman
8I

Seattle Engineering Department, Room 910, Seattle Municipal Building, 600 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104, (206) 583-2843.

THE CITY OF SEATTLE

CSS 25.3

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

DATE January 26, 1976

TO R.W. Wilkinson Attn: Nancy Thomas

FROM P.A. Wiatrak By A.E. Maronek

SUBJECT Neighborhood Safety & Access Program

Attached please find a Community Development Block Grant proposal to support multiple projects that replace, rehabilitate and/or improve traffic control signs, guardrails and roadside fences.

It is our assumption that these projects are in accordance with federal regulations (Title 24, Chapter V; Part 570; Subpart C; Section 570.200 - Eligible Activities) which state that CDBG funds may be used for the "reconstruction, or installation of...streets...parking facilities", "as opposed to ineligible expenditures (Section 570.200 (a) (4) for "operating and maintenance expenses..." We define the proposed activities as capital improvements in that the damaged and deteriorated signs and guardrails will be replaced with new material, improved paints and new designs which meet new safety standards.

It is also important to note that these improvements are not made on a routine, pre-scheduled basis. Each project is a unique response to a specific incidence. As such, each replacement or revision is a capital project - the cost of which is under $10,000 and unaffected by RCW 35.22.620 and RCW35.22.640.

If you need information in addition to that contained in the grant proposal, please contact Lynn Guttmann of Management and Planning.

LAG:lg
Attachment
cc: C.T. Murray
Barry Fairfax
Phil Harrison

CDBG FORM P-1
1976 Community Development Block Grant Program — Physical Development Projects

Page

1 PROJECT TITLE:	2 PERM. PROJECT NO.:	3 DEPARTMENT:	4 PROJECT MANAGER & PHONE:	5 LOCATION (CDA & Census
Neighborhood Safety & Access Program		SEATTLE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT	C. T. Murray 2770	Citywide

6 PROJECT NARRATIVE: (use additional sheets if necessary)

A. HISTORY, NEEDS AND OBJECTIVES: This program encompasses multiple projects for the replacement and rehabilitation of traffic control signs and the replacement of guardrails and roadside fences. For the past several years, the need for sigr replacement has been prompted by a number of factors such as losses through vandalism, accident damage, deterioration and revised area designations.

Until 1974, the City Street Fund supported this program. These funds are derived from state gasoline taxes. Since the 1973 embargo and the shift of consumer preference toward smaller cars, gas consumption has dropped, thereby reducing the revenues generated by the tax. Within the same timeframe, the vast increase in prices meant less material and labor purchased per dollar spent. In summary, there is now less money to buy much more expensive items. This short fall in funds necessitated reducing and/or eliminating portions of the traffic control replacement and rehabilitation program. Fr November 1975 until mid-January 1976, 410 damaged regulatory, warning, time limit, directional and street name signs were removed from the City's streets because there were no funds for replacement, rehabilitation or improvement.

Needs and Objectives of the Program: There is a great need to prevent the City's basic infrastructure from deteriorating. The continued removal of traffic control devices from the City's streets will negatively impact the safety and appearance of the neighborhoods. The public has already perceived and reported numerous safety hazards and street access problems.

The approach of this program application is to match Engineering Department budgeted funds with Block Grant funds. The Block Grant funds would provide for the placement of parking restriction, "local access only", "left turn lane", time limit parking, "dead-end", informational and street name signs. Under current funding restrictions, damaged roadside guard rails and fences protecting private property are being removed and not replaced. Block Grant funds would provide for the broken and rotting post replacement, flex beam repair and replacement, and delineator post repair and replacement. ne of these needs represents "routine maintenance" activities. The City Street Fund portions of the Engineering Department budget will continue to support the "maintenance" of traffic control signs, curbs, crosswalks, guardrails and fences.

The overall need, and the project objective, is to provide a basic level of infrastructure improvement in the most cost effective and visible way. The safety and access of neighborhood streets will decline if this need is not met.

B. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES: Because this program will provide basic traffic control mechanisms throughout the City, it will reinforce all other community development activities geared to upgrade and enhance the neighborhoods.

C. PROGRAM'S CORRELATION WITH CDBG POLICY PLAN:
Funding Strategy: The 1976 Block Grant funding strategy emphasizes the "preservation of sound neighborhoods and the recove of marginally blighted areas..." It reiterates the need to "complete the provision of a basic ingrasturcture." This program provides one mechanism for fulfilling those strategies.
Evaluative Criteria:
Duplication: No
Alternative Funding: Alternative funds are being used in this program to support the maintenance of the traffic control system. Attachment A illustrates the relationship of Block Grant funds to City Street

1 PROJECT TITLE:	2 PERM. PROJECT NO.:	3 DEPARTMENT:	4 PROJECT MANAGER & PHONE:	5 LOCATION (CDA & Censu
Neighborhood Safety & Access Program		SEATTLE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT	C. T. Murray 2770	Citywide

Page

6 PROJECT NARRATIVE: (use additional sheets if necessary)

Funds. Please note that the Block Grant Funds are critical to the implementation of this program as City Street Funds are severely limited in the Engineering Budget.

Program Feasibility: The proposed safety and access improvements can be completed within the funding and time parameters. The requested $300,000 will be utilized in a program that is well defined both in terms of objectives and administrative/operational procedures. No other agencies or private decisions need be made prior to the implementation of the program. The cost estimates are based upon historical cost data that has been collected over the years. The Engineering Department has legal authority to implement the program and has had past experience with its implementation.

Lower Income: Because lower income neighborhoods tend to be concomitant with physically older areas, there is probably a higher incidence of signs which are broken, defaced, weathered, or otherwise rendered very difficult to read. To the extent that traffic control signs, guardrails and fences are damaged, removed and not replaced within predominately lower income neighborhoods, this program would improve the situation.

Critical: This program is critically needed. The warning, regulatory, informational and street name signs are an integral part of the neighborhoods. Areas with poor signing will appear to be deteriorating. And, in fac citizens will find it much more difficult to find locations and move conveniently and safely arbund the City. The Block Grant objectives to improve and stabilize the City's infrastructure can in part be realized through the implementation of this program.

Lost Opportunity: Not funding the program will mean deferring the improvements causing increases in material and labor costs, accident-related expenditures and citizen frustration.

Completeness: Block Grant funding will provide a discrete usable product.

Future City Commitment: A City commitment will remain to maintain the traffic control system that has been establish Block Grant funds will delay the deterioration of the traffic control system, but only continuous funding can prevent deterioration over time.

Historic Preservation: N/A

D. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ELEMENTS: As described in previous sections, this safety and access program includes replaceme rehabilitation or improvements to: warning, regulatory, time limit, directional, informational, and street name signs, roadside guardrails and fences.

G. ALTERNATIVE FUNDING: In "Section A, Needs and Objectives" and in "Section C, Alternative Funding," the alternative source of funding was listed as City Street Fund. Due to severe revenue reductions, CSF supports the maintenance of the traffic control system not the rehabilitation/replacement of this program's elements. The only other eligible source of funding for the program would be the City's General Fund. But, demands for that funding source far exceed the available revenue.

H. SUPPORTIVE PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES: N/A

BUDGET
Jan / June 1976

1 PROJECT TITLE:	2 PERM. PROJECT NO.:	3 DEPARTMENT:	4 PROJECT MANAGER & PHONE:	5 LOCATION (CPA & Census)
Neighborhood Safety & Access Program		Seattle Engineering Dept.	C. T. Murray 2770	Citywide

PROJECT NARRATIVE: (use additional sheets if necessary)

I. CENSUS TRACTS: Citywide

J. MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES: Within twelve months, the Engineering Department will rehabilitate, replace or improve the following elements of the traffic control infrastructure:

Program Element	Annual Output
-Regulatory Signs	1500 revisions 2000 replacements
-Informational Signs	500 revisions 80 replacements
-Street Name Signs	30 revisions 450 replacements
-Fences/Guardrails	10 replacements

The Engineering Department will maintain a record of the disposition of each of these projects.

ATTACHMENT A

PROPOSED CSF/CDBG BUDGET

ACTIVITY ↓ / Time Frame →	1/76 - 3/76	4/76 - 6/76	7/76 - 12/76		1/77 - 6/77		7/77 - 9/77	10/77 - 12/77
Funding Source →	CSF	CSF	CSF	BG	BG	CSF	CSF	CSF
I. Regulatory Signs								
(a) Replacement	15	30		50	50		30	15
(b) Revisions	2	7		11	11		7	2
(c) Maintenance	8.5	14.5	23.5			23.5	14.5	8.5
II. Informational Signs								
(a) Replacement	.8	1		7.2	7.2		1	.8
(b) Revisions	1.5	3		7	7		3	1.5
III. Street Name Signs								
(a) Replacement	7.2	15	.8	30	30	.8	15	7.2
(b) Revisions		1		8	8		1	
IV. Curbs/Crosswalks	6	10	16	0	0	16	10	6
V. Guardrails/Fences								
(a) Replacement				22.8	22.8			
(b) Maintenance	4	7					7	4
SUB-TOTALS	45	88.5	40.3	136	136	40.3	88.5	45
	$173.8(1)			$272(2)			$173.8(1)	
VI. Traffic Control (Engr.) Operations, Signing Street Naming & Numbering				12.8	12.8			
VII. Traffic Control (Clerical)				2.4				
SUB-TOTALS				14.2	12.8			
TOTAL (I-VII)				$300				

(1) CSF 12 month total

(2) CDBG 12 month total (Operations Division)

Note: All numbers in thousands.

G FORM P-2
6 Community Development Block Grant Program – Physical Development Projects

Page

ROJECT TITLE: Neighborhood Safety and Access Program	2. PERM. PROJECT NO.:	

ROJECT ELEMENTS:	4. ESTIMATED TOTAL COST OF EACH ELEMENT:	5. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STATUS
. Regulatory Signs Replacement & Revisions	$ 122,000	☐ EXEMPT Reason:
I. Informational Signs Replacement & Revisions	28,400	☐ FNSE Date:
II. Street Name Signs Replacement & Revisions	77,600	☐ EIS
V. Guardrails/Fences Replacement	47,600	☐ Pending
. Traffic Control, Engineering Improvements	26,000	☐ Draft Completed Date:
	$ 301,600	☐ Final Completed Date:
		☒ NO ACTION
		Comments:

ROJECT PHASE	7. PHASE SCHEDULE START	7. PHASE SCHEDULE END	8. PY '75 CDBG ALLOC.	9. PY '75 CDBG EST. END	10. EST. CDBG CARRYOVER	11. ADD'L PY '76 CDBG REQUEST	12. PY '76 * SEM. I	12. PY '76 * SEM. II	13. PY '77 * SEM. I	13. PY '77 * SEM. II	14. PY '78 * SEM. I	14. PY '78 * SEM. II	15. TOTAL
lanning & Design	7-1-76	12-31-77					10,800	10,800					21,600
onstruction	7-1-76	12-31-77					138,000 (800)	138,000 (800)					276,000 (1,600)
dministration	7-1-76	8-30-76					2,400						2,400
TOTAL							151,200 (800)	148,800 (800)					300,000 (1,600)

* are amounts from other sources in parenthesis.

1976 Mpo Operating Budget
as of 1/1/76

CATEGORY ⇒ / ACTIVITY ⇓	MAINTENANCE in 000s CSF	MAINTENANCE in 000s unfunded	REPLACEMENT in 000s CSF	REPLACEMENT in 000s unfunded	REVISION in 000s CSF	REVISION in 000s unfunded
Sheet Name Signs 53 Pp 9 Bu			11	(42)	1	(8)
Regulatory Signs 47 m 95 p 20 V	47	(35)	45	(15)	20	
Informational/Warning 9 m 11 V		(5)	.8	(3.2)	6	(5)
Curbs/Crosswalks 24 m	32	(52)				
Fences/Guardrails 11 m 29 p	11	(29)				
TOTAL 368	90	(121)	56.8	(60.2)	27	(13)

CSF = $173.8 k
unfunded = $194.2 k
total need = 7368 k

NOTE: Description of work categories reveals little difference in work activities between sign maintenance & sign replacement. "Maintenance" activity may include, but is not limited to, replacing signs & sign posts as does "Replacement" activity. See attached "Description of

Budget

TRL:mcm:1-15-76

ORDINANCE NO. 105347

AN ORDINANCE relating to the Engineering Department; increasing and decreasing certain expenditure allowances in said department's 1975 Budget by reappropriation and transfer.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That as requested by the Mayor, expenditure allowances for designated Objects of Expenditure in Program Category "Landscape Maintenance" (Code 2600) in the 1975 Budget of the Engineering Department are hereby increased as follows:

2000 Supplies	$ 8,000
3000 Other Services & Charges	91,650

by the reappropriation and transfer hereby made and authorized of amounts from the unexpended and unencumbered allowances in said 1975 Budget for Objects of Expenditure in Program Category "Cleaning Operations" (Code 2100) as follows:

1000 Personal Services	$64,650
6000 Capital Outlay	35,000

which allowances are hereby decreased in said amounts, and the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants and make the necessary transfers.

Section 2. Any act pursuant to the authority and prior to the effective date of this ordinance is hereby ratified and confirmed.

Section 3. (30-day ending)

APPROVED: February 19, 1976

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

Walter R. Hundley, Director
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

Date: February 19, 1976

To: Engineering Department

From: Walter R. Hundley

Subject: 1976 DATA PROCESSING BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

Attached is a list of the 1976 budget allocations for the data processing activities of your department as authorized by Ordinance No. 105296 which was adopted January 28, 1976.

You may find that the budget authorizations for some projects have been increased over what was originally requested in the Mayor's Proposed Budget. This was done in order to cover the higher costs of the data processing resource alternative which was selected by the City Council, rather than the Mayor's recommendation for facilities management which was the basis for data processing appropriations in the Proposed Budget. The attachment presents the current adopted budget for all of the authorized data processing projects of your department. This level of appropriation should be sufficient to cover the higher data processing service rates which must be charged to City departments during 1976.

If you have any questions regarding your authorized data processing budget, please contact your department budget analyst or George Roberts (ext. 6020) of OMB/MIS.

WRH:lg

Attachment

cc: K. Scanlan

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
att AEM		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
FEB 27 11 38 AM '76

Budget

2-11

February 11, 1976

Mr. Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management and Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

We request authority to make the following transfer of authorization in the Department's 1976 Budget:

	Fund	Dept.	Cat.	Basub	Object	Title	Amount
From:	501	030	1400	541.23	2100	Office Supplies	$150.00
To:	501	030	1400	541.23	6400	Machinery & Equipment	150.00

This transfer is necessary to provide sufficient authorization for the purchase of 1 Electronic Desk Computer and 1 Cassette Tape Recorder by the Court and Right of Way Division. Further justification can be found in the attached memos.

If you require further information, contact the Financial Management Section of Management and Planning at 2837.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

BY
ARTHUR E. MARONEK
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

TRL:smh
Attachments
cc: E. M. Whiting
C. T. Criscola

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Office of the Mayor
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
AEM		
DMD		

✓February 10, 1976

The City Council
The City of Seattle

Honorable Members:

Ordinance No. 105296 recently passed by the City Council appropriated a total of $103,697 for data processing costs in the Engineering Department. The funds were appropriated only in the Engineering Department's operating budget. To account for these costs without going through the source funds in the Engineering Department Budget will unnecessarily complicate accounting procedures for both the Engineer and the Comptroller and this situation would continue throughout 1976. I am therefore requesting an amendment to Ordinance No. 105296 to appropriate the $103,697 in the following General Fund source accounts:

Account 5013 -	Office Support	$71,120
Account 5029 -	Maintenance Management and Engineering Fiscal Information	$32,577

Draft legislation is attached.

Sincerely,

Wes Uhlman
Mayor

by

Walter R. Hundley
Budget Director

WRH:KS:mr

Attachment

cc: Mayor's Office
Engineering Department

Copy: Computers

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
FEB 11 3 50 PM '76

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

Budget

Engineering

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

Walter R. Hundley, Director
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

February 10, 1976

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
REM		
LAG		

Honorable Sam Smith, President
Seattle City Council
Seattle, Washington

Dear Sir:

Please find attached Executive Requests for legislation which have been approved by the Mayor and his Office of Management and Budget. Comments and recommendations by the Office of Management and Budget are attached to the specific pieces of requested legislation.

We invite your early attention to these matters, which include the following: (Listed Below).

We would appreciate your requesting that the requested legislation be drafted by the Corporation Counsel.

Sincerely,

Walter R. Hundley
Budget Director

WRH:dp

cc: John Harris, Corporation Counsel, Attachments
Mayor
Council Members

1. TOPICS Signal Modernization Program - Engineering
2. Sale of land and buildings known as the Triangle Group in Pike Place Market - DCD
3. legislation authorizing funds for restoration, rehabilitation and preservation of these buildings - DCD
4. Accounts receivable write-offs - Seattle Center
5. $103,697 for data processing costs - Engineering
6. legislation amending Seattle Housing Code and providing alternative methods of recovery of costs for repair, alterations or improvement of buildings - Building Department
7. Sale of parcels 17-5 and 37-11 to MacPherson's Inc. - DCD
8. Brighton Neighborhood Traffic Diverters - Engineering
9. legislation authorizing agreement with Select-A-Seat Corporation - Seattle Center
10. 601 Elliott Avenue West - Building Department
11. approval to accept sculpture gift to the City of Seattle - Seattle Arts Commission

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
FEB 11 3 48 PM '76

12. Seattle Tennis Center - Parks and Recreation
13. Tax Title Property Acquisition; R/W Nos. 7294 and 7407 - Engineering
14. Vacation, Minor Avenue North, North of Mercer Street, CF 280399 - Engineering
15. Agreement to Boeing Computer Services Inc. for Microwave Installations - City Light
16. South Connecticut Street widening project - Engineering

ORIG COPY:	TOPICS	(# 1)
COPIES:	Community Development Dept-Pike Plaza	(# 2)
	✓Budget	(# 5)
	Traffic Diverters	(# 8)
	Community Development Dept-Brighton	(# 8)
	Deeds 44-44	(#13)
	Vac, Minor Ave N, CF 280399/Res 25039	(#14)
	MI-S Connecticut St, et al, Widening, Ord 102173	(#16)

Budget
2/11

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

√ February 10, 1976

V. Porter, Claims Division Manager

A. E. Maronek

Processing of General Fund Claims

√ X-Claims

Attached please find copies of claims totaling $5,552. As you know, the Engineering Department's General Fund claims account was abandoned in 1974. The subsequent attempts to fund general claims from the Engineering Department's Operating Fund has been unsatisfactory because the Operating Fund is an accounting mechanism not a source of funds. To add to the problem gas tax revenues, our general source of financing, cannot be used to pay claims. Thus general claims can only be paid for from the General Fund. The Engineering Department does not have any General Fund earmarked for claims.

Mr. Howard Embree of the Office of Management and Budget is working with your office to establish a more satisfactory method for handling general claims related to the Engineering Department. Until a mutually agreeable alternative is established, please do not appropriate or forward vouchers for payment from the SED Operating Fund.

Thank you for your cooperation.

LAG:emh
cc: Howard Embree
C. T. Criscola

Budget

2/13

February 6, 1976

Via Mayor Wes Uhlman

The Honorable George E. Benson
Councilman
City Council
City of Seattle

✓x Signs
✓x Policy

Dear Councilman Benson:

This is in answer to your letter dated January 16, 1976 regarding our sign replacement policy.

Attached is a copy of a letter from Paul A. Wiatrak to R.W. Wilkinson concerning a Community Development Block Grant proposal to acquire sufficient funds to bring our sign replacement policy up to the 1974 funding level. If this grant is accepted, it should resolve your concerns.

We might add that our present policy does in some cases present an inconvenience for the public, however, if a safety hazard exists resulting from a missing sign, this sign is reinstalled immediately.

We trust this answers your question satisfactorily. If you have any further questions, please contact Barry Fairfax, (2760) of my staff, for assistance.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

by:

W.G. van Gelder, P.E.
City Traffic Engineer

Information

Concurrence
Prior to
Signature

by L.E.O.
LAG

WLM:es
Attach.
cc: Mayor Wes Uhlman
ai

Copy: Community Development Block Grant

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

February 6, 1976

Councilman Tim Hill Via: Mayor Uhlman

A. E. Maronek

1975 Year End Transfers - Street and Bridge Maintenance

It should be noted that the transfers requested are not source fund transfers, but transfers of Operating Fund authorizations. Prior legislation, specifically the Block Grant Ordinance (#104741) and year end source fund transfers (Ord. #105242) did not include corresponding revisions to Operating Fund authorizations. So, the transfers in question are in effect only a housekeeping measure to bring Operating Fund authorizations in line with prior legislative actions.

The need for the original source fund transfer relates to the strategies used to keep expenditures within constantly decreasing budget limits while emphasizing those services deemed most important by the public and the Council.

Rationale Regarding Reduction in Cleaning Operations:

Since January of 1975, the Operations Division has not backfilled vacated positions to ensure that attrition, rather than extensive layoffs, would gradually reduce the manpower level needed to live within the funding restrictions occurring in 1975-1977.

When additional funds became available to the "Stab. and Seal Program," and the further possibility of Block Grant assistance became likely, it was decided to field two asphalt paving crews. The second crew was staffed by 12 positions from District Maintenance Headquarters - many of the same experienced personnel who composed a second crew in 1973. These men normally would have worked in Cleaning, Roadway Maintenance, Drainage, and Landscape. Consequently, their labor dollars were saved in those categories for the time they were to be occupied in the paving section. C.E.T.A. positions did add some continuity to the services which would have been accomplished by these 12 people. The 12 position crew returned to the districts once the paving season ended. The fact that these positions were not backfilled while absent from their normal duties caused salary savings in the Operating Fund authorization.

Rationale Regarding Increase in Landscape Maintenance:

The major reason for the overexpenditures in P.C. 2600 - Landscape Maintenance, is the fact that in 1975 the City experienced the worst tent caterpiller epidemic in recent history. 1975 had been predicted to be an average or below average year for tent caterpillers. Instead, spraying had to be done on unopened street areas under Engineering Department control in response to specific complaints that areas bordering private gardens were not being sprayed. Also, in 1975 landscaping contracts had to be renegotiated. Besides the fact that some additional areas were let out to contract, inflationary pressures resulted in increased costs for those areas already under contract.

Your office has scheduled a meeting on this matter at 8:15 a.m. on Monday, February 9th. My staff will be available for that meeting should you feel that further justification is required. If not, please contact me at 2837.

TRL/REO/LAG:smh
cc: J. G. Ralph

P. Wiatrak

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

Walter R. Hundley, Director
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
FEB 9 9 03 AM '76

M E M O R A N D U M

February 4, 1976

TO: All Department Heads

FROM: Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director

SUBJECT: 1976 Data Processing Service Rates

The 1976 data processing budget ordinance which has just been approved by the Mayor and the City Council reflects their concern to develop an adequate, modern computing capability for the City. The policy which has been established calls for substantial and rapid redirection of the City's data processing program, leading to better and more cost effective services in the future. Unfortunately, however, the Council did not agree with the Mayor's recommendation that a Facilities Management contract be negotiated to provide these services at the lowest possible cost. Therefore, in-house data processing services will be more costly than they were in prior years for several reasons:

1. The City must provide staff and equipment for two data centers - KCSS and the DPC - until the NCR computer programs have been converted to run on the IBM system.

2. City data processing personnel must be retrained in order to function effectively in a modern IBM computing environment.

3. A major recruiting effort is required in order to acquire the technical data processing staff who will accomplish the City's immediate and long-range data processing plans.

4. Modern standards and procedures must be instituted in order to effectively direct and control data processing activities.

5. A much greater emphasis must be placed on systems and program documentation as well as technical training in order to avoid a future repetition of the problems which face us today.

As a consequence of the higher program costs, the technical data processing staff rates are being increased immediately, effective January 1, 1976. The following rates will be reflected on all 1976 billings to departments for data processing services:

Systems Analyst IV	$26.00/hour
Senior Data Processing Analyst	$24.00/hour
Project Supervisor	$24.00/hour
Data Processing Analyst	$22.50/hour
Senior Programmer	$20.00/hour
Programmer	$18.00/hour

The attachment to this memo lists all existing data processing personnel and the new hourly rates at which they will be billed.

These rates compare favorably with rates paid by the City to outside contractors for equivalent services. For example, King County Systems Services charges $25.00 for programming services; Boeing Computer Services charges $26.00 to $29.00 per hour depending upon the application and the amount of support (e.g. desks, office facilities, etc.) which the City provides.

Computer processing rates are not being adjusted at this time. However, a comprehensive data processing rate analysis is presently underway to be completed in February. The personnel rates established here will be re-evaluated, and may be adjusted along with other data processing service rates at that time. All rates will be evaluated again in June based on year-to-date experience with the program. The intent is to ensure that the data processing service rates charged to City departments are the lowest possible, sufficient to recover program costs.

All departmental budget authorizations for City data processing services were adjusted to reflect the higher program costs as part of the ordinance transferring the Data Processing Center from General Services to OMB. You will receive a list of your department's authorized data processing projects and budget allowances very shortly. If you wish further information, please contact Mr. George Roberts at 583-6020.

WRH:GR:laj
JPE
Attachment

1976 D P PERSONNEL RATES
(Effective 1/1/76)

Programmer $18.00/hour

B. Dahle
P. DeAnguera
F. Erickson
B. Irby
J. Recht
L. Rudolph

Senior Programmer $20.00/hour

H. Chinn
B. Harrison
F. Hidaka
S. Mabe
B. Pederson
J. Tomlinson

Data Processing Analyst $22.50/hour

B. Benson
D. Hines
J. Morrison
R. Oliphant
D. Smith
M. Swanson

Senior Data Processing Analyst $24.00/hour
Project Supervisor

J. Banks
M. Rommel
G. Shimizu
D. Wallace

Systems Analyst IV $26.00/hour

F. Ballantine
J. Holt

Budget

Eng

(16) 14

ORDINANCE 105315

AN ORDINANCE relating to the 1975 Budget of the Engineering Department; increasing certain objects of expenditure by reappropriation and transfer to effect payment of certain obligations incurred in 1975.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That as requested by the City Engineer and recommended by the Mayor in the attachment for the purpose of effectuating payment of obligations incurred by the City during 1975, the expenditure allowance for General Fund Account 5016 "Slide Control" in the 1975 Budget of the Engineering Department is hereby increased in the amount of forty thousand six hundred and seventy three dollars ($40,673) by reappropriation and transfer of a like amount from the unexpended and unencumbered allowance in General Fund Account 5017 "Snow and Ice Control" in said Budget of the Engineering Department, which allowance is hereby decreased in such amount and the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants and make the necessary transfers.

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty days from and after its passage and approval, if approved by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect at the time it shall become law under the provisions of the City Charter.

(To be used for all Ordinances except Emergency.)

Section 3. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty days from and after its passage and approval, if approved by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect at the time it shall become a law under the provisions of the city charter.

Passed by the City Council the 2 day of February, 1976, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 2 day of February, 1976.

President of the City Council.

Approved by me this 10 day of February, 1976.

Mayor.

Filed by me this 10 day of February, 1976.

Attest: E. L. Kirk
City Comptroller and City Clerk.

(SEAL)

Published

By J. F. Fenton
Deputy Clerk.

CSS 8.1.6

Budget

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
HEM		
LAG		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
M Staff		

THE CITY OF SEATTLE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

MEMORANDUM

TO All Department Heads

FROM Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director

DATE January 27, 1976

SUBJECT 1977 Budget Manual

And once more the cycle begins....so OMB is now beginning to prepare the Budget Manual for 1977. We would appreciate any constructive comments on how the Budget Manual can better help you, your staff and managers in preparing your program budget for 1977.

Please direct your comments, either in writing or verbally, to Bob Jean of my staff. OMB would appreciate your response by February 13th.

Thank you for your assistance.

WRH:BJ:dj

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
FEB 13 7 58 AM '76

CITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL

C. F. # Letter

TO: Paul A. Wiatrak, City Engineer

Date Sent: ✓ 1-19-76

Reply Requested By:

Subject: Letter from GEB to City Engineer re Sign Replacement Policy.

FROM: George E. Benson, Chairman
Transportation Committee
Seattle City Council

ACTION — required

Copy: Community Development Blk Grant

	Review and Return File With Your Answer to Sender
	Review and Answer Petitioner, Return File and Copy of Answer to Sender
XXXXXX	Review and Make Recommendations, Return File and Recommendations to Sender ( ) In Duplicate
	Prepare Legislation and Return File to Sender

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
JAN 19 8 30 AM '76

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
WGV		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
PAW		

Additional Information:

Budget

Geo. E. Benson
Signature

LDI – 110–5002 CS 20.19

Seattle City Council

Sam Smith
President of the Council
583-2367

George E. Benson
Chairman
Transportation
Committee
583-2357

Tim Hill
Chairman
Finance Committee
583-2356

Paul Kraabel
Chairman
Planning & Urban
Development Committee
583-2364

Phyllis Lamphere
Chairman
Intergovernmental
Relations Committee
583-2355

Wayne D. Larkin
Chairman
Utilities Committee
583-2358

John R. Miller
Chairman
Parks & Public
Grounds Committee
583-2365

Randy Revelle
Chairman
Public Safety &
Health Committee
583-2359

Jeanette Williams
Chairman
Human Resources &
Judiciary Committee
583-2366

January 16, 1976

Mr. Paul A. Wiatrak, City Engineer
910 Seattle Municipal Building
Seattle, Washington 98104

Re: Sign Replacement Policy

Dear Paul:

The City's policy regarding the replacement of various types of signs has created public inconvenience, and at times safety hazards. I am investigating the possibility of reversing all or part of this policy.

I am interested in learning the unit and total costs of restoring each aspect of our discontinued service. What are the costs associated with the installation and maintenance of each of the following: street name signs, crosswalks, local access, and left turn lane signs, and parking restriction signing?

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

George

GEORGE E. BENSON, Chairman
Transportation Committee

GEB:ram:cba
cc: Arthur E. Maronek

Eleventh Floor, Municipal Building, Seattle, Washington 98104

Budget

THE CITY OF SEATTLE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

MEMORANDUM

TO Attention: Art Maronek, Management and Planning
Paul Wiatrak, City Engineer

FROM Walter R. Hundley, ~~Budget~~ WRH Director DATE January 16, 1976

SUBJECT Block Grant Proposal for Traffic Shops and Field Operations

The budget for Traffic Shops and Field Operations was reduced by approximately $180,000 between 1975 and 1976 because of the tight restrictions on available City Street Funds. Both the Mayor and the City Council have expressed concern about the potentially negative impacts on the safety and appearance of Seattle from this reduction. Accordingly, as we have discussed earlier, I am requesting a Community Development Block Grant Allocation for FY 77 in the amount of $300,000 for this Program Category. If such an appropriation is made, it should considerably reduce the negative impact of the budget reduction by allowing the Engineering Department to maintain service levels in the CDBG areas during 1976 and 1977.

I would like the Engineering Department to prepare the detailed proposal for CDBG funding. The proposal should be specifically tailored to the needs of the CDBG target areas and should identify, as concretely as possible, the improvements to be expected if funding is made available. The proposal should be prepared by January 26th at the latest. OMB will assist you in any way possible.

WRH:KS:dj

cc: Walt Crowley, OPP

JAN 20 8 19 AM '76

Orig: Community Development Block Grant

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
AEM		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
PWH KAW		

Budget
LFG

THE CITY OF SEATTLE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

MEMORANDUM

TO: Attention: Walt Crowley, Block Grant Coordinator
W. W. Wilkinson, Director, Office of Policy Planning

FROM: Walter R. Hundley, ~~Budget~~ Director — DATE: January 16, 1976

SUBJECT: OMB Block Grant Request

OMB will be requesting $300,000 in FY 77 Block Grant support for the Traffic Shops and Field Operations (Program Category 2900) in the Seattle Engineering Department. The Mayor and the Council have both expressed concern about the negative impacts associated with the 1976, and projected 1977, budget reduction in this Category necessitated by the constraints on the City Street Fund. The Engineering Department is preparing a detailed proposal targeted to the CDBG areas.

WRH:KS:dj

cc: Art Maronek, Engineering Department

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
ASM		

Orig:
Community Development Block Grant

JAN 20 8 19 AM '76

Budget

1/14

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

January 13, 1976

Kathy Scanlan, OMB

T. R. Lorenz

Year-end Transfers, Maintenance and Operations

RE: Letter to Mr. Hundley dated 11-24-75, same subject.

Attached is a draft ordinance for transfers of authorization in the Maintenance and Operations Program Categories. These transfers were previously requested in the above referenced memo and the draft ordinance is to cover those transfers which are not within the 10% rule and thus must be approved by the City Council. It is our understanding that all other transfers requested in the referenced memo have been approved by your office and forwarded to Budget Control for inclusion in the Budget Report.

In sub-object terms, the transfers requested in the attached ordinance are as follows:

	Fund	Dept.	Cat.	Basub	Object	Title	Amount
From:	501	030	2100	542.67	1110	Salaries F/T & P/T	$56,000
	501	030	2100	542.67	1300	Personnel Benefits	8,650
	501	030	2100	542.67	6400	Machinery and Equipment	35,000
To:	501	030	2600	542.71	2300	Rpr. & Maint. Supplies	$ 8,000
	501	030	2600	542.71	3190	Other Prof. Services	27,850
	501	030	2600	542.71	3800	Repairs and Maintenance	63,800

If you have any questions or require additional information, contact me at 2837.

TRL:smh
Attachment
cc: J. G. Ralph
C. T. Criscola

Budget

Seattle City Council

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
AEM		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
~~PCW~~		
WEPS/REB		

Sam Smith
President of the Council
583-2367

George E. Benson
Chairman
Transportation Committee
583-2357

Tim Hill
Chairman
Finance Committee
583-2356

Paul Kraabel
Chairman
Planning & Urban Development Committee
583-2364

Phyllis Lamphere
Chairman
Intergovernmental Relations Committee
583-2355

Wayne D. Larkin
Chairman
Utilities Committee
583-2358

John R. Miller
Chairman
Parks & Public Grounds Committee
583-2365

Randy Revelle
Chairman
Public Safety & Health Committee
583-2359

Jeanette Williams
Chairman
Human Resources & Judiciary Committee
583-2366

January 6, 1976

Mr. Paul Wiatrak, City Engineer
910 Seattle Municipal Building
Seattle, Washington 98104

Re: State Gas Tax Revenues

Dear Mr. Wiatrak:

In two recent conversations with Mr. William A. Bulley, the Director of the State's Department of Highways, I was informed that over the past five to six months, there has been a slight increase in the amount of money generated by the State's tax on gasoline. Mr. Bulley confirmed this as recently as yesterday in the course of the City Council's first discussion on I-90. Mr. Bulley also indicated that he believes this trend will continue into the new year.

What I am interested in learning is how this trend effects the City's City Street Fund and Arterial Street Fund. How much more money will be available during the course of 1976 than was projected in the proposed budget? What steps can we take to make sure this money is available and allocated?

Since the budget is fresh in everyone's mind, I would appreciate your Department's prompt attention to these questions, so I can get the information out to my colleagues. Thank you very much for your help in this matter.

Yours truly,

GEORGE E. BENSON, Chairman
Transportation Committee
Seattle City Council

GEB:kvc

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
JAN 8 8 10 AM '76

Budget

1/5

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

Walter Hundley, Director - OMB

January 5, 1976

P.A. Wiatrak

Requested Carryovers and Abandonments for 1976

Attached is the Engineering Department's carryover/abandonment request. We are submitting the data written on the attached copy of the Comptroller's Department Budget Summary ("Category Report") for Engineering, Solid Waste Utility, and Sewer Utility. This method will facilitate a direct cross-reference between our request and the Comptroller's records.

All requested abandonments are indicated with an "A" placed to the left of the project number on the attached reports. All carryover requests are indicated with a "CO" placed to the right of the project number. Unless justified on the report itself or by the attached memos, every carryover is for a capital project in progress or which has expenses outstanding. We also request automatic carryover of every ordinance that is so recent that it may not yet be posted on the Comptroller's report.

The carryover/abandonment process was conducted systematically with the participation of every category manager to insure correct information, justification for every carryover, and the correction of a few errors in the Comptroller's report. If your staff has any questions, Michael Draper or Tom Lorenz (x2837) will be happy to provide further information.

MAD:lg

Attachments:

1. October 1975 Dept. Budget Summary Report, with "A", "CO", and special notes, indicated (one each for Engineering, Solid Waste Utility, and sewer Utility).
2. Memo of 12/15/75 with justification for certain carryovers.

BUDGET

June/Dec, 1976

July/Dec, 1976

Unrecorded Subject File

CENTRAL FILE

Your
Seattle
Engineering Department

Paul A. Wiatrak, City Engineer
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

RECEIVED
DEC 30 1976
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
& BUDGET

REVIEWED
OK RHB 1-3-76
BUDGET ANALYST

December 28, 1976

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
JAN 6 10 20 AM '77

ROUTING | DATE | INITIAL
ACTION
FILE
INFORMATION
PRP/LAG
CTC/TRL
JGR/CTH
ASH/REN
WGV
DR
DJH

Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

ATTENTION: Betty Blair

Dear Mr. Hundley:

While reconciling the 1977 adopted budget to the Department's personnel records, several discrepancies surfaced. The problems can be resolved by transferring salary authorization from one Program Category to another so that the budget reflects actual personnel distribution and salary expenditure. Outlined below are the requested Operating Fund transfers with a brief explanation of each situation.

A. PAYROLL FUNCTION

Due to an internal reorganization, the Payroll Function has been shifted from Program Category 1300 to Program Category 1200. This shift occurred after the 1977 budget had been submitted to the Council.

The following positions were transferred:

(3) Technician, Accounting I (pockets #007687, 008868, 008872)
(1) Accountant (pocket #007613)

So that the budget document will reflect the changes, please make the following transfer:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	1300	1100	Salaries	$50,724
FROM:	030	501	1300	1300	Personnel Benefits	$10,144
TO:	030	501	1200	1100	Salaries	$50,724
TO:	030	501	1200	1300	Personnel Benefits	$10,144

B. WAREHOUSE FUNCTION

During the same reorganization, the Warehouse Function shifted from Program Category 1200 to Program Category 2900. The following

were transferred:

(1) Assistant, Accounting Support (pocket #007734)
(1) Supervisor, Warehouse (pocket #008862)
(1) Warehouser, Senior (pocket #008882)
(2) Warehouser (pockets #008884, 008885)

The changes brought about by this reorganization are not reflected in the adopted 1977 budget. Please make the following transfers:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	1200	1100	Salaries	$66,933
	030	501	1200	1210	Overtime	540
	030	501	1200	1300	Personnel Benefits	13,259
	030	501	1200	2100	Office Supplies	215
	030	501	1200	2510	Gasoline	325
	030	501	1200	3200	Communications	710
	030	501	1200	3300	Automobile Exp.	1,496
	030	501	1200	3500	Printing & Dup.	500
	030	501	1200	3800	Repairs & Mtnce.	1,120
	030	501	1200	3900	Rentals	16,617
	030	501	1200	6400	Mach. & Equipment	2,150
TO:	030	501	2900	1100	Salaries	$66,933
	030	501	2900	1210	Overtime	540
	030	501	2900	1300	Personnel Benefits	13,259
	030	501	2900	2100	Office Supplies	215
	030	501	2900	2510	Gasoline	325
	030	501	2900	3200	Communications	710
	030	501	2900	3300	Automobile Exp.	1,496
	030	501	2900	3500	Printing & Dup.	500
	030	501	2900	3800	Repairs & Mtnce.	1,120
	030	501	2900	3900	Rentals	16,617
	030	501	2900	6400	Mach. & Equipment	2,150

C. PERSONNEL TRANSFER

Engineer, Civil, Assistant II (pocket #007983) is a vacant, funded position in Program Category 5100. This position is needed for an employee in Program Category 9100. Please make the following transfer:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	5100	1100	Salaries	$18,625
FROM:	030	501	5100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 3,725
TO:	030	501	9100	1100	Salaries	$18,625
TO:	030	501	9100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 3,725

D. PERSONNEL TRANSFER

An Engineer, Civil, Associate (pocket #007920) is budgeted in Program Category 6100 but should have been budgeted in Program Category 9100. The employee has been, and currently is, working in Program Category 9100. Please make the following transfer:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	6100	1100	Salaries	$21,784
FROM:	030	501	5100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 4,356
TO:	030	501	9100	1100	Salaries	$21,784
TO:	030	501	9100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 4,356

E. CLERICAL SUPPORT

Due to the recent reorganization, the Specifications and Estimates Section needs clerical assistance but has no budget for a clerical position. Program Category 9100 has a budgeted, vacant Office Assistant position (pocket #007745) which could be used by Program Category 8100. Please make the following transfer:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	9100	1100	Salaries	$9,726
FROM:	030	501	9100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$1,855
TO:	030	501	8100	1100	Salaries	$9,726
TO:	030	501	8100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$1,855

These transfers adjust only Operating Fund authority, source funds are available to meet the expenses. We will appreciate your assistance in expediting this matter.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R. R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

APPROVED
Program Budget Manager

LAG:saw
cc: J. G. Ralph
C. T. Criscola
C. T. Murray
R. E. Nieforth
W. VanGelder
D. Roletto
D. Howell
A.E. Maronek
T.R. Lorenz

Budget

12-29

December 28, 1976

Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

ATTENTION: Betty Blair

Dear Mr. Hundley:

While reconciling the 1977 adopted budget to the Department's personnel records, several discrepancies surfaced. The problems can be resolved by transferring salary authorization from one Program Category to another so that the budget reflects actual personnel distribution and salary expenditure. Outlined below are the requested Operating Fund transfers with a brief explanation of each situation.

A. PAYROLL FUNCTION

Due to an internal reorganization, the Payroll Function has been shifted from Program Category 1300 to Program Category 1200. This shift occurred after the 1977 budget had been submitted to the Council.

The following positions were transferred:

(3) Technician, Accounting I (pockets #007687, 008868, 008872)
(1) Accountant (pocket #007613)

So that the budget document will reflect the changes, please make the following transfer:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	1300	1100	Salaries	$50,724
FROM:	030	501	1300	1300	Personnel Benefits	$10,144
TO:	030	501	1200	1100	Salaries	$50,724
TO:	030	501	1200	1300	Personnel Benefits	$10,144

B. WAREHOUSE FUNCTION

During the same reorganization, the Warehouse Function shifted from Program Category 1200 to Program Category 2900. The following

were transferred:

(1) Assistant, Accounting Support (pocket #007734)
(1) Supervisor, Warehouse (pocket #008862)
(1) Warehouser, Senior (pocket #008882)
(2) Warehouser (pockets #008884, 008885)

The changes brought about by this reorganization are not reflected in the adopted 1977 budget. Please make the following transfers:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	1200	1100	Salaries	$66,933
	030	501	1200	1210	Overtime	540
	030	501	1200	1300	Personnel Benefits	13,259
	030	501	1200	2100	Office Supplies	215
	030	501	1200	2510	Gasoline	325
	030	501	1200	3200	Communications	710
	030	501	1200	3300	Automobile Exp.	1,496
	030	501	1200	3500	Printing & Dup.	5000
	030	501	1200	3800	Repairs & Mtnce.	1,120
	030	501	1200	3900	Rentals	16,617
	030	501	1200	6400	Mach. & Equipment	2,150
TO:	030	501	2900	1100	Salaries	$66,933
	030	501	2900	1210	Overtime	540
	030	501	2900	1300	Personnel Benefits	13,259
	030	501	2900	2100	Office Supplies	215
	030	501	2900	2510	Gasoline	325
	030	501	2900	3200	Communications	710
	030	501	2900	3300	Automobile Exp.	1,496
	030	501	2900	3500	Printing & Dup.	500
	030	501	2900	3800	Repairs & Mtnce.	1,120
	030	501	2900	3900	Rentals	16,617
	030	501	2900	6400	Mach. & Equipment	2,150

C. PERSONNEL TRANSFER

Engineer, Civil, Assistant II (pocket #007983) is a vacant, funded position in Program Category 5100. This position is needed for an employee in Program Category 9100. Please make the following transfer:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	5100	1100	Salaries	$18,625
FROM:	030	501	5100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 3,725
TO:	030	501	9100	1100	Salaries	$18,625
TO:	030	501	9100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 3,725

D. PERSONNEL TRANSFER

An Engineer, Civil, Associate (pocket #007920) is budgeted in Program Category 6100 but should have been budgeted in Program Category 9100. The employee has been, and currently is, working in Program Category 9100. Please make the following transfer:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	6100	1100	Salaries	$21,784
FROM:	030	501	5100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 4,356
TO:	030	501	9100	1100	Salaries	$21,784
TO:	030	501	9100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 4,356

E. CLERICAL SUPPORT//

Due to the recent reorganization, the Specifications and Estimates Section needs clerical assistance but has no budget for a clerical position. Program Category 9100 has a budgeted, vacant Office Assistant position (pocket #007745) which could be used by Program Category 8100. Please make the following transfer:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	9100	1100	Salaries	$9,726
FROM:	030	501	9100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$1,855
TO:	030	501	8100	1100	Salaries	$9,726
TO:	030	501	8100	1300	Personnel Benefits	$1,855

These transfers adjust only Operating Fund authority, source funds are available to meet the expenses. We will appreciate your assistance in expediting this matter.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R. R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

LAG:saw
cc: J. G. Ralph
C. T. Criscola
C. T. Murray
R. E. Nieforth
W. Vanselder
D. Roletto
D. Howell
A.E. Maronek
T.R. Lorenz

Budget
12/23

December 23, 1976

Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

ATTENTION: Betty Blair

Dear Mr. Hundley:

As stated in our memo of December 15, 1976, after the departmental budget hearings, Kathy Scanlan reduced the number of SED positions by what she believed to be the results of a layoff procedure. Working with you and SED Program Category Managers, we have reconciled the adopted budget against the Departmental personnel records.

As decided in our meeting on December 17, 1976, we have categorized the positions by funding criteria:

Group 1 - Those positions that should not have been deleted and must be reinstated in the budget;

Group 2 - Those positions that should not have been deleted but can be accomodated by using vacant, funded positons in lieu of those unfunded positions; and,

Group 3 - Those positions that were deleted, are not needed and will remain out of the 1977 budget.

As an interim strategy, please request 60-day temporary positions for the 3 positions listed in Group 1, and then provide the appropriate ordinance/transfer authority needed to complete the reconciliation process required to reinstate the positions in the adopted budget. The transfer and ordinance authority requests are listed by the aforementioned, pre-established criteria.

GROUP 1 - NEEDED POSITIONS THAT MUST BE REINSTATED

A. Deleted Title: Aide, Engineering

Comments: The repercussions of the layoff had been anticipated. The Engineering Aide position which was affected by the layoff (Nilsen's position) had been dropped from Program Category 1500's proposed 1977 budget prior to submittal to OMB. This second Aide position (pocket #007630) represents a double cut and must be reinstated.

ORDINANCE AUTHORITY REQUEST:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
TO:	030	501	1500	1100	Salaries	$13,862
TO:	030	501	1500	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 2,773

B. Deleted Title: Specialist, Field Engineering, Asst. II

Pool (in lieu of) Title: Specialist, Field Engineering, Asst. II

Comments: There were a total of 12 Spec. II positions in Program Category 1500's 1976 budget. Blake was laid off and the associated position (pocket #008788) was transferred to the unfunded pool, leaving 11 funded positions. SED had anticipated the repercussions of the layoff and had budgeted accordingly. But OMB inadvertently cut another position, leaving only 10 of the 11 positions funded.

The (unfunded) pool position can be utilized in lieu of the deleted position, but this Program Category has no vacant positions and will need additional Operating Fund authority as follows:

ORDINANCE AUTHORITY REQUEST:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
TO:	030	501	1500	1100	Salaries	$16,856
TO:	030	501	1500	1300	Personnel Benefits	$ 3,371

C. Deleted Title: (2) Engineer, Civil Senior

Comments: Program Category 910 originally budgeted 10 Senior Civil Engineers and had abrogated 1 position prior to submittal of the budget to OMB. Of the 3 positions cut by OMB, only 2 must be retained in the budget for the duration of 1977. One of those 2 can be filled in lieu of a vacant position (See Group 2, D.) and one position must be reinstated. But one additional position is needed for 60 days or until Civil Service/Personnel can resolve the one pending layoff-related protest.

ORDINANCE AUTHORITY REQUEST:

*A 60-day temporary position authorization is needed for one Engineer, Civil, Senior.

*The following budget authorization is needed:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
To:	030	501	9100	1100	Salaries	$24488
To:	030	501	9100	1300	Personnel Benefits	4897

GROUP 2 - IN LIEU OF POSITIONS

A. Deleted Title: Specialist, Civil Engineering, Asst. I (pocket #008683)

Budgeted (in lieu of) Title: Specialist, Civil Engineering, Asst. III (pocket #015778)

Comments: There were a total of 3 Spec. Is in Prog. Category 1400's 1976 budget. Stelmack was laid off and the associated pocket dropped from the budget prior to submittal to OMB. Unfortunately, another Spec. I position was dropped, leaving only 1 funded Spec. I. There is, however, a vacant, funded position that can be filled in lieu of the deleted Spec. I. No further action is necessary.

B. Deleted Title: (4) Chainman, Survey

Pool (in lieu of) Title: (3) Chainman, Survey

Budgeted (in lieu of) Title: (1) Engineer, Materials, Supervisor (pocket #008072)

Comments: Due to the layoffs, 3 of the Survey Chainman positions could have been deleted from Prog. Category 6100's budget. Because of a rapidly rising workload, these 3 positions are currently being used on a 60-day temporary basis; pool positions are being used during this 60-day period.

One Survey Chainman position should not have been deleted. During the layoffs, one Instrumentman position was dropped (see group 3-E) and the employee bumped into a Chainman position. An Engineer, Materials, Supervisor is an unfunded, vacant position that can be used during 1977. No further action is needed.

C. Deleted Title: Specialist, Field Engineering, Asst. I

Budgeted (in lieu of) Title: Specialist, Field Engineering, Senior (pocket #008842)

Comments: During the preparation of Prog. Category 6100's proposed 1977 budget, a Specialist, Field Engineering, Asst. I (pocket #008775) was deleted from the request. This second position (pocket #008776) was then cut by mistake. But, there is a vacant, funded position which can be used during 1977. No further action is needed.

D. Deleted Title: Engineer, Civil, Senior

Budgeted (in lieu of) Title: Engineer, Civil, Supervising (pocket #008061)

Comments: During the layoffs in Program Category 9100, 2 Supervising Civil Engineering positions were vacated and the 2 employees became

Senior Civil Engineers. One of the vacant, funded Supervisory level positions can be used during 1977 in lieu of the position which was deleted from the budget. No further action is needed.

GROUP 3 - DELETED POSITIONS TO REMAIN OUT

	Title	Prog. Cat.
A.	Specialist, Civil Engineering, Asst. I	5100
B.	Chief, Survey Party	6100
C.	Engineer, Civil, Associate	6100
D.	Engineer, Materials, Associate	6100
E.	Instrumentman, Survey	6100
F.	Engineer, Civil, Asst. III	9100

These transactions account for all the positions listed in our memo of 12/15/76. Of the 17 positions in question, OMB must take remedial funding action on only 4 of them; 7 positions can be exchanged within SED with no further funding or personnel actions; and 6 positions can remain out of the budget.

If you have any questions, please contact Lynn Guttmann at x2381.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R.R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer for
Managemant and Planning

LAG:lg
Attachments
cc: Ted Whiting
W. van Gelder
D. Roletto
Ron Nieforth
Art Maronek
Bill Dolan
Tom Lorenz
Jim Coover

Budget

12-22

December 22, 1976

Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

The Engineering Department requests authorization to make the following Operating Fund transfers:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
From:	030	501	7100	1100	Salaries	$13,000
To:	030	501	7100	3900	Rentals	5,500
To:	030	501	9100	3900	Rentals	7,500

These transfers are for miscellaneous unanticipated expenditures related to MTD billings, Board of Public Works reviews, consultant services, etc. These transfers assure the solvency of the 3000 grand object for the remainder of 1976 and allow the department to meet actual expenses.

These transfers adjust only Operating Fund authority, source funds are available to meet these expenses.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R.R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

LAG:lg
cc: T.R. Lorenz

Budget

12/17

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

December 17, 1976

Betty Blair OMB

L.A. Guttmann

Reconciliation of 1977 Budgeted Positions

You and I have been working on reconciling the 1977 budget position authorizations (per memo of 12/15/76).

During our conversation today, we decided to use the following strategies as an interim resolution of the problem:

(1) For those positions which are deemed to be needed and for which there are no alternate solutions, we will request 60-day temporary positions. You will start the legislation for those 60-day positions.

(2) For those positions which are needed but can be switched into an alternative position, we will either use an unfunded pool position or a vacant funded position in lieu of the lost position. We will continue this strategy for the entire year if it does not prove to be a hardship for the organizational management.

(3) We will drop those positions that are vacant and are not needed.

This is an interim strategy...being used to avoid harming individuals who are currently occupying positions that were inadvertently cut from the budget. We will send you a list of positions which fall into the above listed categories by Wednesday, December 22nd.

After the first of the year, we will present OMB with recommendations for final adjustments to the budget, if any are needed. I anticipate that most of the final actions will be to resolve those problems for which we needed 60-day temporary authorization.

It is unfortunate that this problem developed, but I'm sure that we can resolve the immediate problems as well as come up with some revised methodologies to avoid situations like this from reoccurring in the future.

Thanks for your cooperative effort.

LAG:lg
cc: Ted Whiting
W. Van Gelder
D. Roletto
R.E. Nieforth
A.E. Maronek
Bill Dolan/Bob Graham

Budget
12/16

December 15, 1976

Walter Hundley, ATTENTION: Betty Blair

Lynn Guttmann

Purchasing Plan

Attached please find the Department's Purchasing Plan. It is organized by program category and it is consistent with the 1977 Adopted Budget.

LAG:saw

Budget

12-16

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

December 15, 1976

Walt Hundley ATTENTION: Betty Blair

R. R. Parker

1977 Budget - Authorized Personnel

It has come to our attention that sometime after the proposed budget had been published and submitted to the City Council, Kathy Scanlan reduced the number of positions by what she believed, at the time, to be the results of a layoff procedure. Unfortunately, some of those layoffs had already been accounted for, i.e., we had already reduced the number of positions in the budget in anticipation of the layoffs. In other cases, Kathy deleted positions which were not actually affected by the layoff action.

At this time, we are reconciling the adopted budget against the Departmental personnel records. Within two weeks, we will submit to you detailed documentation of the layoff-related position transactions (and related fiscal impacts) and, we will submit to you a request to reinstate those particular positions and budget authorizations which were deleted in error.

Resolution of this matter cannot be accomplished prior to January 1, 1977. In order to avoid laying off employees because of an error that is clerical in nature, we request that the following positions be extended for a 60-day period:

No. of Positions	Position Title	Prog. Category
1	Specialist, Civil Eng., Asst. I	1400 (Court & R/W)
1	Aide, Engineering	1500 (Street Use & Franchise Utilities)
1	Specialist, Field Eng. II	1500
1	Asst., Adm. Support	5100 (Carpool Program)
1	Specialist, Civil Eng., Asst. I	5100 (Traffic & Transportation)
3	Chainman, Survey	6100 (Construction)
1	Chief, Survey Party Crew	6100
1	Eng., Civil Assoc.	6100
1	Eng., Materials Assoc.	6100

No. of Positions	Position Title	Prog. Category
1	Instrument Man	6100
1	Specialist, Field Eng., Asst. I	6100
1	Eng., Civil Asst. III	9100 (Engineering Design)
3	Eng., Civil Sr.	9100

Using this approach, the Engineering Department and OMB will work together to make the appropriate position authorization adjustments without unintentionally harming any employee.

LAG:saw

cc: Ted Whiting
W. Van Gelder
D. Roletto
R.E. Nieforth
A.E. Maronek
Bill Dolan/Bob Graham
Bill Roach

Budget

Your
Seattle
Engineering Department

Paul A. Wiatrak, City Engineer
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

RECEIVED
DEC 15 1976
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
& BUDGET

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
RRP		
AEM	LK	

December 15, 1976

Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

The Engineering Department requests authorization to make the following Operating Fund transfers:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	8100	1100	Salaries, FT & PT	$1,200
TO:	030	501	8100	6400	Mach. & Equip.	$1,200

During the process of reorganization of the Specifications and Estimates Section, we have found a need for the following office equipment.

1. 3 each - File, Cabinet, Legal 5-Drawer

Hon #215 CA Gray @ $126.50/ea = $379.50
tax 5.4% = 20.49
$399.99

We are required for audit purposes to keep working papers conveniently available for a minimum period of three (3) years. This minimum is also for projects involving outside agency funding. When a project is subject to any claim, the time period is five (5) years and when litigation is possible or pending, the period is seven (7) years. Current files are now stored in cardboard units and boxes and need to be better protected. Part of this equipment was requisitioned earlier (PO #14566-0-06) but reduced by half due to a lack of funds. A total of five are needed with two already ordered.

2. 2 each - Tiffany Bookcases @ $113.90/ea.= $227.80
tax 5.4% 12.30
#E4-3646-GY $240.10

On January 1, 1977, as part of the reorganization, the Division Head will move into a separate office. Existing office equipment will

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
DEC 20 9 04 AM '76

be utilized except for a needed bookcase to store reference material. The second will be used to store manufacturers' catalogues now stored in boxes.

3. 4 each - Calculator, Electronic Printing,

Underwood # 482	@ $127.00/ea. =	$508.00
	tax 5.4% =	27.43
		$535.43

There are presently seven (7) employees using 4 existing adding machines. Three of the existing machines do not have a tape capability. One of these is a Monroe 620 electronic purchased several years ago and still functional. The other two are older model mechanical calculators (a Frieden and a 1920 Comptometer). The Frieden, although it has been in the shop several times, does not always function properly. Two new calculators will replace the two mechanicals. The other two calculators are to equip two new personnel. The new electronic calculators will provide each estimator with his own calculator.

TOTAL = $1,175.52 SAY, $1,200.00

We will appreciate your assistance in expediting this matter.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By R R Parker
R. R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

LAG:DJH:saw
cc: A.E. Maronek
L. Koski
T.R. Lorenz

APPROVED
Program Budget Manager

Budget

12-15

December 15, 1976

Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

The Engineering Department requests authorization to make the following Operating Fund transfers:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	8100	1100	Salaries, FT & PT	$1,200
TO:	030	501	8100	6400	Mach. & Equip.	$1,200

During the process of reorganization of the Specifications and Estimates Section, we have found a need for the following office equipment.

1. 3 each - File, Cabinet, Legal 5-Drawer

   Hon #215 CA Gray @ $126.50/ea = $379.50
   tax 5.4% = 20.49
   $399.99

   We are required for audit purposes to keep working papers conveniently available for a minimum period of three (3) years. This minimum is also for projects involving outside agency funding. When a project is subject to any claim, the time period is five (5) years and when litigation is possible or pending, the period is seven (7) years. Current files are now stored in cardboard units and boxes and need to be better protected. Part of this equipment was requisitioned earlier (PO #14566-0-06) but reduced by half due to a lack of funds. A total of five are needed with two already ordered.

2. 2 each - Tiffany Bookcases @ $113.90/ea.= $227.80
   tax 5.4% 12.30
   #E4-3646-GY $240.10

   On January 1, 1977, as part of the reorganization, the Division Head will move into a separate office. Existing office equipment will

be utilized except for a needed bookcase to store reference material. The second will be used to store manufacturers' catalogues now stored in boxes.

3. 4 each - Calculator, Electronic Printing,

Underwood # 482	@ $127.00/ea. =	$508.00
	tax 5.4% =	27.43
		$535.43

There are presently seven (7) employees using 4 existing adding machines. Three of the existing machines do not have a tape capability. One of these is a Monroe 620 electronic purchased several years ago and still functional. The other two are older model mechanical calculators (a Frieden and a 1920 Comptometer). The Frieden, although it has been in the shop several times, does not always function properly. Two new calculators will replace the two mechanicals. The other two calculators are to equip two new personnel. The new electronic calculators will provide each estimator with his own calculator.

TOTAL = $1,175.52 SAY, $1,200.00

We will appreciate your assistance in expediting this matter.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R. R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

LAG:DJH:saw
cc: A.E. Maronek
L. Koski
T.R. Lorenz

Budget

12-10

√ December 9, 1976

Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

We request authority to make the following transfer of funds in the Engineering Department's 1976 Budget:

	Dept.	Fund	Account	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	01	15012	Street Use Regulation	$10,000
TO:	030	01	15026	Unreimbursed Eng. Serv.	$10,000

This transfer is to correct an error in ordinance 106006 which increased the Department's General Fund appropriations to pay the cost of salary increases effective September 1, 1976. The amount required in account 15026 was $45,380. Ordinance 106006 increased the account by $35,380 which is $10,000 less than the amount required. It is anticipated that account 5012 will realize salary savings sufficient to cover the transfer.

I would appreciate it if you would expedite this matter.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R. R. Parker
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

TRL:saw
cc: C.T. Criscola
J.J. Coover

Budget

12-b

December 6, 1976

Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

The Engineering Department requests authorization to make the following Operating Fund transfers:

	Dept.	Fund	P.C.	Object	Title	Amount
FROM:	030	501	9100	1110	Salaries, FT & PT	$12,000
TO:	030	501	9100	6400	Mach. & Equip.	12,000
FROM:	030	501	8100	2200	Operating Supplies	$500
TO:	030	501	8100	6400	Mach. & Equip.	500
FROM:	030	501	1200	1110	Salaries, FT & PT	$110
TO:	030	501	1200	6400	Mach. & Equip.	110
FROM:	030	501	1200	1110	Salaries, FT & PT	$1,000
TO:	030	501	1200	3110	Exp. & Consult.Serv.	1,000
FROM:	030	501	1200	1110	Salaries, FT & PT	$100
TO:	030	501	1200	2100	Office Supplies	100

These transfers all relate to the purchase requisition for movable panels and other associated office improvements approved by your office during the later part of October. As we stated in our October 27th memo, these minor office changes will result in an improvement in working conditions, greater worker productivity and improved morale.

The transfers requested are all within program categories; therefore, they are not subject to the 10% limit on budget transfers. Please expedite this transfer request as soon as possible as budget control

will not honor the voucher without the budget authorization appearing in the appropriate grand object.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R. R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

LAG:saw
cc: AEM
WJM
TRL

Your City, Seattle

Office of the Mayor
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

December 3, 1976

The City Council
City of Seattle

Honorable Members:

On November 26, 1976, I informed you by letter of my disappointment in your actions in adopting a budget almost one million dollars above my proposal, and stated I would have a final decision for you on whether I could -- in good conscience -- accept the budget on December 2, 1976.

I have made that decision, but before I state my decision I would like to review with you some actions you took which I believe will severely impact the 1978 fiscal problems which I attempted to address in presenting a balanced budget with no tax increases.

In our Library, you have chosen to add staff over my proposal at the expense of the books and materials budget. In our Fire Department, you have restored an engine company and increased administrative staff levels above my proposal.

Although the City already has an effective complaint resolution agency, the Council has again chosen to fund the Ombudsman. You have chosen also -- despite my efforts to build a City program -- to continue funding the Economic Development Council. Despite the City's financial condition, I supported a budget for the Arts Commission which was at 100% of the 1976 level exclusive of a special Bicentennial appropriation. The Council has chosen to perpetuate that Bicentennial appropriation -- and expand the City's operating base in 1977.

In summary, the results of your actions on the General Fund will add the equivalent of over 42 employees to the City's payroll at a projected 1978 cost of over $775,000. During a time when

the City faces increased costs with no new programs and a revenue base which is simply not growing, the net addition of 42 employees at a cost of almost three-quarters of a million dollars is unresponsive to the City's fiscal condition. The Council should have used the opportunity of its budget review to support me in a general "belt-tightening" approach. Instead, it has chosen to increase City employment -- and taxes.

Based on my review of your actions, I cannot sign the 1977 budget you have adopted. I will instead allow it to go into effect without my signature. At the same time, I put the Council on notice that I am seriously considering vetoing the ordinance raising the Utility B & O Tax on Washington Natural Gas customers. There are 60,000 residential natural gas customers in our city. Between October 1973 and January 1977 their average monthly natural gas bill has risen from $14.00 to $28.50 -- an increase of over 100%. An increase in the tax on these and other natural gas users from 7% to 8% simply exacerbates the effects of these price increases.

In conclusion, I must reiterate my disappointment in your actions to increase the City's operating costs while imposing a tax on natural gas customers that at this time is not needed.

Sincerely,

Wes Uhlman

Wes Uhlman

WU:dsl

Budget

ORDINANCE 106020

AN ORDINANCE adopting a budget for the City of Seattle for the year 1977.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That the annual Budget submitted, as contemplated by RCW Ch. 35.32A., by the Mayor and filed as C.F. 284064 with the following modifications, to wit:

(a) Recommendations of the Mayor for changes in his proposed 1977 Budget as set forth in C.F. 284240-A, C.F. 284240-B, C.F. 284240-C; and

(b) Recommendations of the Budget Committee of the City Council for modifications, as adopted by amendments by the City Council on November 22, 1976 and set forth in C.F. 284251

is hereby adopted, and the officer and employee positions designated in said submitted Budget (C.F. 284064) as modified (C.F. 284240-A, C.F. 284240-B, C.F. 284240-C, C.F. 284251) are hereby established in the various departments of The City of Seattle. Should any budget recommendation, modification, adjustment, or amendment conflict, the last adopted shall control and it shall be deemed that the same were adopted in the following order: (1) C.F. 284064, (2) C.F. 284240-A, (3) C.F. 284240-B, (4) C.F. 284240-C, (5) C.F. 284251.

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty days from and after its passage and approval, if approved by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect at the time it shall become a law under the provisions of the city charter.

Passed by the City Council the 22 day of November, 1976, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 22 day of November, 1976.

President of the City Council.

"The foregoing Bill was, on the 23RD day of NOVEMBER, 1976, presented to the Mayor who returned the same to the City Council without his approval or disapproval on the 3RD day of December 1976."

Filed by me this 3 day of December, 1976.

Mayor.

Attest: E. L. Kinn
City Comptroller and City Clerk.

(SEAL)

Published

By D. Longevine
Deputy Clerk.

CSS 9.1.6

Budget
12/3

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

December 2, 1976

Ed Kidd, City Comptroller

R. R. Parker, Assistant City Engineer for Management & Planning

Engineering Department Operating Fund Cash Position

The Engineering Department Operating Fund Cash position has been reported in the red for the third consecutive month. We understand the responsibility to keep the fund solvent and are very concerned that this situation exists. Since deficit reporting has always been a concern of the Comptroller as well, I want to bring the problem to your attention.

The September deficit position resulted from a problem in the Engineering Department which I have corrected. My concern is for the months of October and November when the transfer billing information was supplied to your office in sufficient time to be processed, but was not processed before the month-end cutoff date. Since the transfer billings are our only source of revenues, we closed each month in the reported deficit position.

I hope you will address this issue and take whatever action is necessary to insure that the transfer billings are processed in a timely manner. If I can be of any help to you, please advise.

CTC:saw
cc: P.A. Wiatrak, City Engineer
John Adams, State Examiner

Budget

12/1

December 1, 1976

Mr. Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

The Department of Engineering requests authorization to make the following Operating Fund transfers:

Prog. Cat.	Line Item	Grand Object	To	From
201	1111110	1000		(631,240)
201	2510	2000	631,240	
210	1110	1000		(60,000)
210	2510	2000	20,000	
210	3330	3000	40,000	
220	2510	2000	234,868	
220	3330	3000		(234,868)
250	1110	1000		(10,000)
250	3330	3000	10,000	
270	1110	1000		(10,000)
270	3330	3000	10,000	
280	1110	1000		(35,000)
280	3330	3000	35,000	

The reasons for these transfers are as follows:

PROGRAM CATEGORY 201 GRAND OBJECTS 1000 & 2000: The problem is internal to the current accounting practices. Due to the volume of work orders processed by the Accounts Payable Section, they have been unable to research and code the appropriate organizational unit, i.e., program category, responsible for the materials voucher. Each work order for materials is therefore vouchered against Program Category 201 as a convenience. This system will be changed on January 1, as Program Category 201 does not appear in the 1977 Adopted Budget. The money being transferred into the 2000 Grand Object is from the unexpended salary. authorization which resulted from a drastically diminished amount of reimbursable work.

PROGRAM CATEOGIRES 210, 220, 250, 270, 280: During the preparation of the 1976 Budget, the estimates for gas expense and equipment lease expense were prepared on a pro-rata basis because of the lack of historical data. During the year it became apparent that the budgeted figures were not accurately reflecting the actual rates nor the actual usage patterns. The adjustments requested recognize that too much authorization was allowed for leases and not enough for gas expenses. The source of money for the transfer comes from salary savings resulting from the decline in Departmental personnel. Approximately 34 positions have been vacated during the year and none have been filled by the Maintenance Division.

Please note that all of these transfers are within program categories. Therefore, they are not subject to the 10% limit on budget transfers. Please expedite as soon as possible, as budget control is presently holding expenditures from Program Categories 201 and 220.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R. R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer
For Management & Planning

LAG:lg
cc: R.A. Shimizu
T.R. Lorenz
J.G.R. Attn: D.W. Anderson

Concurrence Prior to Signature	
RAS	RAS

Budget

12/10

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

November 30, 1976

Walter Hundley

R. R. Parker

The 1977 Budget Manual - Improvements

Thank you for providing us with an opportunity to comment on the 1977 Budget Manual and budget process. Due to a heavy workload and shifting personnel, we were unable to respond in a timely manner. But for your consideration here are our observations:

1. EXPENDITURE DETAIL JUSTIFICATION

How much line item justification is required? Should justification include only increases over the prior year or a total line item justification? Are there any benchmarks that can be used to determine the required level of line item justification for the 1978 Budget? It is recommended that the Budget Manual define the level of expenditure change which should trigger the inclusion of expenditure justifications and define the type of data that is needed for policy decisions.

2. INCREASED COSTS

Increased costs are shown as a % in the 1977 Budget Manual. Wherever applicable, a base $ amount should be indicated. Some items which could include a base figure are fuel costs, telephone costs, automobile expenses.

3. PERSONNEL CHANGES

Given the City's declining revenue situation and the fact that the work force is declining, is it necessary to justify decreases in personnel? The Department personnel summary should be sufficient to portray personnel trends. It is recommended that specific justification be required only on the case of personnel increases.

4. BUDGET LINE ITEM 5190 - ALLOCATIONS AND TRANSFERS

The line item is not defined anywhere in the Budget Manual and its proper use in budget preparation (if it should be used at all) is not clear. It is recommended that the intent and use of this line item be clearly defined in the Budget Manual.

5. PURCHASING PLAN

The type of information to be submitted to the Purchasing Office by December 15th is not clearly outlined. Is there a special form or format? The directions for the Purchasing Plan are not indexed and so the required action can easily be overlooked.

6. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The intent of the request was not conveyed by the Forms 7a and 7b. They would have been difficult for the Engineering Department to complete and would not have provided the desired information. Attached are the forms submitted in the SED 1977 Proposed Budget; we suggest that these be substituted for OMB Forms 7a and 7b.

7. TIMING AND RELIABILITY OF RATE INFORMATION

The estimated rates (and "outside" charges) should be provided to the Department as early in the budget process as possible. Delays in the published rates cause hardship and discontinuities during the preparation of the Departmental submittal. More importantly, the rates published must be maintained throughout the budgeted period or the source funds will be insufficient to cover the revised expenditures. (The General Service and the CIS rate setting procedures should be reviewed and modified to accommodate the needs of all concerned.)

8. RELATIONSHIP OF BUDGET TO CIP

Our current program budgeting process requires us to develop the CIPs, operating budget submittal and CDBG budgets within an unwieldy timetable. The Engineering Department's estimate of source fund support comes, in part, from the CIP and CDBG documents. If these documents were drafted (and possibly adopted) prior to April, the Department could use the financial information to predict workload and source fund levels.

9. RECONCILIATION OF PROPOSED TO ADOPTED BUDGETS

Once the Budget has been adopted by the City Council, OMB should provide a summary of all transactions which changed the Departmental Budget Submittal noting the origin of the change.

10. BUDGET FORMAT

The budget instructions should reflect and stress overall policy goals and annual budget constraints. There is too much emphasis on detailed justification that could, and probably should, be left to Departmental managerial discretion. Emphasis should be placed on the programs that relate to line items. New problems should be highlighted that are currently hidden within the mass of organizational line item detail. To shift the informational emphasis, this Department included in its 1977 Budget Submittal "Budget Narratives"--an example is attached.

Considering the ever-increasing volume of data required of the departments in preparing their annual budget submittal and the fact that following the submission, a substantial amount of additional justification has

always been required, it would appear that the 1978 Budget Manual might emphasize the level of justification required in specific areas (or for specific line items). It is increasingly difficult to meet the requirements set forth by OMB. In addition, the cost of producing the annual budget and the program plans supporting that budget is having a significant impact on the Department's administrative (overhead) burden.

It is hoped that these recommendations and comments will be of value as you proceed with the preparation of the Budget Manual for 1978.

LAG:saw
cc: B. Blair, OMB
Attachment

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
att. LRF		
FILE	✓	

MEMORANDUM

November 29, 1976

To: All Department Heads

From: Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director — Walter R. Hundley

Subject: 1977 Budget as Adopted by the City Council

On Saturday, November 20, 1976, the City Council Budget Committee voted 8 - 1 to send a 1977 Budget as amended to the entire City Council. The Council then, on Monday, November 22, 1976, adopted, again by an 8 - 1 vote, engrossed C.B. 97918 entitled "AN ORDINANCE adopting a budget for the City of Seattle for the year 1977." That C.B. is currently on the Mayor's desk pending his decision on whether he will sign the ordinance.

Pending the Mayor's decision, however, several department heads have requested information regarding what actions were actually approved by the Council in adopting the Budget. To provide that information, OMB has compiled the attached sheets which describe the changes from the Mayor's Proposed 1977 Budget as amended by the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Budget Errata. These attachments are:

1. A two-page summary sheet of final adopted department budget figures.

2. A summary of revenue changes made by the Council in adopting the Budget.

3. A handwritten explanation of every adopted change in the Mayor's Proposed Budget. This list does not include (a) proposed actions not adopted by the Budget Committee, or (b) vote tally by Councilmember. This information is available in OMB, however.

4. A copy of C.F. 284251. This is the final adopted C.F. reflecting Council actions of 3. above.

5. A summary based on OMB records of subjects of "Statements of Legislative Intent" as expressed by the Council during Budget hearings.

   These Statements will be discussed, modified, and approved at a Budget Committee meeting on December 9. Approved statements of Legislative Intent will be adopted by the Council by resolution on Monday, December 13. Following adoption, OMB will provide a copy of all adopted Statements to all department heads.

SEATTLE FMC
DEC 3 9 53 AM '76

As was the case in 1976, in printing the Final 1977 Budget, OMB will include the following items:

a. In those areas where the City Council adopts Statements of Intent, these statements will be reproduced in either the Departmental Summaries or the appropriate Program Category under the heading LEGISLATIVE INTENT.

b. In those areas where the City Council makes appropriation changes, those changes will be summarized in narrative form in the Departmental Summary, based on the votes taken by the Council, in a section entitled LEGISLATIVE ACTION.

If you have any questions on any of the attached materials, you should contact your budget analyst or Bob Cowan of my staff.

WRH:RVC: jw

cc: Mayor Wes Uhlman
All Councilmembers
All Budget Analysts

Budget

Eng

#21

JMT:rl
11/9/76

ORDINANCE 106006

AN ORDINANCE increasing certain allowances in the 1976 Budgets of various City departments, making a reimbursable appropriation from the Emergency Fund and appropriations from certain other funds and declaring the emergency therefor.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That to pay the costs of salary increases and related expenses effective September 1, 1976 as agreed to in various labor agreements and under the provisions of Ordinance 105045, Object of Expenditure 1000 - "Personal Services' - in the designated program categories in the 1976 Budgets of the indicated City departments, offices, and agencies are hereby increased as follows:

Board of Ethics and Fair Campaign Practices Commission	
P.C. 110 - Support Services	$ 550
Board of Public Works	
P.C. 110 - Direction of Board of Public Works Activities	$ 9,369
120 - Office of Cable Communications	564
Building - Fund 502	
P.C. 110 - Administration	$ 793
120 - Design and Construction	2,487
130 - Real Estate and Property Management	1,972
140 - Maintenance and Operations	16,989
210 - Administration	935
220 - Housing Inspection	11,492
310 - Administration	783
320 - Building and Electrical Inspection	10,062
330 - Mechanical Inspection	3,262
340 - Zoning Administration	4,325
350 - Plans Examination	5,601

CB2 19.1

106006

360 - North End Office		601
370 - Code Research		657
380 - Environmental Review	$	870
410 - Departmental Administration		3,851
420 - Support from General Fund		47,091
<u>Civil Service</u>		
P.C. 110 - Validation	$	348
120 - Classification		2,949
130 - Examination		6,812
140 - Compensation		1,375
150 - Commission Services		1,089
<u>Community Development</u> - Fund 513		
P.C. 110 - Administrative Services	$	7,216
140 - Office of the Director		1,854
210 - Program Administration		783
220 - Downtown Development		2,561
310 - Program Administration		281
320 - Neighborhood Planning Services		5,597
370 - Residential Housing Rehabilitation		3,159
410 - Program Administration		785
430 - Technical Studies		5,482
510 - Urban and Historic Preservation		2,032
520 - Support from General Fund		12,614
- Fund 512		
130 - Technical and Relocation Services	$	8,063
230 - Pike Project		2,567
350 - Yesler-Atlantic		1,194
<u>Engineering</u> - Fund 501		
- Support from General Fund		
<u>Account</u>		
5011 Right of Way and Property Acquisition	$	1,234

CBB 19.1

106006

5012 Street Use Regulation	7,079
5013 Office Support	1,520
5014 Cleaning Operations	9,653
5015 Roadway and Sidewalk Maintenance and Repair	$ 5,483
5018 Drainage	7,818
5019 Landscape Maintenance	6,538
5020 Roadway Structures	10,641
5021 Supervision and Facilities	10,550
5023 Construction Management	1,758
5024 Administration	518
5025 Civic Activities and Parade Expenses	1,357
5026 Unreimbursed Engineering Services	35,380
5027 Engineering Studies	431
5028 Engineering Records	717

- Support from City Street Fund

Account

5551 Roadway and Sidewalk Maintenance and Repair	$ 2,425
5553 Traffic Shop and Field Operations	16,143
5554 Traffic and Transportation	7,046
5555 Landscape Studies	82
5556 Arterial Planning and Priority Studies	15,579
5557 Concept Transportation Planning	254

- Support from Arterial City Street Fund

Account

5571 Asphalt Paving Programs	$ 1,732
5572 Channelization and Widening	141
P.C. 110 - Executive Management	$ 4,667
120 - Management and Planning	4,751
130 - Administrative Services	11,997

CBS 19.2

140 - Right-of-Way and Property Acquisition	4,932
150 - Street Use Regulation	11,030
160 - Office Support	8,896
201 - Reimbursable Work	31,676
210 - Cleaning Operations	$ 10,146
220 - Roadway and Sidewalk Maintenance and Repair	11,917
250 - Drainage	8,210
260 - Landscape Maintenance	911
270 - Roadway Structures	10,925
280 - Supervision and Facilities Maintenance	11,716
290 - Traffic Shop and Field Operations	16,662
510 - Traffic and Transportation	22,708
610 - Construction Management	29,424
710 - Transportation Design	13,377
810 - Estimates and Specifications	3,145
910 - Utility Design	19,252
- Fund 450	
P.C. 310 - Solid Waste Utility	$ 22,166
- Fund 440	
P.C. 410 - Sewer Utility	17,188
<u>Executive</u>	
P.C. 120 - Office of Management and Budget	$ 7,500
310 - Procurement of Goods and Services	6,085
610 - Policy Management	6,275
620 - Policy Development	6,421
- Fund 505	
P.C. 210 - Management and Administrative Services	8,639
230 - Employee Development and Personal Services	37,569
240 - Labor Relations	1,522

250 - Support from General Fund	11,735
Finance - Comptroller's Office	
P.C. 110 - Administration	$ 1,308
120 - Accounting and Auditing	11,401
130 - City Clerk	1,354
Finance - Treasurer's Office	
P.C. 110 - Administration	$ 1,317
120 - Financial Management - Fund 510	5,730
P.C. 130 - Collection of Utility Bills	3,525
General Services - Fund 503	
P.C. 110 - Administration	$ 1,617
120 - Fleet Management	2,179
130 - Vehicle Maintenance Services	54,855
210 - Management	649
220 - Printing, Duplicating, Photocopying Services	3,231
230 - Central Office Supplies, Mail Messenger Service	553
240 - Records Management and Microfilm Services	372
250 - Telephone Services	1,157
310 - Management	878
320 - Engineering	957
330 - Operations	4,641
510 - Office of the Director	1,333
520 - Administrative Services	7,146
Human Resources - Fund 511	
P.C. 110 - Operations Administration	$ 201
120 - Aging	2,148

	140 - Handicapped	724
	180 - Community Services	2,854
	210 - Office of the Director	796
	230 - Financial Management/Administration	1,484
	240 - Program Control	1,823
	260 - Support from General Fund	10,030
<u>Law</u>		
P.C.	110 - Administration	$ 1,085
	120 - Advisory	6,965
	130 - Claims	2,871
	140 - Litigation	5,174
	150 - Prosecution	4,786
<u>Library</u> - Fund 104		
P.C.	110 - City Librarian	$ 1,329
	120 - Management Support	3,168
	210 - Technical	11,815
	220 - Buildings and Grounds	6,625
	310 - Administration	625
	320 - Subject Collections	17,200
	330 - Special Collections	3,877
	340 - Quick Information Center	2,523
	410 - Administration	2,533
	420 - Northeast	7,096
	430 - Northwest	5,824
	440 - South	5,839
	450 - Mobile	3,629
	510 - Library for the Blind	4,193
	520 - Support from General Fund	72,083
<u>Licenses and Consumer Affairs</u>		
P.C.	110 - Administration	$ 843
	120 - Licenses	11,961

	130 - Consumer Affairs	3,648
	140 - Animal Control	7,201
<u>Light</u> - Fund 410		
P.C. 110 - Planning and Management Control		$320,518
	220 - Research and Pre-Design	88,591
<u>Municipal Court</u>		
P.C. 110 - Presiding Judge		$ 2,892
	140 - Probation	6,558
	150 - Hearing Examiner	1,615
	160 - Magisterial Hearings	3,227
	170 - Administration and Finance	5,309
	180 - Ordinance Violations	19,399
<u>Parks</u> - Fund 102		
P.C. 110 - Operations Administration		$ 3,094
	120 - Community Recreation	28,087
	130 - Special Programs and Facilities	13,483
	140 - Maintenance of Facilities	34,364
	150 - Maintenance of Grounds	51,882
	210 - Zoo Administration and Exhibition	1,972
	220 - Zoo Health and Operations	11,954
	310 - Management Services	7,356
	320 - Project Management	10,197
	330 - Financial Management	4,742
	410 - Aquarium Operations	1,687
	420 - Support from General Fund	90,000
<u>Police</u>		
P.C. 110 - Office of the Chief		$ 20,296
	120 - Inspectional Services	15,962
	130 - Fiscal and Property Management	3,633
	210 - Administration	4,317
	220 - Operations	192,053

310 - Administration	1,614
320 - Traffic	51,677
330 - Metropolitan	37,918
340 - Communications	23,140
410 - Administration	2,827
420 - Criminal Investigations	63,144
430 - Vice and Narcotics	$ 16,869
440 - Juvenile	12,966
510 - Administration	1,561
540 - Records, Evidence and Fleet Control	23,822
560 - Pensions	25,467
570 - Personnel	3,708
580 - Training	9,263
<u>Employees' Retirement</u> - Fund 601	
P.C. 110 - Management of Employee Benefit Plans	$6,681
<u>Seattle Center</u> - Fund 114	
P.C. 110 - Departmental Administration	$ 880
210 - Program Administration	659
220 - Special Activities	488
240 - Research and Development	370
310 - Program Administration	1,169
320 - Finance and Accounting	856
330 - Contracts and Concessions	552
340 - Administrative Services	966
350 - Facility Sales	831
360 - Event Servicing	6,577
370 - Facility Support	22,237
380 - Technical Services	9,054
390 - Security and Parking	3,068

and to effectuate such increases there is hereby appropriated and transferred from the Sewer Fund the sum of Seventeen

Thousand One Hundred Eighty-eight Dollars ($17,188), and from the Solid Waste Fund the sum of Twenty-two Thousand One Hundred Sixty-six Dollars ($22,166), and from the Light Fund the sum of Four Hundred Nine Thousand One Hundred Nine Dollars ($409,109), and from the Emergency Fund the sum of One Million Four Hundred Forty-seven Thousand One Hundred Forty-nine Dollars ($1,447,149) which latter Fund shall be reimbursed by the appropriation and transfer hereby made and authorized of the indicated amounts from Funds as follows:

General	$ 1,008,448
Building Department Operating	17,589
Community Development Operating	17,136
Urban Renewal Operating	11,824
Engineering Operating	92,263
City Street	41,529
Personal Services Operating	35,995
Treasurer's Operating	3,525
Arterial City Street	1,873
General Services Operating	79,568
Library	4,193
Parks	78,818
Employees' Retirement	6,681
Seattle Center	47,707

and the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants and make the necessary transfers.

Section 2. WHEREAS, the appropriation herein made is to meet actual necessary expenditures of the City for which insufficient appropriation has been made due to causes which could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time of making the 1976 Budget; Now, Therefore, in accordance with RCW 35.32A.060, by reason of the facts above stated and the

emergency which is hereby declared to exist, this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon the approval or signing of the same by the Mayor or passage over his veto, as provided by the Charter of the City.

PASSED by three-fourths vote of all the members of the City Council the 22 day of November, 1976 and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 22 day of November, 1976.

President of the City Council

Approved by me this 29 day of November, 1976.

MAYOR

Filed by me this 29 day of November, 1976.

ATTEST:

City Comptroller and City Clerk

By:

Deputy

(SEAL)

Published_____

CSS 19.2

Budget
11/30

√ November 29, 1976

Mr. Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management and Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

We request authority to make the following transfer of funds in the 1977 Operating Budget:

	FUND	PROGRAM CATEGORY	DEPT.	OBJECT	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
FROM:	501	6100	030	3900	(988 sq.ft. @ $3.48/sq.ft.	$3,438
TO:	501	8100	030	3900	of Muni. Bldg.)	$3,438

The necessity of this transfer is to correctly allocate space cost for 988 square feet of space reallocated from the Survey Engineering Section to the Specifications and Estimates Division.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R. R. Parker
Assistant City Engineer for
Management and Planning

CEV:saw
cc: D. Roletto
C. Blair
L. Koski
T. Lorenz

CS57.11

LA9/Action

Parker
How soon can we get our Rental rate reduced and by how much. — D Roletto

MEMORANDUM

To Dominic Roletto

By Claude E. Buckner CEB Date November 12, 1976

Subject Space Rental Reduction

Estimation Division has taken over 988 square feet of space from Survey Engineering Section, as of November 8th, 1976.

CEB/sl

RECEIVED
NOV 12 1976

From the 1977 Budget Package #4
Expenditure Detail - General Svcs Wkbk.
p2

"Object 3900 - Rentals: Space in the Municipal Building will be budgeted at $3.48/sq ft. All other space..."

Budget
11/24

November 23, 1976

E. L. Kidd, City Comptroller

R. R. Lorenz, Assistant Fiscal Control Manager

Interfund transfer to Correct Voucher

Because of the premature abandonment of certain ordinances which authorized the transfer of $40,156 from the Arterial Development Fund (Fund 316) to the Arterial City Street Fund (Fund 122), the transfers cannot be accomplished.

For this reason, it is requested that $40,156 be transferred from Fund 316 to Fund 122 as authorized by Ordinances 98503, 99362 and 102208 and that this transfer be considered sufficient to satisfy the exceptions against SFD Voucher #3119, a copy of which is attached. These are valid expenditures made under the authority of said ordinances, which have been affected by the abandonment.

Your cooperation in this matter will be appreciated.

TRL:saw
Attachment
cc: June Smith, Budget Control
D. Salo, Accounts Payable

Ord 98503 appr 12-31-69 filed MI-West Seattle Freeway
Ord 99362 appr 10-14-70 filed MI-(Cont) 2H Roxbury St. Widening
Ord 102208 appr 5-31-73 filed TOPICS

Budget

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

1977 BUDGET

7 x agmte

1977 TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING AND PLANNING ACTIVITIES

It is agreed that transportation planning and policy formulation is the duty of the Planning Commission with the assistance of the Office of Policy Planning and that implementation of transportation policies and plans and operation of the transportation system is the function of the Engineering Department.

"Transportation Policy Planning" is to be defined as the determination and evaluation of a recommended action, policy, plan or an element of a plan. Required activities include the assessment of issues, existing goals, policies and transportation plans, problem description and policy plan.

"Transportation and Traffic Engineering" can be defined as the sequence of activities leading to implementation and operation of the recommended actions, policies, plans or plan elements as approved by elected officials. Such activities include system surveillance, problem definition, solution concept development, development of preliminary engineering plans and estimates, impact and benefit assessment, final design, construction and operation.

OFFICE OF POLICY PLANNING ACTIVITIES

In 1977 the Office of Policy Planning shall carry out Seattle transportation planning activities as follows:

I. Develop a Transportation Policy Plan that will consist of the following elements:

A. A redefinition of functional classification and a map of transportation facilities.

B. A definition of the city's transportation goals, objectives and policies.

C. Description of system adequacies and deficiencies in 1980, 1985 and 1990.

D. Description of area transportation impacts and deficiencies.

E. Proposed modifications to the existing system (both capital and operational), but not at a detail design level (costs will be expressed in ranges).

F. Relative priorities for the above modifications.

G. A statement of assumptions, data and technical assessments underlying the Plan conclusions and recommendations.

Concurrence Prior to Signature

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
GEF	11/2/76	GEF
RRP	11/2/76	RRP
AEM	11/2/76	AEM
EPS	11/3/76	EPS
INFORMATION		

RPL brought in for file 11-4-76

C. FILES

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

1977 BUDGET

1977 TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING AND PLANNING ACTIVITIES

It is agreed that transportation planning and policy formulation is the duty of the Planning Commission with the assistance of the Office of Policy Planning and that implementation of transportation policies and plans and operation of the transportation system is the function of the Engineering Department.

"Transportation Policy Planning" is to be defined as the determination and evaluation of a recommended action, policy, plan or an element of a plan. Required activities include the assessment of issues, existing goals, policies and transportation plans, problem description and policy plan.

"Transportation and Traffic Engineering" can be defined as the sequence of activities leading to implementation and operation of the recommended actions, policies, plans or plan elements as approved by elected officials. Such activities include system surveillance, problem definition, solution concept development, development of preliminary engineering plans and estimates, impact and benefit assessment, final design, construction and operation.

OFFICE OF POLICY PLANNING ACTIVITIES

In 1977 the Office of Policy Planning shall carry out Seattle transportation planning activities as follows:

I. Develop a Transportation Policy Plan that will consist of the following elements:

A. A redefinition of functional classification and a map of transportation facilities.

B. A definition of the city's transportation goals, objectives and policies.

C. Description of system adequacies and deficiencies in 1980, 1985 and 1990.

D. Description of area transportation impacts and deficiencies.

E. Proposed modifications to the existing system (both capital and operational), but not at a detail design level (costs will be expressed in ranges).

F. Relative priorities for the above modifications.

G. A statement of assumptions, data and technical assessments underlying the Plan conclusions and recommendations.

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
NOV 12 3 46 PM '76

Orig: Budget
Copies: Capital Impr Program
Transportation Planning

II. Develop the 1978 Transportation Capital Improvement Program as follows:

A. After consultation with an input from SED, develop policy guidelines:

1. Definition of goals, objectives, and policies for development of TCIP.

2. Identification and evaluation of specific issues as perceived by the various constituencies, agencies communities, etc.

B. After concultation with and input from SED, develop and implement a TCIP citizen involvement program.

C. Participate in priority programming process as a member of the interdisciplinary team (IDT).

D. Prepare Executive TCIP:

1. Establish final prioritization of projects proposed by SED.

2. Prepare final document and handle review through City Council approval.

E. Monitor TCIP:

1. Review appropriation requests.

2. Review EIS during draft circulation.

3. Monitor implementation of TCIP with regard to major scope revisions, scheduling, cost revisions, etc.

III. Recommend a City position on MetroTRANSITion

This will be accomplished within the context of activities on the Comprehensive Policy Plan above. Activities include:

A. Comparative evaluation of proposed transportation solutions to needs in terms of performance goals and physical plan realization, issues and assumptions.

B. Development of recommendations for City Council review and adoption.

IV. Respond to major transportation issues

OPP anticipates having to prepare recommended City position papers on the following issues in 1977:

A. Surveillance Control and Driver Information System (Freeway ramp metering et al)

B. Metro Transit Service Policies/Criteria

C. PSCOG Work Program, 1990 Plan Refinement

D. Emergent issues unforeseen (e.g., a "rebirth" of I-90 controversy, Carpool strategies to be implemented on I-5, etc.)

E. Downtown People Mover (if Seattle project is approved)

V. Liaison with PSCOG and Metro

Assume lead role in coordination activities for the City on a Policy Planning level.

Through this agreement all parties recognize that the activities described in Sections I through V above are the responsibility of the Office of Policy Planning and shall be carried out by that body. However, inasmuch as these activities have an influence on "Transportation and Traffic Engineering" the Office of Policy Planning will develop close liaison and coordination with the Engineering Department.

THE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES

I. Direct reimbursement from OPP Budget

In 1977, the Engineering Department agrees to undertake the following planning support with direct reimbursement from the Office of Policy Planning 1977 Budget:

A. Comprehensive Transportation Policy Plan

1. Joint review of OPP products.

2. Technical and professional support (at concept level)
   a. Data collection - field, office tabulation
   b. Problem definition
   c. Formulation of possible actions/projects
   d. Evaluate physical feasibility
   e. Evaluate operations feasibility
   f. Assess system impacts, benefits, equity
   g. Costs (capital, M & O)
   h. Graphics support

B. MetroTRANSITion

Most of the technical support and evaluation will be performed by Metro. Engineering Department work would be concentrated on assessing non-transit factors such as impacts on street system, traffic control and circulation, access to businesses, loading and parking.

C. Major Transportation Issues

Provide technical support and evaluation of major issues outlined in OPP section 4. This support will cover several areas, with emphasis on:

1. problem definition
2. impacts on traffic control, circulation and access
3. capital and operational costs
4. user and non-user benefits and impacts

II. SED Operating Budget

In addition to the Engineering Department's role in providing technical support to transportation planning, it is recognized by all parties to this agreement that responses to issues that arise in the day to day operation of the transportation system require professional engineering studies and evaluations. Such responses can be summarized briefly:

A. Develop 1978 TCIP

1. Consult with and provide input to OPP regarding TCIP policy guidelines.

2. Implement priority programming process

   a. Simplify and improve current evaluation methodologies.

   b. Using plans and policies approved by OPP, develop detailed problem definitions and solution concepts, environmental assessments and benefit cost analysis, thru the IDT process.

   c. Recommend project priorities based on technical evaluaions (IDT).

   d. Assist OPP in development of citizen involvement program.

3. Perform allocation of funds.

4. The City Engineer through "exception reports" will advise the City Council of progress on TCIP projects.

B. Respond to communities

SED will respond to inquires from communities about traffic diversion, bikeway design and needs, noise, speeding and traffic safety programs.

C. Technical response to agencies and officials

SED will review, assess, and evaluate other department programs (NIP Block Grant), agency programs and projects (Metro and WSDOH

- especially plans, specifications and estimates, coordination with Engineering projects, etc.), review environmental impact statements, provide inputs to PSCOG and City officials on TSM, etc.

D. Respond to private companies and individuals

Review and evaluate access and circulation requirements, street vacations, variances, rezones, etc.

E. Perform Traffic Engineering Studies

Perform transportation studies regarding before/after assessment of operations and design improvements; participation with other agencies, e.g. Elderly-Handicapped Study; engineering cost reduction studies of capital improvements, e.g. signals, signs, overpasses; and miscellaneous data compilation for State or Federal agencies as required.

F. Grant Application Activities

Perform technical work required to develop and submit applications for Federal and State grants (UMTA, FHWA, HUD, Traffic Safety Commission, etc.). In addition, updating of street classifications and inventory of existing street conditions and hardware are often required by many funding agencies.

Through this agreement all parties recognize the activities described in sections I and II under the heading "Engineering Department Activities" are the responsibility of the Engineering Department and shall be carried out by that body. However, inasmuch as these activities have a potential influence on "Policy Planning", the Engineering Department will develop close liaison and coordination with the Office of Policy Planning.

AGREED COSTS AND STAFFING

It is agreed that the following transportation planning positions will be included in OPP's 1977 Budget:

1 Senior Traffic Engineer
2 Senior Transportation Planners
1 Associate Transportation Planner

Total Cost : $128,000.

It is agreed that Transportation Planning Contract Support shall total $34,000 and shall be disbursed at the descretion of the Physical Planning Division Manager in OPP.

It is agreed that the Engineering Department will have included in the 1977 Source Fund Budget the following:

$15,000 to develop the CIP and
$15,000 to develop grant applications.

$70,000 to continue to respond to communities, agencies, officials, private companies and conduct the necessary engineering studies.

The attached table summarizes the allocation of funds.

It is understood that OPP shall have $34,000 for contracted professional and technical assistance and may elect to contract such assistance with either a consultant or with the Engineering Department. The Engineering Department may elect to use a consultant to complete the tasks of this agreement.

R. W. Wilkinson, Jr.
Director, Office of Policy Planning

Paul A. Wiatrak, P.E.
City Engineer

Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management Budget

BUDGET ALLOCATION

Activity	SED/OPP Agreement
A P & P	
CIP	$15,000
City Engineer Response to street related topics	41,000
T & T (510, 520, 570)	
Grant applications	15,000
Response capabilities	29,000
Response to OPP	- 0 -
Sub-total SED	100,000
OPP	
Issue analysis	17,000
CIP	35,000
Transportation Plan	55,000
Sub-total OPP	107,000
OPP Supplement	
1 Associate Planner	21,000
Contract or SED Assistance	34,000
Sub-total OPP	55,000
TOTAL	$262,000

Budget

11-3

November 2, 1976

Mr. Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

ATTENTION: Kathy Scanlan

Dear Kathy:

The drainage review budget is under serious stress. General Fund Account #5026, Unreimbursed Engineering Services, has been accepting work referred to it through the Building Department in accordance with an agreement outlined in the accompanying letter to P.A. Wiatrak from A. Petty. This informal agreement was developed without the knowledge or assistance of Management & Planning. Consequently, the source funds budgeted for 1976 are extended to provide funds for more services than originally planned.

In accordance with the enclosed memo to R.E. Nieforth, I am requesting an additional $6,000 for 1977 Unreimbursed Engineering Services as a temporary stop-gap for anticipated additional services which do not have funding from any other source. It is expected than any stress to the 1976 budget can be alleviated from current allocations and reduced services in other areas. During the spring of 1977, more permanent funding can be developed with guidelines from the #201 Planning Study. Until those directions are clear, however, we must make a temporary allowance to R.E. Nieforth's section for anticipated work beyond the 1977 budget submittal request.

The Engineering Department requests the Office of Management and Budget to make the following changes in the 1977 budget submittal:

	FUND	CAT.	OBJ.	ACCT.	TITLE	AMOUNT
TO:	501	9100	1110		Salaries	$6,000
TO:	001			5026	Unreimb. Eng. Svcs.	$6,000

Copy: Community Development Dept - South Park

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
ROBERT R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer
for Management & Planning

CEV:saw
Attachments

Seattle
Department of Buildings

Alfred Petty, P.E. Superintendent
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

July 20, 1976

Mr. Paul A. Wiatrak, P.E.
City Engineer
City of Seattle

Dear Sir:

On Friday, July 9, 1976, Jan Arntz of my Environmental Staff met with representatives of the Engineering Department's Drainage Section. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the current drainage problems in the South Park Community. The consensus of the meeting was that any new development must not add to the existing drainage problems in that area. To insure this, the representatives at the meeting decided that my Environmental Staff will exercise its authority under SEPA and, when necessary, request a drainage plan from South Park applicants. Such plans would be submitted to the Drainage Section of your Department for review and approval.

Hopefully, this will greatly relieve the drainage problems in the South Park area. We appreciate your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED PETTY, P.E.
Superintendent of Buildings

JA:mh

cc: Mr. Phil Harrison
Mr. Bob Joiner
Mr. Ken Crimps
Mr. Elwood Ott
Mr. Rick Hooper

ENG. FORM 3218
CSS 7.11

MEMORANDUM

To R.E. Nieforth

By C.E. Veatch CEV Date November 2, 1976

Subject Drainage Review Costs and Charges

The findings of our meeting on November 1, 1976 with Elwood Ott, Joe Talbot, Lynn Guttmann and ourselves are:

a. The first drainage review on the South Park drainage problems sent to the SED from the Building Department to comply with SEPA flood control ordinances was September 22, 1976.
b. The work on drainage plans referred to your section (by the Building Department) has amounted to four plans in two months at a total of 50± hours; the cost being approximately $1,000: and the range of time expended per study being 3 to 24 hours.
c. No compensation for any drainage review has been received by SED from the Building Department.
d. Some direction is expected to emerge from the #201 Planning Study.

Conclusions drawn therefrom are:

a. No existing precedent exists which would quickly validate SED's claim to private party reimbursement through the Building Department collections.
b. All residents are responsible for the runoff and drainage of collected water deposits of their properties.
c. No uniform, enforceable statute or ordinance exists to develop an SED supervision or quality control check on new or existing buildings.
d. Budgetary allowances for current citizen assistance needs are insufficient to develop an absorbed or gratis type of counselling service or regulation agency.

Action available to us at this time is:

a. To request a temporary general fund increase to supplement current budget allowance for increased work load.
b. To wait for definite conclusions of the #201 study in order to develop a permanent plan of action.

Some possible permanent financing plans to develop from the #201 study findings are:

a. Building control fees where the SED incurs a cost for inspection of new or adjusted development.
b. SEPA and flood control ordinances which leave their department in supervisory position.
c. Street use ordinance to establish storm drainage fund supported by new construction fees and which leaves the SED in supervisory position.
d. One-stop permit system which allows builders to check in with one building permit desk and dispense all City code requirements at one time.

CEV:saw
cc: E. Ott
J. Talbot

Budget
11/1

November 1, 1976

Mr. Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

The offices of sewer and drainage planning of the Engineering Department request authority to transfer funds as follows:

	FUND	DEPT.	CAT	ACCT.	TITLE	AMT.
From	501	030	9100	1110	Salaries	4500.00
To	501	030	9100	6400	Mach. & Equip.	4500.00

This request is necessary in order to maintain progress on the #201-208 Planning schedule for the sewer and drainage section commitments.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R. R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer
For Management & Planning

CEV:lg

Budget
July/Dec. 1976

Budget
11/1

November 1, 1976

Mr. Walter Hundley, Director
Office of Management & Budget
City of Seattle

Dear Mr. Hundley:

The Department of Engineering requests authorization to make the following transfers of funds:

FROM:	Fund	Dept.	Account	Title	Amount
	001	030	015016	Slide Control	$ 30,000
	001	030	015019	Landscape Maintenance	160,000
	001	030	015020	Roadway Structures	100,000
					$290,000

TO:	Fund	Dept.	Account	Title	Amount
	001	030	015014	Cleaning Operations	$ 20,000
	001	030	015015	Roadway and Sidewalk Maint.	230,000
	001	030	015019	Drainage	40,000
					$290,000

The reasons for this need are:

1. A reduction in reimbursable workload required the Department to expend its budget at a faster rate than originally anticipated.
2. A reduction in personnel through attrition left other accounts with more funds than we would have expected if the positions had been refilled.
3. An arbitrary reduction in general fund fuel budgets did not allow for the level of work performed.
4. The overhead rates were increased with no corresponding increase in source fund amounts.

These transfers are all within the Maintenance and Operations program category and do not involve conflicting Departmental interests.

Any expediency in this matter will be appreciated very much. The receiving accounts are seriously in need of funds to meet their October obligations.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
R. R. PARKER
Assistant City Engineer
for Management and Planning

CEV:saw

Oct

-21

October 21, 1976

K. Scanlan

C.E. Veatch

Additions and Corrections to Proposed Annual Budget - 1977

I found three errors in the executive (printed) budget submittal at the account number designations which will be important to readers and a few administrators:

page 191	GF Acct. #5028	-	should be GF Acct. #5018
page 194	GF Acct. #5026	-	should be GF Acct. #5020
page 202	CSF Acct. #5558	-	should be CSF Acct. #5557

The revenues totaled on page 35 of the printed submittal indicate $3,339,971 for CSF total, and summing these from the program category detail adds to only $3,299,971. Also, the Transportation CIP total does not agree with the sum of P.C. detail. Only these two totals were checked. If these totals are incorrect, are there more errors? If these differences are explainable, may I be advised? If the final budget will explain all, perhaps an intervening notice is superfluous.

Now, the enclosed pages are changes to be made in the 1976 and 1977 budget and source fund accounts. One revenue fund change order for each year and one operating fund change order for each year. Included with the 1977 changes is a tally sheet for those source fund accounts which appear in more than one program category and a set of xeroxed budget sheets.

I found no Solid Waste Fund account to change with regard to the 5.3% salary increases. I changed the whole budgets of Sewer Fund and Waterway Operations and Maintenance as if the total of the budget were labor charges. The remainder of the pencil changes on the P.C. pages are probably self explanatory. If not, I will be happy to illuminate the area(s) of darkness.

CEV:saw
Attachments

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

MEMORANDUM

October 18, 1976

To: Honorable John Miller

From: Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director

Subject: Your Memorandum of October 13, 1976

You have asked this Office to respond to two questions. The first is to provide a list showing specifially where OMB would cut the budget by 5% and by 10% if it were necessary. Our response is that the Proposed Executive Budget is the result of a thorough analytic process jointly undertaken by the Lighting Department and the Executive Department. The Budget then presents the Mayor's best judgements concerning departmental programs and priorities. This being the case, we do not feel that it is possible for us to re-program and re-prioritize as you request. We are, and have been, available to assist your budget review by explaining and providing more detail on the Mayor's proposals.

The second question relates to joint billing of water, lighting, sewer and garbage charges. Our response is that, at this time, we simply do not have the information you request and are unable to produce it in the time frame specified. We share many of your concerns with customer billing. Because we share your concerns, we have engaged the firm of Arthur Andersen & Company to review the area of utility billing. Attached please find a copy of the contract which has been signed with Arthur Andersen for your information. We expect the consultant to present recommendations to the Executive early in 1977. We will submit the report to you at that time.

We are also in the process of preparing an overall status report on the Customer Information System (CIS) Project. We expect that report to be completed late in October of this year. We will certainly provide you with that report as soon as possible during budget deliberations. Again we emphasize that we remain willing and eager to provide you with explanations and information on the Mayor's proposals.

Copy: Customer Service

WRH:SW:ms

cc: Mayor Wes Uhlman
Ken Lowthian
Gordon Vickery
Paul Wiatrak

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
Pow		
RPP	DMD	WJM
JGR	HTT	
	GBF	

3C

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
OCT 20 8 37 AM '76

Budget
10/15

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

OMB

October 15, 1976

Kathy Scanlan

Carol Veatch

Solid Waste Utility Positions

Attached please find a listing of the salary positions and the actual salary amounts which differ from their salaries as budgeted.

Position No.	Title	Budgeted Salary (per mo.)	Actual Salary (per mo.)	Difference
007686	Asst., Adm. Support	795	765	30
007773	Driver, Heavy Trk.- 6 mos.	1164	1119	45
007772	" " " " "	1164	1119	45
008630	Scaleman	913	878	35
007706	Spec., Admin. I	894	861	33
007712	Technician, Acctg. I	861	826	35
007690	Technician, Acctg. I	931	894	37
007692	Technician, Acctg. I	931	894	37
			Total Difference	297

None of these salaries has the 5.3% cost of living increase included.

There doesn't seem to be much reason to change the budget for this small amount: $297 per month or $3564 for the year.

CEV:lg
Enclosure
cc: G.N. Fairbanks

Copy: Solid Waste Util

Budget
10/15

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

October 15, 1976

Ed Kidd, City Comptroller Attn: Budget Control

C.T. Criscola

Budget Control Liaison

The Engineering Department liaison will be Walt North ext. 2912 and Tom Lorenz ext. 2660.

TRL:lg
cc: T. Lorenz
W. North

Budgets

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

MEMORANDUM

October 14, 1976

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
RRP		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
OCT 18 11 48 AM '76

To: All Department Heads

From: Walter R. Hundley, Director OMB

Subject: OMB Work Program for 1977

Each year in the budget process OMB reviews with departments their performance based upon an adopted set of program plans. Much of the program planning effort is directed toward increasing the efficiency of City operations and having a rational basis for prioritizing programs within the confines of revenues available. From my perspective this process has been critically important to the departments, OMB and elected officials in effectively responding to the growing disparity between resources available and expected levels of service delivery to the public. Over the years the City has had a number of notable successes in implementing organizational changes and new technologies which have saved money by improving performance.

Credit for such improvements is due in large part to the work of departmental staff and to a certain extent to the staff support which OMB provides. OMB encourages these improvements both through the"accountability" mechanisms of the budget process, through ongoing advice and assistance, and by work on special projects which the analysts undertake.

Each year this Office establishes a formalized work program of project assignments for the analysts of the various departments. Our success at completing these projects within established time frames is of course governed by the general administrative requirements placed upon the Office, special requests for information and analysis from elected officials, handling of emergency problems as they develop, etc. For 1977 it is my intention to repriortize some of the resources of this Office to provide for a Special Studies Team of skilled analysts who will concentrate an major projects. A summary explanation of this proposal is contained in the program plans for OMB in the Proposed 1977 Budget on pages 224 - 225. If the Council adopts the proposed staffing configuration I will establish the Special Studies Team to undertake larger scale analyses, while the Budget Analysts assigned to individual departments will conduct studies of a smaller magnitude. There will be a close coordination between the study team and the departmental budget analysts as well as a clearly established direct interface with departmental staff in conducting all of these work activities.

My staff is currently in the process of formulating proposals both for the study team work in 1977 as well as the work program for the departmental analysts. I would like your input into our planning process both in terms of major projects or smaller specific studies which you would like to see OMB undertake next year. These should include issues relating directly to the operation of your department or alternatively including your interface with other departments. I am sure that you can appreciate that our staff resources are very limited in terms of the number of projects that can be undertaken next year. I cannot assure you at this time that any major projects will be undertaken in your department next year. However, I can assure you that all projects will be seriously considered.

I would therefore request that any recommendations you have for special projects be submitted to me in writing no later than Friday, October 29th. I would appreciate a few paragraphs on each project rather than a lengthy explanation. You should also describe the staff resources available within your department, if any, to provide direct or indirect assistance in completing the project. Your OMB analyst will be available to provide any additional information regarding this inquiry.

The following are examples of OMB studies conducted in previous years.

(1) 1975 City-wide analysis of environmental review resources and costs.

(2) 1974 Seattle Personnel Network Analysis and Recommendations

(3) 1976 Analysis of cash float requirements of all City funds.

WRH:JS:ms

cc: Mayor Wes Uhlman

Budget

10/12

October 6, 1976

Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director, Office of Management and Budget

Paul A. Wiatrak, City Engineer

Solid Waste Utility Budget 1977 Sgd Paul A. Wiatrak

At the Solid Waste Budget hearing held on August 26, 1976, in OMB, I indicated that we would go on record as to the appropriateness of some of the proposed budget reductions in the 1977 Solid Waste Utility budget. Since then I have received your memo of September 2nd, which summarizes these reductions and also furnishes OMB's recollection of the dialogue pertinent to each of the reductions.

Personnel

In the area of vacant positions we are not sure that filling four laborer positions would result in an "unspecified increase in service". It may be that certain activities may continue to be fulfilled by use of overtime or a curtailment on compliance with the Washington State Minimum Functional Standards for Solid Waste Facilities (RCW 70.95 and WAC 173-301). We will endeavor to accomplish the required tasks within the staffing levels authorized.

Overtime

A brief analysis of holiday staffing for 1977 indicates that approximately $50,000 will be spent on mandatory holiday overtime at the time and one-half rate. This will leave $60,000 for all other overtime requirements which will be at the double time rate. It is our belief that the reduced funding level of $110,000 will not be adequate.

Combined Utility Bill/CIS/Low Income Elderly

It was our understanding that this item would be budgeted at $350,000 for 1977 and that the Utility's liability will not exceed this amount. We assume from your memo the Low Income Elderly expenditure will be in addition to the $350,000 budget item.

Land

King County has surplused approximately 20 acres ± of property immediately south and west of the South Transfer Station. The Solid Waste Utility has a need for a portion (probably 4 to 5 acres) of the property at this time to enlarge parking and staging areas. There are at least two complications to SWU acquiring the property; 1) it is uncertain whether King County will break up property for sale and 2) should the SWAP program proceed and South Transfer site selected, all of the property would be needed. Notwithstanding these complications, we are still of the opinion the City of Seattle should give King County notice of our intention to acquire at least a portion of the property in 1977.

Copy: Solid Waste Util

Barge Closure

Seattle Engineering Department agreed that SED should not initiate closure of the barge but pointed out the City Council has indicated barge closure would be advantageous to the City of Seattle and the Council would take matter up in the proposed rate structure for 1977 and beyond.

If you have comments on our interpretations of the issues please let us know.

GBF:slt

Concurrence Prior to Signature	
	GBF

Budget

9-23

ENGINEERING DEPAR..NT

September 23, 1976

Mayor OMB

Kathy Scanlan

L.A. Guttmann

1977 City Street Fund Programmed Balance

During the budget hearings, the Engineering Department earmarked $91,000 for a pending appropriation for posting traffic regulatory and warning signs at school crosswalk locations. Ordinance 105791 actually appropriated $62,000 from the City Street Fund. You had mentioned that you had adjusted the hold-out downward from $91,000 to $35,000.

Now, the appropriation amount is $62,000. If the programmed balance for 1977 City Street Fund is to remain $100,000, the OMB adjustment (exchanging GF for CSF) should be $315,000; see the attached Resource Availability Form.

Please call me if this is not your understanding.

LAG:lg

Budget

Your City, Seattle
Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget
Walter R. Hundley, Director
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
SEP 10 9 52 AM '76

√ September 7, 1976

Ken Lowthian, Superintendent, Water Department
Gordon Vickery, Superintendent, Lighting Department
Paul Wiatrak, City Engineer

Gentlemen:

For sometime Lighting Department staff has provided untility consumer services at the Ballard, White Center and University Community Service Centers. A recently completed study of the City's Community Service Centers reveals that only about 69% of total customer contacts handled by the utility consumer services' staff related to the Lighting Department. The bulk of the non-Lighting contacts were Water, Sewer and Solid Waste utility customers. Both the Executive and Legislative Departments feel it is inappropriate for the Lighting Department to continue to pay the full cost for services provided to all city utilities.

Consequently, we request the Lighting Department to begin billing the Water Department a pro-rated share of costs associated with the utility services provided at the three community service centers. We expect that the Water Department will distribute this cost appropriately to Water, Sewer and Solid Waste utilities.

As noted above we feel that the 31%-69% split, based on the data contained in the attached table, is a reasonable division of costs. If either the Lighting or Water Department feels that another distribution would be more equitable, please develop a proposal for our mutual review. As the City Council has specifically requested that the costs of providing this service be allocated among the utilities and that a report be made to them during 1977 Budget review, we request your prompt response in this matter.

Copy: Community Service Centers

Yours sincerely,

Walter R. Hundley

Walter R. Hundley
Budget Director

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
~~PAW~~		
JGR	HTT	
GBF		
WEPS	HEL/BWB	

WRH:dp

cc: Curtis M. Green, Jr.

COMMUNITY SERVICE CENTERS

1976 OPERATIONS

Annualized, Based on First Quarter

Service Type/ Service Mode	Human Resources		Nbhd. Development		Public Service		TOTALS		UNIT COST	TOTAL COST
	Contacts	% Time	Contacts	% Time	Contacts	% Time	Contacts	% Time		
Information	9,056	1.7%	2,172	1.0%	6,228	.8%	17,456	3.5%	$ .63	$ 11,053
Assistance	28,264	24.8%	1,616	2.0%	5,820	4.8%	35,700	31.6%	2.84	101,360
Collections/ Registrations Only	1,004	.4%	---	---	36,520*	4.4%	37,524	4.8%	.20	[illegible],668
Collections With Assistance	---	---	---	---	26,144*	21.7%	26,144	21.7%	1.02	26,714
Community Group Work	N/R	14.3%	N/R	21.4%	N/R	2.7%	N/R	38.4%	12.34/hr.	122,761
	38,324	41.2%	3,788	24.4%	74,712	34.4%	116,824	100.0%		$269,556
COST	$129,346		$77,607		$62,603					$269,556

N/R -- Not Recorded as "Contacts"

* Public Service Collections/Registrations - Detail

Traffic Tickets	1,268
Pet Licenses	1,016
Voter Registration	1,308
City Light	40,655
Combined Utilities	18,416

budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

MEMORANDUM

To: Gordon Vickery, Superintendent, Lighting Department

From: Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director WRH

Subject: AC to DC Power Rectification Budget

Date: September 7, 1976

The purpose of this memo is to inform you that the Mayor's proposed 1977 budget will include an appropriation of $69,600 in Finance-General Account 4123 for AC to DC power rectification. The appropriation includes:

$54,000	- Maintenance and Operations
15,600	- Land/Building Rent
$69,600	- Total

It is my understanding that the rent fee includes an allocated portion of substation upkeep, and that, due to the depreciation of the current rectifiers, no charge will be made for rectifier rental.

The General Fund has not paid the rental for the period 1972-76. Therefore, we have back payments totaling $62,400. These should be billed in 1976.

If you have any questions about this, please feel free to contact me or Kathy Scanlan of my staff.

WRH:KS:wb

cc: Paul Wiatrak, City Engineer
R. V. Cowan, OMB

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
Paul Cowan		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
SEP 9 8 33 AM '76

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

MEMORANDUM

August 30, 1976

To: Paul A. Wiatrak, City Engineer

From: Walter R. Hundley, Director, Office of Management and Budget — Walter R. Hundley by RA

Subject: 1977 Budget Hearing - SED

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
RRP		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
PAW		

I. General Issues

A. Reorganization

The Engineering Department agreed to review the current organizational structure in 1977 in conjunction with the EFIS project, noting that organizational reviews are an ongoing process. The Department agreed to submit a reorganization proposal in the 1978 Budget or, if not, to indicate the reasons why not.

B. Project Engineer

The Department indicated that Management and Planning has been assigned the task of reviewing the current project engineer system with an analysis of the project manager concept presented by Price-Waterhouse and others.

II. Program Category 1100

A. Engineer, Civil Principal I position was discussed - retained in the Budget.

B. $10,000 of unprogrammed expert and consultant services - deleted.

III. Program Category 1200

A. The Department agreed to delete Engineer, Industrial Asst. for Vefac maintenance.

B. The Department agreed to a reduction of $12,000 in General Fund Account 5026 assuming that other departments pay their outstanding bills.

C. $20,735 will be added to the City Street Fund to pay street-related bad debts.

SEP 7 11 08 AM '76
SEATTLE ENG DEPT

IV. Program Category 1300

A. General Fund Account 5024 was shifted to overhead.

B. General Fund Account 5025 - $6,200 for United Way and Civil Defense was shifted to overhead.

C. General Fund Account 5028 - $31,500 was deleted for the Motion Picture Program - OMB will check possible 1% for Arts funding.

D. The 8th Floor counter was eliminated.

E. Microfilming of the vault records will be done. $10,000 will be budgeted in 1977, and $10,000 will be carried over from 1976. $10,000 will be moved from PC 1500.

F. One Administrative Specialist II will be eliminated; the position will be placed in the pool.

G. $800 was deleted for a sound-sync slide system.

V. Program Category 1400

No change

VI. Program Category 1500

A. $7,682 - Data processing for the street use billing system eliminated.

B. $10,000 - Reduce side sewer permit microfilming - move to PC 1300 for Vault.

VII. Program Category 2100

Two laborers added to produce "can man" in Pioneer Square and the International District.

VIII. Program Category 2800

Building Improvement - eliminated - for $13,500 - vacation of N. 126th St.

IX. Program Category 2900

A. $45,006 - Added to Street Name Sign Maintenance to increase to 1975 service level.

B. $9,000 - Building improvements eliminated.

C. $5,000 - Photo-typesetter denied.

X. Program Category 4100

- All CIS - Combined Utility Bill costs will be shown in Line Item 3190 - at the amount estimated by the Water Department, which is:

Combined Utility Bill (include Treasurer's operating payment)	$405,864
CIS - DP Phase I Batch O&M	55,314
CIS - DP Phase II Dev.	1,273
Low-Income Elderly	10,600
	$473,051

Sewer will not be charged for Order Entry or Inquiry phases of CIS.

XI. Program Category 5100

A. Temporary Labor Pool - $4,000 is for Traffic
$21,000 is for Computer Pool

B. Signal Operations - Due to the Wofac findings:

1 Engineer Asst., Civil III eliminated, and
1 Engineer, Traffic Sr. will be reduced to an Engineer, Traffic Assoc.

C. $33,000 - eliminated from Building Modernization.

D. $5,000 - new copier eliminated.

E. $20,735 - Miscellaneous Admin. was moved from CSF Account 5554 to overhead.

XII. Program Category 6100

- All General Fund support for the preparation of 1/4 section maps was deleted. The authorization will remain in the Operating Fund and OMB will take the lead in working with SED in an attempt to have the Utilities fund the program as a capital improvement. General Fund Account 5026 was reduced by $141,120.

- $6,237 - Survey Repair was moved from General Fund Account 5026 to overhead.

XIII. Program Category 8100

No changes

XIV. Program Category 9100

$17,000 in Building improvements eliminated.

XV. City Street Fund

A cash float of $100,000 will be left in the City Street Fund. The remainder will be used to balance the General Fund Budget.

WRH:SC:jw

Budget

8-10

August 9, 1976

Honorable Wes Uhlman
Mayor
City of Seattle

Attention: Walter R. Hundley, Director
Office of Management and Budget

Dear Mayor Uhlman:

Attached is the 1977 Operating Budget submittal of the Seattle Engineering Department. Per OMB's instructions, the General Fund request is 90.3% of the adjusted 1976 General Fund budget level.

Two additional demands for General Fund monies have matured during 1976--each of which has been handled separately. First, 1977's traffic control operation for the Domed Stadium will cost approximately $124,400. This is a newly budgeted and, now, on-going expense. Second, the expenditure of General Fund ($561,700) for the purchase and installation of the remaining 5,784 replacement parking meters has not been budgeted. We have recommended, in a separate appropriation request, that the City Street Fund loan the General Fund the total required amount so these meters can be purchased prior to September 30, 1976, to take advantage of the manufacturer's guaranteed price. The General Fund will repay the loan over a three year period beginning in November of 1977. The supplemental budget contains a request of $674,470 to highlight the fact that if the separate appropriation is not adopted, the cost of the replacement program will increase by approximately $112,770.

This year's budget submittal contains all of the financial data requested by OMB. It also contains narrative amplification of activities which are reshaping the products and processes of the department. The program plans, evaluative criteria and budget issue narratives examine the special concerns of the department and OMB.

Chief among those concerns is the progress and implementation of the new Engineering Financial Information System (EFIS). The Office of Management and Budget and the managers of the Engineering Department have come to realize that the development of a new EFIS encompasses all management activities, including cost recovery, cost control, utilization of resources, performance of tasks, accounting for fund transactions and compliance with external financial and legal requirements. The scope of the project includes the realignment of the Department's accounting practices, financial management tasks and staffing patterns, and the manual and data processing support systems. Implementation of the new EFIS is crucial to the management of this department.

Much has been said about the difficulties of instituting new and complex information systems. Fully realizing the risks and money involved, we have taken conscious and systematic steps to assure the project's timely and successful completion by assigning an experienced management systems analyst as Project Manager, by utilizing an interdisciplinary Steering Committee as a project review board, by carefully researching other systems to gain knowledge from others' experience and by entering into staged, performance-bound contracts with financial management experts. To date this use of careful management, close review, and tight contract management has resulted in the successful implementation of other Engineering Department management systems (i.e., Maintenance Management and VeFac Workload Planning) and should be equally successful in bringing to fruition the new EFIS project.

Design and implementation of the new EFIS system will be completed by the end of 1977. Via the departmental overhead rate, we are utilizing the City Street Fund and the capital improvement program to finance this major management system while keeping the 1976-1977 service levels stable.

Finally, it should be noted that the proposed budget is balanced. The new variable overhead rates will be sufficient to meet 1977 projected overhead costs given the proposed staffing level. Any surplus in overhead recoveries will be applied to 1975-1976 underrecoveries and to offset the impact of any further decline in the direct labor base. The current emphasis on workload planning, manpower scheduling and reorganization will continue in 1977, to insure congruous staffing and funding levels and compliance with the Task Force recommendations.

Very truly yours,

Sgd Paul A. Wiatrak

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

LAG:lg
Attachment

R P Fuhrer

Budget
7/22

Your
Seattle
Engineering Department

Paul A. Wiatrak, City Engineer
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

July 21, 1976

To: R. W. Wilkinson, Director, OPP

From: Paul A. Wiatrak, P. E. , City Engineer Sgd Paul A. Wiatrak

Subject: Transportation System Management

The attached remarks from Mr. Patricelli Administrator of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, on page 4 of his address to the National Association of Regional Councils, he confirms a posture that we in Seattle have been pursuing with our governmental conference; i.e., doing that kind of planning which is best done at the local level by local staff as an agent for the metropolitan planning organization. Due to the complexity of our plannning and Capital Improvement Programming process, I believe a joint review by Office of Policy Planning, Office of Management and Budget and the Engineering Department would be useful so that we may best project our work loads in 1977.

Our mutual agreement for 1976 between the Office of Policy Planning and the Engineering Department was not mutual with the Office of Management and Budget, and in May we found we were $40,000 less mutual than we had believed.

I would like to keep the Engineering Department in a stature of being responsive to the City's needs. We currently envision a reduced planning work load and are tailoring staff assignments on this basis. If this is not to be the case, we will make every effort to retain our trained planning staff. I would suggest a joint agreement again between OPP and the Engineering Department, itemizing what is expected for assistance regarding Metro Transit activities, governmental conference activities, and other city transportation issues. Inasmuch as this agreement should correspond to our budget activities, I would hope that if this is an appropriate course of action, it could be expedited by the end of July.

WVG:pm

cc: Kathy Scanlon, OMB
R. R. Parker

Concurrence Prior to Signature		
ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
WGV	21 Jul	BWS
INFORMATION		

"Yellow": Transportation Planning

Seattle Engineering Department, Room 910, Seattle Municipal Building, 600 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104, (206) 583-2843.

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Executive Department-Office of Management and Budget

MEMORANDUM

July 20, 1976

To: Paul Wiatrak, City Engineer

From: Walter R. Hundley, Budget Director Walter R. Hundley by RA

Subject: License Fees and Costs

The Department of Licenses and Consumer Affairs and this Office are presently reviewing the fees charged for City licenses with an eye toward adjusting them in the Mayor's 1977 Proposed Budget. Some of the licenses we are reviewing are for activities regulated or overseen by the Engineering Department.

In order for the City to recover its costs for regulatory licenses it is necessary to determine those costs. Therefore, I hope you will be able to provide this Office with average cost data (including overhead) for Engineering Department activities with respect to the following:

1. Public Garage - Present fee - $5.00 per 1,000 square feet. Bill Roach has shown interest in changing this fee.

2. House Mover - Present L & CA fee - $50/year plus $25 (SED fee) for each building moved. Cost data are provided in the SED budget submission. Should both L & CA and SED be charging fees?

Your assistance in this matter will be appreciated very much. Because of the deadline for budget submission, this Office needs your information about the above by August 12, 1976. Should you have any questions, please call George Pernsteiner of the OMB at 2551.

Thank you.

WRH:GP:pt
cc: Keith Kleinhen, Licenses & Consumer Affairs
Tony Puma, OPP

Copy: Licenses/Consumer Affairs Dept

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
WGU/WTR		
WEPS/JJC		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
JUL 23 8 25 AM '76

Budget

Your City, Seattle

Office of the Mayor
Wes Uhlman, Mayor

July 16, 1976

ROUTING	DATE	INITIAL
ACTION		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
Law		
RRP/DMD		
LAG		

Honorable Tim Hill
Chairman, Budget Committee
City Council
City of Seattle

Re: Status of Engineering Fiscal Information System (EFIS) Project

Dear Councilman Hill:

In my letter of response to the Council's Statement of Issues and Policies, I indicated that OMB would provide a status report on the EFIS project for the Second Interim Budget Review. In this status report I would like to emphasize two aspects of the project:

(1) The inadequacies of the current EFIS have adversely affected all management activities of the Engineering Department, and

(2) The scope of the development of a revised EFIS encompasses all financial management activities, including the Department's accounting practices; financial management organization and staffing; and manual and data processing support systems.

I. Project Status - Overall

The EFIS project has been divided into the following phases:

I. Definition of management information requirements.

II. Conceptual design.

III. Review package systems.

IV. Detail design

V. Programming

VI. Implementation.

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
JUL 22 12 35 PM '76

Phase I, the Definition of Management Information Requirements, was completed 6/20/76 by Price Waterhouse and Company. A Request for Proposal is being

Copy: Engineering Financial Info System

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL 1776-1976

developed for Task II. A consultant should be engaged by September 1, 1976 and should complete the conceptual design by December 31, 1976. Design and implementation should be completed by the end of 1977. This represents a year's slippage, with the project occurring in 1976-77 rather than the originally anticipated 1975-76 time frame. This occurred because of the need to do some initial documentation work and to develop a Request for Proposal for Phase I.

II. Phase I - Findings - Current EFIS

The current EFIS as documented by Price-Waterhouse is a complex, cumbersome system that has impeded the ability of the Department to manage its source funds, operating fund, projects, activities and organization units. The inadequacies of the current system, which can be traced to its fundamental accounting and systems features, have led to a proliferation of secondary support systems and to a diffusion of financial management responsibility. The cost of the current EFIS is nearly doubled by these secondary systems; total yearly cost is $381,600, divided between $207,700 for EFIS and $173,900 for secondary systems.

I have summarized below some of the major accounting, systems and management information inadequacies in the current EFIS.

a) System and Procedural Problems

- No general ledger for operating fund.
- EFIS transaction coding complex, difficult to relate to IFS, unable to capture all relevant information.
- Difficult, time-consuming to trace financial transactions.
- Weak internal controls over information processed.
- Cash basis for fund accounting.

b) Source Fund (City Street Fund, Arterial City Street Fund) Management.

- No formal method for comparison of actual v. forecasted revenues and expenditures.
- Inadequate cash flow monitoring.
- No data on billed, collected, unbilled source fund cost recoveries (particularly ACSF).
- Prior year's information not in a form to allow segregation of projected cost changes from service levels, cost/unit of service or incremental costs associated with CIP.

c) Engineering Operating Fund Management.

- Cost recovery by project and activity to EOF not projected. No reports of actual v anticipated cost recovery to EOF.

- Aged work-in-progress (unbilled source fund costs) not systematically reported in Operations Cost Report - delays billings - impairs cash flow.

- No summary report of accounts receivable.

- No way to bill source fund by object of expenditure (BARS)

- Budget of EOF and source funds confusing mix of program (function) and organization.

d) Activity management.

- Activity expenditure v budget, organization unit charging reports not available.

e) Organization Unit Management.

- No comparison of actual overhead expenditures to anticipated overhead expenditures - allocated v internal by type not reported.

- No comparison of actual cost recovery from projects and activities to anticipated cost recovery.

- Organization cost report from EFIS inadequate - depend on IFS for total cost reporting.

- No segregation of direct and overhead costs.

f) Project Management.

- No reporting of total project cost (only phases).

- No automatic aggregation of work order to job numbers (project phase) - requires extensive manual search through job code master listing.

- No routine reporting of cost to complete information.

- Project Cost Report (main tool) lacks management summaries, late, no encumberances, not include costs paid directly by source funds.

III. <u>Phase I - Definition of Management Information Requirements - new EFIS</u>.

The new EFIS, as envisioned in the Price-Waterhouse statement, would re-

quire revamping of the Department's accounting procedures, budget structure, financial management organization, manual and data processing systems, in order to produce information essential to improved Department management.

a) System Philosophy/Concepts.

A budgeting/accounting/reporting system compatible with, and supportive of, the management interrelationship between organization units and projects/activities should be developed. The Engineering Operating Fund Program budget should contain the organization unit budgets. The source fund budgets would encompass the Departments projects and activities. These two budgets will equal one another, recognizing that the source fund budget includes appropriated as well as authorized amounts.

As the organization unit accomplishes the projects and activities assigned to it, the Operating Fund's costs would be recovered by a billing for each direct labor hour to the source fund. The billing rate would include the direct labor rate, unit indirect costs, and allocated indirect costs.

The new EFIS will utilize accrual accounting for the Operating Fund and modified accrual accounting for the City Street Fund and the Arterial City Street Fund. A new general ledger and chart of accounts, with a revised transaction code, will be developed to produce the information required.

b) System Information.

The new system should be capable of providing essential management and accounting information. The reports generated should be pyramidal, relating the level of detail in the report to the intended management user. These information (or report) requirements are outlined briefly below:

(1) <u>Organization Unit Management</u>

- actual direct and indirect cost versus budget
- actual cost recovery versus anticipated
- variance analysis of under/over cost recovery
- unit cost of service
- personnel utilization

(2) <u>Project Management</u>

- include all costs (memo entries if not through EOF)
- estimated cost of project
- appropriation(s)
- project-to-date cost + encumbrances
- unencumbered appropriation

- cost-to-complete
- variance
- organization unit charging
- total project and phase

(3) Activity Management

- original and revised budget
- current month and year-to-date
- unencumbered balance
- variance
- organizational unit charging

(4) Engineering Operating Fund Management

- balance sheet
- statement of operations and change in fund balance
- cost recovery by source fund
- statement of expenditures and encumbrances
- source fund billing status report
- statement of accounts receivable
- cash balance report
- inventory status report
- accounts payable
- fixed asset and depreciation reports
- projected cash flow - monthly - monitor
- cost recovery variance analysis

(5) Source Fund Management

- balance sheet
- statement of operations and changes in fund balance
- revenues and cost recoveries by source report
- statement of expenditures and encumbrances
- statement of accounts receivable
- cash balance report
- accounts payable report
- unit cost report
- cash flow projection reports

IV. Budget Status - EFIS Project.

The original budget estimate for the EFIS project was $400,000. The current estimate is $580,755. This estimate, which includes in-house and consultant costs, assumes that the City would have to build its own system rather than buy a package. It also recognizes the in-house costs associated with implementation of this system. The 1977 proposed Executive Budget will include a recommendation on funding the project.

Project Estimate

		In-House	Consultant
1975	Preliminary Documentation	$ 16,226	
	TOTAL	16,226	
1976	Phase I - Management Information Requirements	5,000	$ 68,029
	Phase II - Conceptual Design	17,000	60,000
	TOTAL	$ 22,000	$128,029
1977	Phase III - Review of Packages	2,000	9,500
	Phase IV - Detail Design	16,000	150,000
	Phase V - Programming	83,000*	76,000
	Phase VI - Implementation	33,000	40,000
	TOTAL	$134,000	$275,500
	TOTAL PROJECT	$177,226	$403,529

* Includes $75,000 for computer test time.

If the Council desires more information on this project, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

Walter R. Hundley
Budget Director

WRH:pt

cc: Mayor Uhlman
Paul A. Wiatrak, City Engineer

Budget

7-16

July 16, 1976

Mr. Walter R. Hundley, Director
Office of Management and Budget
City of Seattle
Attention: Kathy Scanlan

Dear Mr. Hundley:

In order to finance the cost of Domed Stadium Operations for 1976, it is requested that the following transfers be approved:

GENERAL FUND

	Fund	Dept.	Account	Title	Amount
From:	001	030	5011	Right of Way & Prop. Acq.	$ 5,940.51
	001	030	5012	Street Use Regulation	8,905.53
	001	030	5013	Office Support	6,470.32
	001	030	5016	Slide Control	12,302.85
	001	030	5020	Roadway Structures	5,577.29
	001	030	5500	Aid to LID's	25,221.00
To:	001	030	5025	Civic Activities & Parade Expenses	$64,417.50

ENGINEERING OPERATING FUND

	Fund	Dept.	Cat.	Basub	Object	Title	Amount
From:	501	030	2200	542.30	1110	Salaries F/T & P/T	$68,770
To:	501	030	2900	542.64	1210	Overtime	$68,770

The requested transfers are from funds and authorizations carried over from the 1975 Budget specifically for the funding of Kingdome operations as agreed to by your office in March of this year. Additional required funding is already contained in the carryover ordinance (#105662).

If you have any questions or require additional information, contact the Financial Management Section of Management and Planning at 2381.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. WIATRAK, P.E.
City Engineer

By
ROBERT R. PARKER
Asst. City Engineer for
Management and Planning

TRL:lg
cc: C.T. Criscola
J.G. Ralph/C.T. Murray
W.G. van Gelder/L.E. Overton

Budget

Seattle City Council

ROUTING	DATE	IN.
ACTION		
RRP		
FILE	✓	
INFORMATION		
Paul		

July 12, 1976

Sam Smith
President of the Council
625-2455

George E. Benson
Chairman
Transportation
Committee
625-2441

Tim Hill
Chairman
Finance Committee
625-2438

Paul Kraabel
Chairman
Planning & Urban
Development Committee
625-2447

Phyllis Lamphere
Chairman
Intergovernmental
Relations Committee
625-2436

Wayne D. Larkin
Chairman
Utilities Committee
625-2443

John R. Miller
Chairman
Parks & Public
Grounds Committee
625-2451

Randy Revelle
Chairman
Public Safety & Justice
Committee
625-2445

Jeanette Williams
Chairman
Human Resources &
Operations Committee
625-2453

Paul A. Wiatrak
Engineering Department
City of Seattle
Seattle, Washington 98104

Dear Paul:

Attached for your review is a copy of the City Council's "Statement of Issues and Policies for the 1977 Budget and 1977-82 Capital Improvement Program." As part of the Annual Budget Review this year, each Councilmember has been requested to submit a list of programs which he or she feels should be investigated within each of their established departmental assignments.

As the Engineering Department is one of my departmental assignments, I would request that your Department submit to me a list of prioritized programs for Council review for the 1977 Budget. Please use the attached format (one sheet for each program) to indicate these programs. As the Budget Program Assignments are due on Monday, July 19, 1976, I would request that you comply with the above request by no later than Thursday, July 15, 1976.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,

Wayne

WAYNE D. LARKIN
Seattle City Council

Copy: CIP

WDL:jsb

Enclosures:

SEATTLE ENG DEPT
JUL 13 4 09 PM '76

Budget

RVC:mr
6/9/76

HEL
Ecronin 4 Engr
C.F.

ORDINANCE

105662

AN ORDINANCE carrying over and transferring the unexpended and unencumbered balances in certain 1975 Budget appropriations made from the General, Library, Seattle Center, City Street, Light, Water, Sewer, Engineering Department Operating, Building Department Operating, General Services Operating, Personnel Services Operating, Human Resources Operating, Urban Renewal Operating, Community Development Operating, Arts Commission Operating, Employees' Retirement, Firemen's Leave and Disability, and Model City Funds to the respective items in the 1976 Budget.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That the unexpended and unencumbered balances remaining in the 1975 Budget in certain appropriations specified in Exhibit I, "1975 Carry-Over List", attached hereto, from the General, Library, Seattle Center, City Street, Light, Water, Sewer, Engineering Department Operating, Building Department Operating, General Services Operating, Personnel Services Operating, Human Resources Operating, Urban Renewal Operating, Community Development Operating, Arts Commission Operating, Employees' Retirement, Firemen's Leave and Disability, and Model City Funds in the following ordinances, to wit: 102833 and 104064 are hereby carried over and transferred to the respective items in the 1976 Budget; provided, that nothing herein shall affect the validity of any expenditures made under the authority of said ordinances.

(To be used for all Ordinances except Emergency.)

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty days from and after its passage and approval, if approved by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect at the time it shall become a law under the provisions of the city charter.

Passed by the City Council the 30 day of June, 1976

and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 30 day of June, 1976

President of the City Council.

Approved by me this 2 day of July, 1976

Mayor.

Filed by me this 2 day of July, 1976

Attest:

City Comptroller and City Clerk.

(SEAL)

Published

By

Deputy Clerk.

CSS 8.1.6

6/9/76
RVC:mr

Budget

Engr
C.F.

4

ORDINANCE 105661

AN ORDINANCE abandoning the unexpended and unencumbered balances in certain 1975 and prior appropriations made from the General, Park and Recreation, Library, Seattle Center, Emergency, City Street, Arterial City Street, Federal Shared Revenue, Seattle Sewer Improvement Bonds 1968, Seattle Fire Protection Bonds 1968 - Station and Shop, Arterial Development (King County Bond Issue), Neighborhood Improvement Bonds 1968, Light, Water, Sewer, Solid Waste, Engineering Department Operating, Building Department Operating, General Services Operating, Personnel Services Operating, Public Health Revolving, Sick's Stadium Operating, Treasurer's Office Operating, Human Resources Operating, Urban Renewal Operating, Community Development Operating, Arts Commission Operating, Employees' Retirement, Comprehensive Planning Assistance, and Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing Funds.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That the unexpended and unencumbered balances remaining in certain appropriations specified in Exhibit I, "1975 Write-Off List", attached hereto, from the General, Park and Recreation, Library, Seattle Center, Emergency, City Street, Arterial City Street, Federal Shared Revenue, Seattle Sewer Improvement Bonds 1968, Fire Protection Bonds 1968 - Station and Shop, Arterial Development (King County Bond Issue), Neighborhood Improvement Bonds 1968, Light, Water, Sewer, Solid Waste, Engineering Department Operating, Building Department Operating, General Services Operating, Personnel Services Operating, Public Health Revolving, Sick's Stadium Operating, Treasurer's Operating, Human Resources Operating, Urban Renewal Operating, Community Development Operating, Arts Commission Operating, Employees' Retirement, Comprehensive Planning Assistance, and Housing and Community Development Revenue Sharing Funds, in the following ordinances, to wit:

88523; 97305; 97877; 97884; 98328; 98478; 99194; 99236; 99362; 99433; 99602; 99802; 99907; 99950; 100007; 100079; 100084; 100186; 100230; 100334; 100393; 100465; 100473; 100928; 101066; 101109; 101159; 101228; 101336; 101391; 101557; 101607; 101630; 101664; 101699; 101700; 101766; 101837; 101890; 101949; 101950; 101999; 102084; 102163; 102181; 102206; 102208; 102235; 102416; 102421; 102445; 102462; 102494; 102654; 102681; 102707; 102717; 102833;

102937, 102960, 102969; 102980; 102999; 103135; 103211; 103233; 103245; 103260; 103263; 103273; 103303; 103365; 103463; 103491; 103547; 103562; 103567; 103702; 103718; 103814; 103817; 103882; 103893; 103956; 104054; 104064; 104195; 104220; 104247; 104258; 104418; 104465; 104467; 104472; 104490; 104576; 104792; 104855; 104950; and, 105080 are hereby abandoned and shall revert to the respective funds from which such appropriations were made; provided, that nothing herein shall affect the validity of any expenditure made under the authority of said ordinances, all as recommended by the Mayor and the City Comptroller.

(To be used for all Ordinances except Emergency.)

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty days from and after its passage and approval, if approved by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect at the time it shall become a law under the provisions of the city charter.

Passed by the City Council the 28 day of June, 1976, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 28 day of June, 1976

President of the City Council.

Approved by me this 2 day of July, 1976.

Mayor.

Filed by me this 2 day of July, 1976.

Attest:

City Comptroller and City Clerk.

(SEAL)

Published

By

Deputy Clerk.

CSS 8.1.6

Budget

MSC:klm
6/2/76

ORDINANCE 105630

AN ORDINANCE increasing expenditure allowances in the 1976 Budgets of the Engineering, Fire, Parks and Recreation, and the Police Departments for the support of Bicentennial and Civic Events; making a partially reimbursable appropriation from the Emergency Fund and declaring the emergency therefor.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That to provide for the support of Bicentennial and Civic Events, the expenditure allowances for the designated Objects of Expenditure in the following Program Categories in the 1976 Budgets of the indicated Departments are hereby increased as follows:

Engineering Department

Account 5025 "Civic Activities and Parade Expenses"	$ 6,625

Fire Department

Program Category "Fire Suppression" (Code 2400)

1000	Personal Services	5,014

Department of Parks and Recreation

Program Category "Maintenance of Facilities" (Code 1400)

1000	Personal Services	3,248

Program Category "Maintenance of Grounds" (Code 1500)

1000	Personal Services	18,505

Police Department

Program Category "Office of the Chief" (Code 1100)

1000	Personal Services	126,725
		$160,117

by the appropriation and transfer hereby made and authorized of the sum of One Hundred Sixty Thousand One Hundred Seventeen Dollars ($160,117) from the Emergency Fund to be reimbursed

by the appropriation and transfer, hereby made and authorized, of the sum of Ten Thousand One Hundred Seventeen Dollars ($10,117) from funds received or to be received from Seafair, Inc.; and the City Comptroller is authorized to draw and the City Treasurer to pay the necessary warrants and make the necessary transfers, all as recommended in the materials attached hereto.

Section 2. WHEREAS, the appropriation herein made is to meet actual necessary expenditures of the City for which no appropriation has been made due to causes which could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time of making the 1976 Budget; Now, Therefore, in accordance with RCW 35.32A.060, by reason of the facts above stated and the emergency which is hereby declared to exist, this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon the approval or signing of the same by the Mayor or passage over his veto, as provided by the Charter of the City.

PASSED by three-fourths vote of all the members of the City Council the 21 day of June, 1976, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 21 day of June, 1976.

President of the City Council

Approved by me this 25 day of June, 1976.

Mayor

Filed by me this 25 day of June, 1976.

ATTEST:

City Comptroller and City Clerk

BY:

Deputy

(SEAL)

Published _____