

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
35	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$51,250 General Subfund to HSD in 2010 to restore Access to Services program funding and impose a budget proviso

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; Harrell; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Lisa Herbold

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$51,250</u>
Net Balance Effect	(\$51,250)
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$51,250
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$51,250</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	(\$51,250)

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This action restores \$51,250 from the GSF in training and education funding to the Human Services Department to facilitate better access to services for vulnerable populations, including communities of color and sexual minorities.

This green sheet also imposes the following budget proviso:

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
35	1	A	2

“Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Human Service’s Department’s Leadership and Administration BCL, \$51,250 is appropriated solely for Access to Services programs and may be spent for no other purpose.”

Background:

The City of Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) works to meet the basic needs of families and individuals with low incomes, children, domestic violence and sexual assault victims, homeless people, seniors, and persons with disabilities. Budget Issue Paper (BIP) HSD-114 explains that “HSD’s approach is to preserve core services to those most vulnerable populations.” The category “Access to Services” does not fund direct services, so it was rated a lower priority given the need to make reductions due to budget constraints. Still, Council has consistently indicated that funding for access to services is a high priority and has provided funding when cuts have been proposed in past years’ budgets.

Agencies Receiving Access to Services Funding

A Request for Proposals (RFP) process for Access to Services was conducted in 2009, and HSD allocated funding to three agencies – Solid Ground; Welfare Rights Organizing Coalition; and Northwest Network for Bisexual, Trans, Lesbian, and Gay Survivors of Abuse. Of the three agencies, one agency - Solid Ground - is being funded by HSD in 2010 under the legal services program area, and Welfare Rights Organizing Coalition no longer provides services. Only Northwest Network for Bisexual, Trans, Lesbian, and Gay Survivors of Abuse will not receive continued funding under the Mayor’s 2010 Proposed Budget. This green sheet restores \$51,250 for Access to Services programs, which will be allocated by HSD using an RFP or other selection process.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
35	1	A	2

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$51,250 General Subfund to HSD in 2010 to restore Access to Services program funding and impose a budget proviso

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Increase GSF support to HSD for Access to Services				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		\$51,250
2	Increase revenue from GSF for Access to Services				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	\$51,250	
3	Increase appropriation for Access to Services				HSD	Leadership and Administration	H50LA	16200	2010		\$51,250

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
36	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$150,000 GSF in 2010 to HSD to restore funding for the Non-Profit Agency Technical Assistance & Capacity Building Program and impose a budget proviso

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Harrell; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Traci Ratzliff

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>
Net Balance Effect	(\$150,000)
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$150,000
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	(\$150,000)

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would add \$150,000 GSF to the Human Services Department (HSD) to restore funding for the Non-Profit Agency Technical Assistance and Capacity Building program. Program funding was eliminated in the Mayor's 2010 Proposed Budget. The Council intends that this funding be awarded to the agency that was selected for this program through the 2009 Request for Investment process. That agency should use the funds to provide assistance to organizations receiving City funding. This green sheet also imposes the following budget proviso:

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
36	1	A	2

“Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Human Services Department’s Leadership and Administration BCL, \$150,000 is appropriated solely for the Non-Profit Agency Technical Assistance and Capacity Building program and may be spent for no other purpose.”

Tab	Action	Option	Version
36	1	A	2

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$150,000 GSF in 2010 to HSD to restore funding for the Non-Profit Agency Technical Assistance & Capacity Building Program and impose a budget proviso

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Increase GSF support to HSD to restore funding for Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Program.				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		\$150,000
2	Increase revenue from GSF for Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Program.				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	\$150,000	
3	Increase appropriation for Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Program.				HSD	Leadership and Administration	H50LA	16200	2010		\$150,000

## 2010 City Council Budget Action (BUGS)

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
36	2	A	3

**Budget Action Title:** Funding for Direct Human Services rescind and replace 36-2-A-1

Departments: HSD

BCLs (if applicable):

Councilmembers: Budget Committee

Staff Analyst: Traci Ratzliff

### Budget Committee Vote:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<i>11/23/2009</i>	<i>Pass 9-</i>	<i>Y</i>								

### Budget Guidance Statement:

This BUGS rescinds and replaces 36-2-A-1 in order to correct the dates for the next biennial budget. This change has no substantive effect.

The Council highly values direct services funded through the Human Services Department, including funding for such programs as: Technical Assistance and Capacity Building, Advocacy, and Access to Services. The Council believes that these programs, do in fact, provide direct benefit to low and moderate income individuals and families.

The Council requests the Executive to include full funding in the 2011 - 2012 biennial budget, for direct services including: Technical Assistance and Capacity Building, Advocacy, and Access to Services programs funded through the Human Services Department.

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
37	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Cut \$100,000 of GSF funding in HSD for expanding the PeoplePoint program.

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Michael Fong

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b>General Subfund Expenditures</b>	(\$100,000)
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	(\$100,000)
<b>Other Funds Expenditures</b>	(\$100,000)
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$100,000</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would reduce GSF support by \$100,000 for the Human Services Department's (HSD's) planned enhancements to the PeoplePoint program in 2010.

Subsequent to the Mayor's budget submittal, HSD learned that it had been awarded a \$250,000 Strengthening Communities capacity building American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) grant from the federal government to expand the PeoplePoint program. \$100,000 of this ARRA grant may be used to implement the web-portal technology improvements proposed by HSD. As a result, the \$100,000 reduction in GSF support will have no impact on the department's proposed scope of work for PeoplePoint. In addition to the web portal, the ARRA grant will enable HSD to

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
37	1	A	1

carry out additional capacity building activities for PeoplePoint with non-profit partner agencies in the community.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
37	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Cut \$100,000 of GSF funding in HSD for expanding the PeoplePoint program.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Decrease GSF support for PeoplePoint				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		(\$100,000)
2	Decrease revenue to HSD for PeoplePoint				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	(\$100,000)	
3	Decrease appropriation for PeoplePoint				HSD	Leadership and Administration	H50LA	16200	2010		(\$100,000)

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
37	1	C	1

**Budget Action Title:** Transfer \$150,000 from the Cable Television Franchise Subfund and cut \$150,000 of GSF to HSD to expand the PeoplePoint program.

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Michael Fong

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>(\$150,000)</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$150,000
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would transfer \$150,000 from the Cable Television Franchise Subfund to the Information Technology Fund to pay part of the cost of planned enhancements to the PeoplePoint program in the Human Services Department (HSD) in 2010. This action would also cut \$150,000 in GSF support to HSD for the PeoplePoint program.

In the Mayor's proposed 2010 budget, there is a one-time unreserved fund balance of \$320,000 in the Cable Subfund. Use of this revenue source to implement technology enhancements for the

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
37	1	C	1

PeoplePoint program is consistent with the Cable Subfund's financial policies adopted by the City Council via Resolution 30379.

Adopting this action would have no net-impact on HSD's proposed scope of work for the PeoplePoint program. It would replace proposed GSF with money from the Cable Subfund for this one-time expenditure.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
37	1	C	1

### Budget Action Transactions

**Budget Action Title:** Transfer \$150,000 from the Cable Television Franchise Subfund and cut \$150,000 of GSF to HSD to expand the PeoplePoint program.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Transfer from Cable Subfund to Info Tech Fund for PeoplePoint				CBLFEE	Cable Fee Support to Information Technology Fund	D160B	00160	2010		\$150,000
2	Reduce fund balance in Cable Subfund for PeoplePoint				CBLFEE	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	379100	00160	2010	\$150,000	
3	Increase revenue in Info Tech Fund for PeoplePoint				DOIT	Community Technology - Cable Fund	542810	50410	2010	\$150,000	
4	Decrease revenue to HSD for PeoplePoint				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	(\$150,000)	
5	Decrease GSF support for PeoplePoint				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		(\$150,000)
6	Increase appropriation in Dolt for PeoplePoint				DOIT	Office of Electronic Communications	D4400	50410	2010		\$150,000
7	Decrease appropriation in HSD for PeoplePoint				HSD	Leadership and Administration	H50LA	16200	2010		(\$150,000)

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
38	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Impose a proviso on \$96,000 in HSD's Area Agency on Aging BCL for the Wallingford Senior Center.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Licata; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Michael Fong

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/10/2009	Pass 7- 2-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$0
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	\$0

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would impose the following proviso:

“Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Human Services Department’s (HSD’s) Area Agency on Aging BCL, \$96,000 is appropriated solely for the Wallingford Senior Center and may be spent for no other purpose.”

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
38	1	A	1

HSD's 2010 budget includes \$96,000 for the Wallingford Senior Center (Center). Subsequent to submittal of the Mayor's budget, it has been publicized that the Center is facing financial challenges with a possibility that it may have to close.

This action signals Council intent to give the Center an opportunity to raise additional operating funds knowing that the City's financial commitment is secure for 2010. In the event the Center is unable to address its financial challenges and must close, Council anticipates that HSD would present an alternative proposal for providing senior services near the Center and submit legislation to lift this proviso with a new spending plan.

## 2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
38	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Planning for Seattle's senior centers and the delivery of services to seniors.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Licata; McIver; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Ann Corbitt

### Budget Committee Vote:

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/10/2009	Pass 7-2-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y

### Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests that the Human Services Department (HSD) coordinate and undertake a comprehensive planning process that will identify recommendations for:

- (1) the City of Seattle's policy goals for engaging older adults in healthy activities that support their independence, enhance their dignity, and encourage their involvement and contribution to the community;
- (2) the role of senior centers and related initiatives such as senior programming in Parks Department facilities to support these goals; and
- (3) steps the City can take to implement effective services for older adults and develop and support a sustainable path for the programs and services provided by senior centers and related organizations to meet the City's stated goals for older adults.

The planning process should include an assessment of the delivery of services currently provided by senior centers and their role in supporting the City's goals for older adults.

The Council requests that HSD work with the Parks Department and any other relevant City departments and its community partners that provide senior services, such as King County, Senior Services, United Way of King County, the eight currently existing senior centers in the city, and other private and not-for-profit organizations.

Council requests that HSD report back to Council with a detailed work plan outlining the objectives, tasks, deliverables and schedule for the comprehensive planning process by March 1, 2010. Council then requests a final report to Council by August 1, 2010.

### Background:

Senior centers are a vital component in the continuum of services to seniors in Seattle. They typically serve an older senior population and provide services such as health and wellness services, community meals, recreation and socialization opportunities, and social services and support.

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
38	2	A	1

The eight existing centers currently in operation in Seattle range from private 501 (c) 3 organizations to centers affiliated and supported by an umbrella organization, such as Senior Services or the Phinney Neighborhood Association. The City is also a partner and our current contribution to the centers accounts for roughly one third of their budgets. This current contribution has not been enough, along with their other sources of funding, to sustain every center's operations. Each year for the last three years the City has been faced with the news of another center failing and closing or threatening to close.

Along with Council's yearly contribution of operations and maintenance funding for the centers, Council funded a two-part series of consultant studies to make recommendations about the future of senior centers and other services targeted to seniors. The primary conclusion of those studies is that a comprehensive planning process must be done to determine a sustainable path forward for the centers and for the delivery of senior services in general.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Public Safety, Human Services, and Education

**Date Due to Council:** March 1, 2010 – work plan

August 1, 2010 – final report

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
39	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Contracting for Enhanced Public Health Services.

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Michael Fong

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/10/2009</b>	<b>Pass 7- 2-Absent</b>	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

The Human Services Department (HSD) is requested to provide the Council with a plan to modify the contracting relationship for services with Public Health – Seattle and King County (PHSKC). This proposal should achieve administrative efficiencies and budget savings within HSD while maintaining accountability for the City’s enhanced public health funding. The plan should meet the following criteria:

- Result in no negative impacts to direct service delivery;
- Enable the City of Seattle to maintain an acceptable level of accountability;
- Assure a strong City presence and influence on PHSKC’s activities and services in Seattle;
- Agreement is consistent with and supports the City’s Healthy Communities Initiative Policy Guide and the Public Health Operational Master Plan;
- Clearly delineate all staffing and oversight responsibilities of HSD and PHSKC regarding the City’s enhanced public health funding and services;
- Directly yield efficiencies such as budget and staffing savings within HSD; and
- The terms of the relationship are agreed upon by PHSKC, the City, and the County and formalized as part of a memorandum of understanding or Inter-local agreement between the City of Seattle and King County.

The Executive is requested to provide the Council with a proposal no later than August 1, 2010. Any budget impacts and changes to appropriation authority related to public health funding are expected to be proposed by the Executive as part of the 2011-2012 biennium budget.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Public Safety, Human Services, and Education

**Date Due to Council:** August 1, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
40	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Review existing City youth mentoring programs and recommend enhancements.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Drago; Harrell; McIver

**Staff Analyst:** Michael Fong

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/10/2009</b>	<b>Pass 7- 2-Absent</b>	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

In Resolution 31134, Council expresses support for expanding the City’s youth mentoring efforts as part of its budget priorities. While the City engages in various forms of youth mentoring across departments, the extent and effect of these investments have not been well documented or examined comprehensively. This Statement of Legislation Intent (SLI) is intended to produce information to: (1) determine whether existing City funded youth mentoring efforts align with Council’s priorities, (2) better understand the goals and outcomes of the City’s existing programs and (3) inventory major youth mentoring programs and activities in Seattle (not necessarily supported or funded by City government).

The Executive is requested to:

- Inventory all existing mentoring programs funded by the City (develop a matrix that identifies the lead department, program description, objectives and outcomes, source and level of funding). This inventory should include the following:
  - Programs that most closely fit the standard industry definition of “youth mentoring” – a caring, responsible adult who helps and supports a younger person transition into adulthood over a substantial period of time;
  - Programs that provide mentoring services, that may not perfectly fit the standard industry definition of “youth mentoring” but are providing similar youth engagement opportunities and outcomes.
- Inventory major youth mentoring programs and activities in Seattle that are not funded by the City (develop a matrix that identifies the agency, program description, objectives and outcomes and funding information, if available);
- Review best practices and what other cities are doing with regard to youth mentoring investments;
- Identify any potential gaps in service delivery based on community needs and existing City priorities; and
- Provide Council with recommendations regarding where future new investments in youth mentoring should be focused and how existing investments could be strengthened.

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
40	1	A	1

The Executive is requested to work with Council staff to refine the scope of the SLI as necessary. The work will be based on continued dialogue and discussion in the first quarter of 2010. The Executive is requested to provide Council with a final response to the SLI no later than July 1, 2010.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Public Safety, Human Services, and Education

**Date Due to Council:** July 1, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
41	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Outreach and Engagement Services to the Homeless

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Licata; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Traci Ratzliff; Nate Van Duzer

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/10/2009</b>	<b>Pass 7-2-Absent</b>	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The City invests nearly \$40 million annually in homeless services. The Council requests that the Human Services Department (HSD), with assistance from Council staff, complete an assessment of current outreach and engagement services to people who are homeless. This assessment should include whether outreach programs are meeting their goals and specific recommendations for how these services could be improved, including whether they should be expanded. HSD should share a draft of the assessment with the relevant provider agencies for feedback before submitting a final copy to the Council.

Specifically, the assessment should include the following elements:

1. A list of programs and social service agencies that provide outreach and/or engagement services to the homeless population in the City. This section of the assessment could include a map of provider locations, a short description of the services each provides, the type of outreach and engagement services the organization engages in, the goals or outcomes intended to be achieved through its outreach, its target population and the level of funding each receives from the City and/or other entities.
2. An assessment of existing coordination efforts on outreach and engagement services among human service agencies and the criminal justice system.
3. A comparison of Seattle's outreach and engagement efforts to those in other municipalities across the country, including but not limited to San Diego and Philadelphia. Included in this section of the assessment should be a list and description of current best practices across the country.
4. Answers to these specific questions:
  - a. Are the outreach and engagement activities and service delivery to Seattle's homeless population sufficient to address current needs? If not, what changes does HSD recommend?
  - b. What, if any, improvements can be made that do not require additional funds or would require only minimal funds?

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
41	1	A	1

5. A summary of current services beyond outreach provided to homeless individuals and families in Seattle based on existing data sources. This information will help launch a broader discussion on coordination of services, improvements that may be necessary and the effectiveness of these services.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Public Safety, Human Services, and Education

**Date Due to Council:** April 1, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
42	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$150,000 GSF in HSD for a Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Children and impose budget provisos

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; Conlin; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Betsy Graef

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>
Net Balance Effect	(\$150,000)
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$150,000
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$150,000</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	(\$150,000)

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This action would add \$150,000 GSF in 2010 for a Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Children in the Human Services Department.

The Mayor's 2010 Proposed Budget does not include funding for this program.

This green sheet would also impose the following budget provisos:

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
42	1	A	1

“Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Human Services Department’s (HSD’s) Domestic and Sexual Violence Prevention BCL, \$150,000 is appropriated solely for the implementation and evaluation of the Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Children and may be spent for no other purpose. This \$150,000 is in addition to the \$47,000 from HSD’s “Sex Industry Victims Fund” that is similarly restricted by another proviso.”

“Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Human Services Department’s (HSD’s) Domestic and Sexual Violence Prevention BCL, \$47,000 of the amount from HSD’s “Sex Industry Victims Fund” is appropriated solely for the implementation and evaluation of the Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Children and may be spent for no other purpose. This \$47,000 is in addition to the \$150,000 that is similarly restricted by another proviso.”

Background

Since June 2008, HSD staff has been preparing to launch a two-year pilot program that would provide dedicated shelter and residential recovery services to prostituted children. There are an estimated 300-500 such children in King County today and there are no dedicated programs to meet their unique needs. The costs of the pilot phase of the program are estimated at \$698,730 in 2010 and \$703,453 in 2011, for a total of \$1,402,183. In addition to City sources, funding that would allow the program to launch in 2010 is expected to be obtained from grant and private support. To-date, \$150,000 in 2010 (and \$300,000 in total over two years) has been pledged by United Way of King County and by a private donor. The program timeline anticipates finalizing funding sources by January 31, 2010 and project start-up March 31, 2010. If first year funding sources are not fully identified in time, project start-up may be delayed.

There is a Statement of Legislative Intent associated with the Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Children, which details Council’s expectations for evaluation of the recovery program’s performance.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
42	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$150,000 GSF in HSD for a Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Children and impose budget provisos

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Increase GSF support to HSD to add residential recovery services for prostituted children				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		\$150,000
2	Increase revenue from GSF to add residential recovery services for prostituted children				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	\$150,000	
3	Increase appropriation to add residential recovery services for prostituted children				HSD	Domestic and Sexual Violence Prevention	H40DV	16200	2010		\$150,000

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
42	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Residential Recovery Program for Prostituted Children

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; Conlin; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Betsy Graef

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

In approving funding for the pilot residential recovery program for prostituted children, it is the Council's intent that the Human Services Department (HSD) will apply a rigorous evaluation component in order to establish a program that will be a national model over the longer term. Another goal is for the program to evolve into a network of providers serving prostituted children statewide while allowing them to be close to family members, as appropriate. Finally, the Council intends that the selected provider will work closely with an advisory committee of program experts to be established by HSD and convened throughout the pilot period. The purpose of the advisory committee is to (1) offer advice and support, (2) address problems and remove barriers as they arise and, (3) to the extent possible, review outcome information and suggest program revisions as needed.

Expectations for performance should take into account the extremely challenging circumstances of prostituted children. Research indicates that most were victimized before ever engaging in prostitution. Because they have been psychologically manipulated, physically coerced and deeply indoctrinated by their exploiters, they tend to run back to the streets if they have the opportunity. And, because they have often experienced violence and high levels of trauma on a repeated basis, they can be difficult to engage. Most have missed normal developmental experiences and lack basic life skills; they often have decreased coping skills, poor self-concepts and developmental delays; and some may be bipolar or suffer from other mental illnesses. As a consequence, relapse and program exits will occur.

The Council intends for HSD to contract with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, as well as other evaluators, to assess the effectiveness of the program. In addition to basic service numbers, other outcomes that may be measured include:

- Do participants in the residential recovery program have lower involvement (recidivism) with the criminal justice system as a result of their involvement in the program vs. those who are not in the program but have similar backgrounds?

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
42	2	A	1

- Are children in the program more likely to participate in the prosecution of their pimp/exploiter(s) than those not in the program but with similar backgrounds?
- Are participants able to set and achieve personal goals?
- Is there a decrease in mental health and substance abuse symptoms for children served vs. those not served but with similar backgrounds?
- What are the key program components that help participants achieve their goals, decrease recidivism and address mental health and drug use symptoms?
- What are key characteristics of children coming into the program that help them achieve their goals, decrease recidivism, and address mental health and drug use symptoms?

The Council requests that HSD provide the Public Safety, Human Services and Education Committee an initial report of program service delivery and performance by September 30, 2010. A more detailed report, including the findings of contracted evaluators, should be provided to the Public Safety, Human Services and Education Committee within 15 months of initiating services but no later than June 2011.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Public Safety, Human Services, and Education

**Date Due to Council:**

Initial report to Public Safety, Human Services and Education Committee by September 30, 2010

Detailed report, including contracted evaluation findings to Public Safety, Human Services and Education Committee within 15 months of initiating services but no later than June 2011

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
43	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$26,000 from GSF to HSD for the Drug Market Initiative program and impose a budget proviso

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Nate Van Duzer

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$26,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>(\$26,000)</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$26,000
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$26,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>(\$26,000)</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet adds \$26,000 from the GSF in 2010 to the Human Services Department (HSD) to contract with a community-based agency with experience providing case management and community outreach services for ongoing Drug Market Initiative (DMI) operations. The DMI is an evidenced-based community intervention model designed to close down open air drug markets and reduce associated crime and violence. The first intervention was in August 2009 and a second is planned for mid-2010. Preparation for the second intervention will occur during the first half of the 2010 and continued follow-up and evaluation will occur during the second half of the year.

This green sheet would also impose the following budget proviso:

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
43	1	A	1

"Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Human Services Department's Youth Development and Achievement BCL, \$26,000 is appropriated solely for the Drug Market Initiative and may be spent for no other purpose."

Tab	Action	Option	Version
43	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$26,000 from GSF to HSD for the Drug Market Initiative program and impose a budget proviso

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Increase GSF support to HSD for Drug Market Initiative program				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		\$26,000
2	Increase revenue from GSF for Drug Market Initiative				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	\$26,000	
3	Increase appropriation for Drug Market Initiative				HSD	Youth Development and Achievement	H20YD	16200	2010		\$26,000

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
44	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Restore \$40,000 of GSF to HSD for community-based support systems for food banks and meal programs, and impose a budget proviso.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Drago; Harrell; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Michael Fong; Katherine Fountain

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$40,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>(\$40,000)</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$40,000
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$40,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>(\$40,000)</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet restores \$40,000 of GSF support to the Human Services Department for community-based support systems for food banks and meal programs. These funds were cut in the Mayor's 2010 proposed budget. This action also imposes a budget proviso.

This budget action item would bring the funding for the Food Resources Coalition and the Meals Partnership Coalition programs back to 2009 levels. These two programs provide system support to Seattle hot meal programs and food bank providers. Between the two organizations, 90 emergency food banks and meal programs receive food and nutrition education, and administrative, collaborative, and training support.

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
44	1	A	1

This green sheet also imposes the following budget proviso:

“Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Human Services Department’s Emergency and Transitional Services BCL, \$40,000 is appropriated solely for system support to Seattle hot meal programs and food bank providers and may be spent for no other purpose.”

Tab	Action	Option	Version
44	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Restore \$40,000 of GSF to HSD for community-based support systems for food banks and meal programs, and impose a budget proviso.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Increase GSF revenue to HSD for Food Support Systems				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	\$40,000	
2	Increase appropriation from GSF for Food Support Systems				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		\$40,000
3	Increase appropriation for Food Support Systems				HSD	Emergency and Transitional Services	H30ET	16200	2010		\$40,000

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
47	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$20,500 GSF in HSD for senior companionship and early intervention programs and impose a budget proviso.

**Councilmembers:** Drago; Godden; Harrell; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Monica Ghosh; Tom Van Bronkhorst

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$20,500</u>
Net Balance Effect	(\$20,500)
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$20,500
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$20,500</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	(\$20,500)

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet adds \$20,500 from the GSF to the Human Services Department (HSD) Area Agency on Aging BCL to contract with a community-based agency with experience providing senior companionship and early intervention programs and imposes a budget proviso.

These programs would work to alleviate loneliness and isolation experienced by a growing number of elderly living alone through in-home visits and group social outings. Outcomes should include: 1) improving seniors' quality of life, 2) increasing their ability to live independently, 3) providing early

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
47	1	A	1

intervention by connecting seniors to needed medical, social service or other services, and 4) fostering intergenerational relationships.

This green sheet also imposes the following budget proviso:

“Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Human Services Department’s Area Agency on Aging BCL, \$20,500 is appropriated solely for senior companionship and early intervention programs and may be spent for no other purpose.”

Tab	Action	Option	Version
47	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$20,500 GSF in HSD for senior companionship and early intervention programs and impose a budget proviso.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Increase GSF support to HSD for senior companionship and early intervention programs.				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		\$20,500
2	Increase revenue from GSF for senior companionship and early intervention programs.				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	\$20,500	
3	Increase appropriation for senior companionship and early intervention programs				HSD	Area Agency on Aging	H60AD	16200	2010		\$20,500

## 2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
48	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Shelter Services

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Traci Ratzliff

### Budget Committee Vote:

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/10/2009	Pass 8-1-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

### Statement of Legislative Intent:

Concerns have been raised regarding potentially inadequate compensation levels for employees of shelters serving single adults and the extent to which such compensation levels may impact retention of workers and the quality of services provided.

The Human Services Department (HSD) conducted a survey in July of 2009 that obtained information about the wages, training, job responsibilities, retention rates, and operational budgets for direct service personnel employed in City-funded single adult shelters in Seattle. The results of this survey did not show a correlation between wage rates and retention rates, but further analysis is desired to fully understand the responses provided.

HSD is scheduled to conduct a Request For Proposal (RFP) process for shelter services in mid-2010, setting the stage for new contracts at the beginning of 2011.

In advance of this process, the Council requests HSD to report back on the results of the July 2009 survey including additional supplementary information such as: average tenure of employee by job title; # of employees in each job title included in survey; reason for employee turnover (voluntary leave, firing, promotion); the minimum qualifications required for each job; staff to client ratio; population served by shelter; and other related information that might help provide greater understanding regarding some of the differences noted in the initial July 2009 survey data. The report could include recommendations regarding changes to evaluation criteria, such as: outcomes, program or contract funding levels, etc.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Public Safety, Human Services, and Education

**Date Due to Council:** March 30, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
49	1	B	1

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$100,000 General Subfund to HSD in 2010 to fund services for homeless women and impose a budget proviso

**Councilmembers:** Godden; Harrell; Licata; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Lisa Herbold

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
Net Balance Effect	(\$100,000)
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$100,000
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	(\$100,000)

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This action provides \$100,000 from the GSF to the Human Services Department (HSD) to fund services for single, homeless, low-income women, including shelters and day centers. Funds will be distributed through a Request for Investment process.

This green sheet also imposes the following budget proviso:

“Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Human Service’s Department’s Emergency and Transitional Services BCL, \$100,000 is appropriated solely to fund services for single, homeless, low-income women, including shelters and day centers, and may be spent for no other purpose.”

*\* Has Proviso*

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
49	1	B	1

**Background:**

Shelter and day services are a vital link in services for homeless, low-income women, providing safe shelter and sanctuary, social contact, referrals to housing and other services, and a place to get basic needs met.

Agencies providing services for homeless, low-income women are experiencing unprecedented demand and a reduction in funding from non-City funders. Unfortunately these agencies can't meet the increased demand.

Without these services there could be increased outdoor sleeping and presence of encampments, and a resulting public safety vulnerability, as well as loitering on sidewalks, parks and bus shelters, increased difficulty for homeless women trying to find toilets and shower facilities, and increased panhandling and requests for food outside of restaurants.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
49	1	B	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$100,000 General Subfund to HSD in 2010 to fund services for homeless women and impose a budget proviso

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Increase GSF support to HSD for services for homeless women				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		\$100,000
2	Increase revenue from GSF for for services for homeless women				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	\$100,000	
3	Increase appropriation for services for homeless women				HSD	Emergency and Transitional Services	H30ET	16200	2010		\$100,000

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
52	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Police and GSF: Restore 2 Parking Enforcement Officers and add \$143,000 to Police. Add \$400,000 to GSF Court Fines & Forfeitures revenue.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Godden; McIver

**Staff Analyst:** Peter Harris

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$400,000
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$143,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$257,000</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$257,000</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This action would restore two Parking Enforcement Officers in the Police Department that are abrogated in the proposed budget, at a cost of \$143,000 to the GSF. It would also add \$400,000 in GSF Court Fines & Forfeitures revenue.

The two positions were abrogated in the proposed budget as part of the Citywide effort to reduce personnel costs. Because eliminating these positions would reduce the Police Department's parking enforcement efforts, it would also reduce revenue from fines for parking infractions. Thus the

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
52	1	A	1

proposed budget accordingly reduced Court Fines & Forfeitures revenue by \$400,000. This green sheet would reverse these changes.

The net impact would be an increase of \$257,000 in the GSF balance.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
52	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Police and GSF: Restore 2 Parking Enforcement Officers and add \$143,000 to Police. Add \$400,000 to GSF Court Fines & Forfeitures revenue.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Add 2 Parking Enforcement Officers	Parking Enf Ofcr - FT	2	2	SPD	Special Operations	P3400	00100	2010		\$143,000
2	Increase revenue from enforcement activity of 2 PEOs				GSF	Court Fines & Forfeitures (100%)	455900	00100	2010	\$400,000	

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
52	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Police and GSF: Add 7 Parking Enforcement Officers and \$930,601 to Police. Add \$1,050,000 to GSF Court Fines & Forfeitures revenue.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; Harrell; Licata; McIver

**Staff Analyst:** Peter Harris

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$1,050,000
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$930,601</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$119,399
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$0
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	\$119,399

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This action would add seven Parking Enforcement Officers (PEOs) to the Police Department, at a cost of \$930,601 from the GSF. It would also add \$1,050,000 in GSF Court Fines & Forfeitures revenue.

The cost of the seven PEOs would be \$500,178 for salaries and benefits, \$63,952 for ongoing equipment costs, and \$366,471 for one-time equipment costs, including vehicles. The seven PEOs would be distributed among the seven existing PEO squads, increasing the PEO Supervisors' span of control from 12:1 to 13:1.

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
52	2	A	1

The increase in revenue would result from nine months of enforcement activity by the additional PEOs. It would take three months to hire and train the new PEOs.

The net impact in 2010 would be an increase of \$119,399 in the GSF balance.

In 2011, the cost of the seven PEOs would be \$575,413. In 2011 the revenue resulting from a full year's enforcement activity by these seven positions would be \$1,400,000. Thus the net impact in 2011 would be an increase of \$824,587 to the GSF balance.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
52	2	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Police and GSF: Add 7 Parking Enforcement Officers and \$930,601 to Police. Add \$1,050,000 to GSF Court Fines & Forfeitures revenue.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Add 7 Parking Enforcement Officers	Parking Enf Ofcr - FT	7	7	SPD	Special Operations	P3400	00100	2010		\$930,601
2	Increase revenue from enforcement activity of 7 PEOs				GSF	Court Fines & Forfeitures (100%)	455900	00100	2010	\$1,050,000	

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
53	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Pass C. B. 116701 Speed Infraction Pilot Ordinance

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Peter Harris

**Council Bill or Resolution:** C. B. 116701, tab 18 in gray notebook

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/10/2009</b>	<b>Pass 7- 2-Absent</b>	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

Do pass C. B. 116701.

This ordinance authorizes a two-year pilot project to test the feasibility of using traffic safety cameras for speed enforcement throughout the city, as recently allowed by state law. The project builds on the Council's 2008 initiative to use traffic safety cameras for speed enforcement in school zones. The current ordinance will allow the City to study the effectiveness of traffic safety cameras in reducing speeding violations on arterial streets and other roads where excessive speed and speed-related accidents have occurred in recent years. The project will expire in mid-2011 unless the state makes permanent the authority for such enforcement and the City then passes another enabling ordinance.

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
53	1	A	1

The proposed budget assumes \$50,000 in revenue from fines paid for infractions detected by the pilot project cameras.

## 2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
54	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Speed Infraction Revenues for Pedestrian Master Plan

**Councilmembers:** Clark; Licata; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Dan Eder

### Budget Committee Vote:

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/10/2009	Pass 6- 1, 2- Absent	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	N	Y

### Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests that the Mayor evaluate and make specific recommendations to change policy with respect to use of General Subfund revenues collected from the mobile speed van program. Specifically, Council wants to explore the possibility of dedicating infraction revenues (net of costs to implement the speed van program and net of costs related to Municipal Court's processing of the infractions) for pedestrian safety purposes consistent with the Seattle Pedestrian Master Plan.

In 2008, Council passed Ordinance 122725 amending Seattle Municipal Code Section 11.31.090 and Seattle Municipal Code Subsection 11.31.120 C to provide that Seattle Municipal Code Section 11.52.100 may be enforced through the use of evidence detected by an automated traffic safety camera and providing penalties for such violations. Ordinance 122725 contemplated that mobile speed vans would be used only in school zones. Council is considering a green sheet (53-1-A) that would expand the use of mobile speed vans to other areas beyond school zones.

In 2009, Council adopted Resolution 31157 approving the Seattle Pedestrian Master Plan. The City has been allocating a minimum of \$10 million per year to address pedestrian safety issues and intends to continue to do so in 2010, with the City striving both to increase this to a minimum of \$15 million per year and to identify a dedicated funding source for implementation of the Seattle Pedestrian Master Plan.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** March 1, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
55	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** SPD: Restore one Evidence Warehouse position and add \$40,134 GSF to Police.

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Peter Harris

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$40,134</u>
Net Balance Effect	(\$40,134)
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$0
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	(\$40,134)

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This action would restore one Evidence Warehouse position in the Police Department that is abrogated in the proposed budget.

The evidence warehouse is a mission critical function in the Police Department. Accurately processing and maintaining evidence is often essential to the successful prosecution of offenders. There are currently 15 Evidence Warehouse workers who process and maintain nearly 200,000 pieces of evidence. In 1982 there were 14 Evidence Warehouse workers who handled less than half this number of items. The demands on the evidence warehouse continue to increase, in part because the

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
55	1	A	1

requirements for retention are increasing. For example, evidence must be maintained for 10 years on pedestrian and bicycle crashes, 40 years for sexual assault cases, and 100 years for homicides. The number of items in the warehouse is currently increasing by approximately 10,000 items per year.

Net of other recently identified potential savings in this function, the restoration of this position would cost \$40,134.

The net budget impact is an increased General Subfund expenditure of \$40,134.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
55	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** SPD: Restore one Evidence Warehouse position and add \$40,134 GSF to Police.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Add one Evidence Warehouse	Evidence Warehouse - FT	1	1	SPD	Criminal Investigations Administration	P7000	00100	2010		\$40,134

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
57	1	B	1

**Budget Action Title:** Impose a budget proviso restricting use of 2010 appropriations for SDOT's Major Projects BCL related to the Mercer East project

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Drago

**Staff Analyst:** Dan Eder

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/10/2009	Pass 8- 1-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$0
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	\$0

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would impose the following proviso:

“The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) is authorized to spend money from the Major Projects BCL for the Mercer Corridor (“Mercer East”) project, Project ID: TC365500 to advertise the project’s construction contract, to prepare the construction management plan, and to evaluate contractor bids to determine the lowest responsive, responsible bidder. SDOT may complete right-of-way acquisition and any associated relocation activities, demolish buildings, complete design, complete right-of-way certification, and perform any other activities necessary to prepare the Mercer East project for advertisement for bid; however, 2010 appropriations to SDOT's Major

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
57	1	B	1

Projects BCL may not be spent or encumbered for any other construction activities related to the Mercer East project until authorized by future ordinance.”

The proviso allows SDOT to demolish buildings but is otherwise consistent with Council’s previous action (Ordinance 122953) imposing a proviso on 2009 appropriations for the Mercer East project.

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
58	3	B	1

**Budget Action Title:** Impose a budget proviso restricting use of 2010 appropriations for SDOT's Major Projects BCL related to the Mercer West project

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; Conlin; Drago; Godden; Harrell; Licata; McIver

**Staff Analyst:** Dan Eder

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/10/2009	Pass 8-1-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$0
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	\$0

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would impose the following proviso:

“In addition to the restrictions imposed in Section 4(c) of the ordinance adopting a 2010 budget and any other restriction imposed by law, no more than \$4.5 million of the money appropriated in the 2010 budget for the Seattle Department of Transportation’s Major Projects BCL may be spent for the Mercer West project (Project ID: TC367110), until authorized by a future ordinance. None of the money appropriated in the 2010 budget for the Seattle Department of Transportation’s Major

---

\* Has Proviso

Tab	Action	Option	Version
58	3	B	1

Projects BCL may be spent for the Mercer West project for any purpose besides design, until authorized by a future ordinance.”

Seattle Department of Transportation staff advise that this proviso will not cause any change to the Mercer West project schedule assuming Council lifts the proviso by June 30, 2010.

The Mercer West project is a new \$100 million project in the Mayor’s Proposed 2010-2015 Capital Improvement Program (“Proposed CIP”). The project is included as a City funding responsibility in the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Agreement between the City and the State of Washington.

Proposed 2010 appropriations are supported by federal grants (\$290,000) and 2010 LTGO Bonds (\$9.0 million). However, the project funding plan includes \$82.6 million from future sources about which the Council wants more information.

1. **\$22M in To Be Determined:** The Proposed CIP includes \$22.0 million of “To Be Determined” funding source starting in 2012. It is not yet clear what revenue source the Mayor plans to use to support anticipated project costs.
2. **\$26M in Private Funding/Donation:** The Proposed CIP includes \$25.6 million of “Private Funding/Donation” funding in 2013. The Mayor plans to sell future surplus properties in the South Lake Union area both to support a cash contribution to the Mercer West project in 2013 and also to repay a \$15.2 million interfund loan (plus accumulated interest) for the separate Mercer Corridor (“Mercer East”) project. Council needs more information on the Mayor’s anticipated time of sale and the Mayor’s anticipated appreciation rates for these surplus properties.
3. **\$33M in General Obligation Bonds:** The Proposed CIP includes \$33.1 million of “General Obligation Bonds” starting in 2011. The Mayor plans to support the debt service for these bonds using revenues from an increased Commercial Parking Tax (in addition to the existing ten percent Bridging the Gap tax). However, Council does not yet have enough information to determine whether it will be willing to increase the Commercial Parking Tax to a level sufficient to support the planned debt service starting in 2011.
4. **\$2M in Commercial Parking Tax:** The Proposed CIP includes \$1.9 million of “Commercial Parking Tax” funding in 2012. Council does not yet have enough information to determine whether it will be willing to increase the Commercial Parking Tax to a level sufficient to support the planned funding level in 2012.

This proviso is related to a separate Statement of Legislative Intent under consideration by the Council (SLI 67-1-A) requesting that the Mayor provide the Council with a recommendation related to an increase in the Commercial Parking Tax and a new vehicle license fee (Transportation Benefit District) by June 1, 2010.

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
59	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Pass C.B. 116592 repealing Employee Hours Tax

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; Conlin; Drago; Harrell; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Dan Eder

**Council Bill or Resolution:** CB 116592, gray tab # 22

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 8-1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would recommend passage of C.B. 116592 – Employee Hours Tax Repeal Ordinance (tab #22 in the gray budget legislation notebook).

The Mayor’s Proposed 2010 Budget assumes the repeal of the Employee Hours Tax (EHT) effective January 1, 2010. EHT annual revenues for 2009 are projected to be \$4.7 million. This revenue stream had been dedicated to support debt financing of SDOT major projects and spending in four capital program areas:

1. Bridge Rehabilitation;
2. Bridge Seismic;

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
59	1	A	1

3. Arterial Asphalt & Concrete; and
4. Urban Trails and Bikeways Spot Improvements.

According to recent revenue forecasts for the Commercial Parking Tax (CPT), 2010 CPT revenues are expected to be \$21.8 million. This is \$7.5 million higher than the original projections for 2010 made when the Bridging the Gap (BTG) funding plan was initially developed. As a result, the CPT is expected to be sufficient to pay annual debt service for existing and planned Major Projects bonds should Council repeal the EHT.

The Executive indicates that the four capital program areas where EHT had previously supported activities are all back-filled in the Proposed CIP with other Bridging the Gap (BTG) revenues in order to preserve funding commitments and deliverables through BTG Phase I (ending in 2015).

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
60	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Amend SDOT's proposed 2010-2015 CIP for the Linden Avenue North Complete Streets project to accelerate the project schedule and modify revenues and the spending plan.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Michael Fong

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

**Action:** This green sheet would amend the Seattle Department of Transportation's (SDOT's) 2010-2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to revise the Linden Avenue North Complete Streets project ("Linden") (#TC366930). Consistent with Statement of Legislative Intent 60-2-A, this green sheet would accelerate the Linden project schedule and modify its revenues and spending plan. This green sheet also would implement the Council's intent that SDOT complete design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the entire corridor from 128th to 145th by the end of 2012. It is

---

\* CIP Amendment

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
60	1	A	1

Council's expectation that the Executive's proposed 2011-2012 biennium budget will include full funding for Linden.

This green sheet would revise SDOT's proposed 2010-2015 CIP for the Linden Avenue North Complete Streets project (#TC366930) as follows:

- Change the End Date from "On Hold" to "Q4 2012"
- Change the amount in "Revenue Sources" labeled "Transportation Funding Package – Parking Tax" to \$3,203,000 for 2011, and revise the totals accordingly;
- Change the amount in "Revenue Sources" labeled "To be determined" to \$6,113,000 in 2012 and \$0 in 2013, and revise totals accordingly;
- Change the amount in "Fund Appropriations/Allocations" labeled "Transportation Operating Fund" to \$3,203,000 in 2011 and \$6,113,000 in 2012, and revise totals accordingly; and
- Change the amount in "Spending Plan" to \$1,635,000 in 2010, \$4,203,000 in 2011, \$6,113,000 in 2012 and \$0 in 2013, and revise totals accordingly.

These amended totals (which include \$1,300,000 of carry-forward in the 2010 Spending Plan) bring the total funding available to complete the project in line with SDOT's \$11,951,000 cost estimate.

**Background:** The Executive has presented the most recent revenue forecast (August 2009) for the Commercial Parking Tax (CPT) to Council. According to the Executive, it is estimated that after projected expenditures are made in 2011 (cash spending and debt service) there would remain a cumulative balance of \$8 million from this revenue source. This reserve CPT balance fluctuates from year to year, but given the long-term revenue and spending projections provided by the Executive, reducing the reserve balance in 2011 by \$1,664,000 is not anticipated to result in negative cash-flow going forward. This additional allocation of CPT revenues in 2011 should have no impact on existing and planned transportation projects.

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
60	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Clarifying Council intent and providing direction to SDOT with regard to the Linden Avenue North Complete Streets CIP project.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Michael Fong

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

As part of the 2010 budget process, Council requests that the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) proceed with full corridor design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the Linden Avenue Complete Streets CIP project. The Council requests that SDOT not phase the implementation of the Linden project as earlier proposed by the Executive. Rather, Council requests SDOT to continue advancing full corridor design from 128th to 145th along Linden Avenue North with the goal of completing project construction by the end of 2012.

The Executive has provided Council with estimated total costs and annual appropriation authority to maintain an accelerated project schedule. Green Sheet 60-1-A amends the 2010-2015 CIP to reflect revenues and expenditures necessary in order to fund and implement the full corridor project as outlined in the chart below. Council hereby endorses the following proposed project schedule and cost estimates provided by SDOT for the Linden project:

	<b>Phase</b>	<b>Schedule</b>	<b>SDOT Cost*</b>
1	Design	• Complete design 2Q 2011	\$1,700,000
3	Acquisition	• Acquire construction easements by 2Q 2011	\$85,000
4	Construction	• Ad 3Q 2011 • Complete construction 4Q 2012	\$10,166,000
			\$11,951,000

\*Does not reflect project costs prior to 2010

With Green Sheet 60-1-A, Council has added \$1,664,000 in the 2010-2015 CIP in Commercial Parking Tax revenues to support the project. This brings the total identified funding available in 2010 and 2011 to implement full corridor improvements to \$5,838,000. In 2012, there remains a \$6,113,000 funding gap listed in the CIP as "TBD." It is Council's expectation that in the 2011-2012 Biennium Budget, the Mayor will identify specific revenue sources to fully fund the Linden project and close this remaining funding gap.

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
60	2	A	1

Council recognizes that there is an additional estimated \$600,000 in costs associated with Seattle City Light (SCL) and utility relocation. Council requests that the Mayor also propose funding in the 2011-2012 Biennium Budget to fund SCL's costs associated with this project.

The Executive is requested to provide a progress report on the Linden project to the Council no later than September 1, 2010. This progress report should include an update on design, environmental review and cost estimates related to the project.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** September 1, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
61	1	A	4

**Budget Action Title:** Rescind Green Sheet 61-1-A-3 and impose a budget proviso restricting appropriations for SDOT's Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas Street CIP Project

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Godden; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Norm Schwab

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/23/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b>General Subfund Expenditures</b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	\$0
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$0
<b>Other Funds Expenditures</b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	\$0

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would rescind Green Sheet 61-1-A-3 in order to correctly apply a proviso to the Seattle Department of Transportation's budget.

This green sheet would impose the following proviso:

"In addition to the restrictions imposed in Section 4(c) of the ordinance adopting a 2010 budget and any other restriction imposed by law, none of the 2008 Parks Levy Fund money appropriated in the 2010 budget for the Seattle Department of Transportation's (SDOT's) Mobility-Capital BCL, and none

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
61	1	A	4

of the 2000 Parks Levy Fund money appropriated for SDOT and carried forward from a previous year, may be spent for the Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas Street CIP Project (Project ID: TC366210) until authorized by future ordinance. Council anticipates that such authority will not be granted until SDOT and the Department of Parks and Recreation provide Council with a specific proposal for completing this project by modifying the scope or filling the funding gap.”

Background. This project was started in 2003 and originally scheduled for construction in 2005. This connection is called for in the Uptown and Belltown Neighborhood Plans. Funding for the project was included in the 2000 and 2008 Park Levies (\$2,069,000 and \$1,500,000, respectively). When the 2008 Parks Levy was developed last year, the additional \$1.5 million was provided to fill an SDOT estimated funding gap so the project could proceed to construction. SDOT’s estimate was based on a conceptual design. Since then, SDOT has proceeded to 90% construction design, with a current increase in the estimated project construction cost from approximately \$3.75 million to \$7.75 million, leaving a \$4 million funding gap. The proposed 2010-2015 CIP shows that SDOT has spent approximately \$1.3 million, including \$879,000 in 2000 Parks Levy funds (Life to Date Expenditures) on design and community involvement. The Proposed 2010-2015 CIP states that the project has been suspended due to lack of funding.

Council requests in a related Statement of Legislative Intent that SDOT work collaboratively with the Department of Parks and Recreation to provide the Council with ways to complete the project or reallocate the Parks Levy funds to another project(s). The SLI requests a report back on this by March 31, 2010.

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
61	2	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Completing Funding for SDOT's Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas St. CIP Project or Reallocating Parks Levy Funds

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Godden; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Norm Schwab

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/10/2009	Pass 8- 1-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

Council requests the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) work collaboratively with the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to provide the Council with a report by March 31, 2010 showing how SDOT can complete the Belltown/Queen Anne Waterfront Connections - Thomas Street CIP Project (Project ID: TC366210), funded in part with 2000 Parks Levy Fund and 2008 Parks Levy Fund. The Council requests a report back on this by March 31, 2010, as well as a detailed explanation of funds expended to date on the project.

Background. This project was started in 2003 and originally scheduled for construction in 2005. This connection is called for in the Uptown and Belltown Neighborhood Plans. Funding for the project was included in the 2000 and 2008 Park Levies (\$2,069,000 and \$1,500,000, respectively). When the 2008 Parks Levy was developed last year, the additional \$1.5 million was provided to fill an SDOT estimated funding gap so the project could proceed to construction. SDOT's estimate was based on a conceptual design. Since then, SDOT has proceeded to 90% construction design, with a current increase in the estimated project construction cost from approximately \$3.75 million to \$7.75 million, leaving a \$4 million funding gap. The proposed 2010-2015 CIP shows that SDOT has spent approximately \$1.3 million, including \$879,000 in 2000 Parks Levy funds (Life to Date Expenditures) on design and community involvement. The Proposed 2010-2015 CIP states that the project has been suspended due to lack of funding.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks and Seattle Center; Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** March 31, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
62	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Pass C.B. 116693 approving a paving interfund loan

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Dan Eder

**Council Bill or Resolution:** CB 116693, gray tab # 20

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/10/2009</b>	<b>Pass 7- 2-Absent</b>	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would recommend passage of C.B. 116693 – Paving Interfund Loan Extension Ordinance (tab #20 in the gray budget legislation notebook).

The Council previously approved Ordinance 122641 authorizing an interfund loan to accelerate paving improvements on streets in and around downtown Seattle to ensure that alternative routes are in the best possible condition by the time Alaskan Way Viaduct construction begins. At the time, the Mayor planned to return to seek an extension of the paving interfund loan after two years based on a review of unit costs, revenues, and financing options.

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
62	1	A	1

The proposed ordinance extends the existing interfund loan authority (originally set to expire on December 31, 2009) to December 31, 2015.

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
63	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Pass C.B. 116692 Parking Permit Fee Ordinance

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Norm Schwab

**Council Bill or Resolution:** C.B. 116692, Tab #19 in Gray Notebook

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/10/2009</b>	<b>Pass 8- 1-Absent</b>	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

Do pass C.B. 116692.

This legislation establishes a new Restricted Parking Zone (RPZ) Single-Day Use Guest Permit at \$1.00 per permit, with a limit of 50 such permits per household per year. This is consistent with RPZ changes approved by the Council in Ordinance 123001 earlier this year.

This legislation also creates a new "Car Share Parking" permit and fee. The Executive states that this permit will improve parking enforcement officers' ability to ticket vehicles that illegally park in on-street car share parking spaces. The City expects to have 25-30 such spaces at the start of 2010. The

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
63	1	A	1

fee for a permit in a non-paid parking area is proposed at \$300 per year to reflect the right-of-way value. Fees in other areas are set according to the average on-street paid parking revenue per space that would have been generated in each area as follows:

- \$300 in non-paid parking spaces
- \$900 where paid parking is \$1.50/hr
- \$1,600 where paid parking is \$2.00/hr
- \$3,100 where paid parking is \$2.50/hr

Most of the car share parking spaces are located in non-paid parking spaces.

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
64	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Do Pass C.B. 116694, amending Ordinance 122603 to extend the term of an interfund loan from December 31, 2009 to December 31, 2012 to finance the South Lake Union Streetcar capital costs.

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Christa Valles

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/12/2009	Pass 6- 2, 1- Absent	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	\$0
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	\$0

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would pass C.B. 116694, amending Ordinance 122603, to extend the term of an interfund loan from December 31, 2009 to December 31, 2012 to finance the South Lake Union's capital costs.

**Background**

In December 2007, the City Council authorized the Executive to borrow \$5,945,000 from the City's Consolidated Cash Pool to pay for the South Lake Union Streetcar's outstanding capital costs (C.B. 116095). The Executive is requesting to extend the length of the interfund

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
64	1	A	1

loan until December 31, 2012. The loan balance is currently ~\$4.9 million but the Executive needs to maintain the total amount of the capital loan at \$5.9 million to cover the additional interest costs that will accrue as a result of the extended loan period.

### **History**

At the time Council authorized the original loan, the Executive estimated the Streetcar's total capital costs were \$52.1 million<sup>1</sup> and the outstanding capital gap between revenues and expenditures was ~\$5.9 million.

The Executive intended to repay the original loan no later than December 31, 2009 using the following revenue sources:

- \$2 million from the South Lake Union (SLU) property proceeds Subaccount.
- \$3.9- \$4.6 million from the sale of surplus property adjacent to and air rights above the South Lake Union Streetcar Maintenance Facility and Yard. (Estimates from 2007, which were based on future projected property values.)
- \$1.5 million from Denny/South Lake Union transportation mitigation funds (the Executive later learned the City could not use these funds to pay for streetcar capital costs).

The use of SLU property proceeds was to reduce the loan to ~\$3.9 million and the proceeds from the sale of surplus property adjacent to the maintenance base, along with the Denny Triangle/SLU transportation mitigation funds would cover the balance. The total project costs for the streetcar, however, came to ~\$53.3 million instead of \$52.1 million. Thus, the proceeds from the SLU Subaccount only decreased the loan to \$4.9 million instead of \$3.9 million. In addition, the Executive did not move to sell the excess maintenance base property before the economic downturn occurred in late 2008, preventing a subsequent sale.

### **Comments**

- The outstanding loan balance is more than what the City projected it would receive from the sale of excess maintenance base property.
- The Executive has suggested the City may want to use the excess maintenance base property for a staging area for the Mercer project or for expanding the City's streetcar fleet and network. If the property is used for either of these purposes, it is not clear how the Executive intends to handle the repayment of the interfund loan.

---

<sup>1</sup> Original project costs was \$50.5m

2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
64	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** South Lake Union Streetcar Interfund Loan Extension

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Christa Valles

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 8- 1-Absent	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** C.B. 116694 extends the term of an interfund loan for the South Lake Union (SLU) streetcar’s outstanding capital costs from December 31, 2009 to December 31, 2012.

The City Council requests the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) to prepare a proposal outlining viable options to repay the interfund loan prior to the authorized extension date of December 31, 2012 (December 31, 2010 would be ideal). In addition to various loan repayment options, the proposal should address the following issues related to the disposition of the SLU streetcar’s surplus maintenance base property: current value, various options for the use of the property, and the likelihood the property will be needed for staging purposes for the Mercer Project or expanding the streetcar network.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation

**Date Due to Council:** June 30, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (BUGS)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
65	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Summary of Key Pedestrian-Related and Bicycle-Related Improvement Projects and Programs Funding Levels in Biennial Budget

Departments: DOF; SDOT

BCLs (if applicable):

Councilmembers: Budget Committee

Staff Analyst: Traci Ratzliff

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/10/2009	Pass 8- 1-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Budget Guidance Statement:**

The Mayor’s 2010 Proposed Budget includes a new “Pedestrian Master Plan Implementation” Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project. This new project includes four sub-projects that, prior to the 2010 Proposed Budget, were separate CIP projects. These include: ADA Spot Improvements, Pedestrian Lighting, Sidewalk Development Program, and Stairway Rehabilitation Program. The projects included in the new Pedestrian Master Plan Implementation CIP project reflects only a handful of the SDOT CIP projects and operating/maintenance programs that relate to improving the pedestrian environment in the City. There are several other existing CIP projects and operating/maintenance projects or programs that were not included in the new CIP project. The City is committed to funding a minimum of \$10 million per year, and increasing this to \$15 million a year, for implementation of the recently approved Pedestrian Master Plan.

In addition, the Mayor’s 2010 Proposed Budget folds three projects into a newly scoped Bike Master Plan Implementation CIP project: Bike Master Plan Implementation, Bike Spot Improvements, and Urban Trail & Bikeways Spot Improvements. Prior to the 2010 Proposed Budget, these three projects were separate CIP projects. Like the Pedestrian Master Plan CIP project, the projects included in the Bicycle Master Plan CIP reflect only a subset of projects or programs with bicycle improvements. There are other bicycle improvement CIP projects and/or programs that were not included in the newly scoped Bike Master Plan Implementation CIP project.

It has been suggested that future annual budgets include separate summary tables that display proposed biennial appropriations for key pedestrian-related transportation improvement projects or programs and bicycle-related transportation improvement projects or programs in order to more easily document the City’s progress in fulfilling the commitment to fund such efforts.

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
65	1	A	2

The Council requests the Executive to include separate summary tables in the next biennial budget that display proposed biennial appropriations for key pedestrian-related and bicycle-related- transportation improvement projects or programs. Each table should include: project or program title, project number (if applicable), amount and fund source(s) of annual and biennial appropriation for each project or program, amount of appropriations for last two calendar years for each project or program. Projects or programs should be included in each of summary tables only if the majority of funding is for either pedestrian-related or bike-related improvements. These summary tables would be for information purposes only.

## 2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
67	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Financing Plan for the City's Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Drago; Harrell; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Dan Eder

### Budget Committee Vote:

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/10/2009	Pass 8-1-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

### Statement of Legislative Intent:

Council requests that the Mayor propose specific recommendations for implementing either or both of the following new funding sources: an increased Commercial Parking Tax (CPT) and a new Transportation Benefit District. Council requests that the Mayor report back to Council by June 1, 2010.

### Background and Additional Information:

Council approved C.B. 116668 authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement between the City and the State of Washington related to the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program (AWVSRP Agreement). The AWVSRP Agreement contemplates that the City will be responsible for funding an estimated \$927 million in costs related to the Bored Tunnel Alternative.

The Proposed 2010-15 Capital Improvement Plan assumes that Council will act to approve either an increased Commercial Parking Tax or a new vehicle license fee (Transportation Benefit District) or both sometime in 2010.

The Mayor has thus far provided a "Funding Feasibility Analysis" rather than a detailed finance plan. The Mayor has indicated that there are a number of different options for implementing each of these two new funding sources, including but not limited to the following:

#### Commercial Parking Tax:

1. Total percent increase needed to support a total of \$200 million in planned cash and bonds for City's project funding;
2. Phasing the increase over one or more than one years; and
3. Length of time needed to support planned debt service.

#### Transportation Benefit District:

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
67	1	A	2

1. Total new annual vehicle license fee needed to support a total of \$100 million in planned cash and bonds for City's project funding;
2. Phasing the increase over one or more than one years; and
3. Length of time needed to support planned debt service.

The Council also requests that the Mayor identify which projects in the AWVSR Program Agreement will use the recommended new funding source(s), identify cash spending and bonds supported by each recommended new funding source, and for each project identify all other anticipated sources of funding for planned spending through 2018.

This Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) is related to another SLI under consideration by Council (SLI 67-2-A) regarding Local Improvement District funding for the projects in the AWVSR Program Agreement.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Full Council

**Date Due to Council:** June 1, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
67	2	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Preliminary Analysis of Local Improvement District(s) financial support for the City's Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Drago; Harrell; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Norm Schwab

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/10/2009	Pass 8- 1-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

Council requests that the Executive conduct a preliminary analysis of using Local Improvement District(s) for funding various elements of the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program, including but not limited to Central Waterfront improvements and a potential First Avenue Streetcar. Council requests that the Mayor report back to Council by June 1, 2010.

**Background and Additional Information:**

Council approved C.B. 116668 authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement between the City and the State of Washington related to the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program (AWVSRP Agreement). The AWVSRP Agreement contemplates that the City will be responsible for funding an estimated \$927 million in costs related to the Bored Tunnel Alternative.

The Mayor has thus far provided a "Funding Feasibility Analysis" rather than a detailed finance plan. In this feasibility analysis, the Mayor has included a future Local Improvement District to generate \$175 million to help fund Central Waterfront improvements and a potential First Avenue Streetcar.

The Mayor plans to use other new funding sources – Commercial Parking Tax (CPT) increase and Transportation Benefit District (TBD) – to pay for the City's funding responsibility under the AWVSRP. The Council would like to know to what extent an LID or LIDs could reduce the need for CPT or TBD funding for the AWVSRP.

The Council requests that the Executive conduct a preliminary investigation of the ability of the City to use an LID or LIDs for the various elements/projects in the AWVSRP that the City has funding responsibility. This analysis should be based on preliminary element/project cost estimates or estimates based on similar projects, and based on planned spending through 2018 (whether supported by cash or bonds).

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
67	2	A	2

The Council requests that the Executive hire a property appraiser to assist with determining the special benefits to property owners that might accrue from implementation of these elements/projects.

The scope of the analysis should include:

1. Identify a preliminary estimate of the portion of the costs for the AWVSRP elements/projects that could be attributed to an LID.
2. Identify the potential area or areas for an LID or LIDs and benefit zones within each LID, if any.
3. Provide a reasonable estimate of what the market would bear in the way of LID assessments for the elements/projects identified under Task 1 based on an evaluation of existing property conditions (zoning, site, and building improvements), neighborhood trends, and overall property values proximate to the proposed AWVSRP projects.
4. Provide the Council with at least three scenarios of LID(s) formation for its consideration that could generate an amount to cover the costs of the applicable program elements/projects, including identification of boundaries and duration of LID(s). One scenario should identify the highest amount that could be attributable to LID(s) for all the elements/projects in the AWVSRP for which the City has funding responsibility. Another scenario should identify the minimum LID(s) funding amount required given the other funding sources the Executive proposes to use. A third and any additional scenarios should be between these bookends.

This Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) is related to another SLI under consideration by Council (SLI 67-1-A-1) regarding a Financing Plan for the City's Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Program.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Full Council

**Date Due to Council:** June 1, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
68	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Amend SDOT's proposed 2010-2015 CIP to add the University of Washington's proposed pedestrian land bridge at Rainier Vista.

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Ketil Freeman

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/10/2009	Pass 7- 1-Abstain, 1-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

**Action:** This green sheet would amend the Seattle Department of Transportation's (SDOT's) 2010-2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to add the Pedestrian Land Bridge at the University of Washington's Rainier Vista project as shown in the attachment to this green sheet.

The new project would construct a pedestrian land bridge that spans a lowered N.E. Pacific Place and Burke-Gilman Trail from the University of Washington's Rainier Vista. The project would be managed by the University of Washington and funded by the University of Washington, Sound

---

\* CIP Amendment

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
68	1	A	1

Transit, and the City. An associated future project would add a signalized, mid-block crossing at Montlake Blvd. between N.E. Pacific Place and N.E. Pacific Street.

This project would serve as a placeholder should Council decide to pursue this alternative to the pedestrian bridge approved in concept by Resolution 31124 for access to the University of Washington from Sound Transit's University Station. The decision to pursue the alternative will be based on: (1) the availability of funds for design and construction in 2011 and beyond; (2) how costs, including the cost of overruns, will be allocated among the University of Washington, Sound Transit, and the City; and (3) the relative merits of the proposed design.

This green sheet makes no appropriations for the 2010 budget.

**Background:** Since adoption of Resolution 31124, when Council granted conceptual approval for a pedestrian bridge proposed by Sound Transit that would cross Montlake Boulevard NE and NE Pacific Place, the University of Washington, the Seattle Department of Transportation, and Sound Transit have completed conceptual design on an alternative that would be more consistent with the University of Washington's future plans for the Rainier Vista promenade and view corridor. The concept would include a land bridge over the Burke Gilman Trail and a depressed roadway at Pacific Place. This would provide grade-separated pedestrian access to the University campus from the triangle garage block. Transit riders going from the University Station to the University of Washington campus would cross Montlake Blvd. at a mid-block crosswalk to get to the land bridge.

There would be no cost to the City for the pedestrian bridge as originally proposed. The design and construction cost of the land bridge alternative is estimated to be approximately \$18,700,000. The cost is proposed to be divided as follows:

Sound Transit	\$10,700,000
University of Washington	\$ 4,000,000
Seattle	\$ 4,000,000

Contribution to the project by the City may require debt financing that is not included in the estimate. Additionally, the cost of the mid-block crossing at Montlake is not included. Funding from the University of Washington and Sound Transit is not yet secured. Development of the project is contingent on execution of a memorandum of agreement between the University of Washington, Sound Transit, and the City. The University will decide whether to pursue the project by June of 2010.



**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
73	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Amend C.B. 116689, DPR's 2010 Fee Schedule, eliminating proposed 2010 fee increases for Amy Yee Tennis Center and Adult Athletic Field fees, and pass as amended.

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Christa Valles

**Council Bill or Resolution:** C.B. 116689/gray tab 11

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/12/2009	<i>Pass 8- 1-Absent</i>	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	(\$102,800)
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>(\$102,800)</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet amends the Department of Parks and Recreation's (DPR) 2010 fee schedule (C.B. 116689) by eliminating proposed 2010 fee increases for adult athletic fields (\$225,000) and the Amy Yee Tennis Center (88,800). The actual reduction to DPR's appropriation and expenditure authority is less than the total fee reduction since DPR recently determined it underestimated its 2010 athletic fee revenue, without the fee increases, by \$211,000.

DPR's 2010 Fee Schedule, C.B. 116689, Attachment 1, page 6, is revised as follows:

- **Indoor Court Fees**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
73	1	A	1

2009	2010	Fees per each 1 ¼ hr court use
\$25.00	<del>\$29.00</del> \$25.00	Singles
\$30.00	<del>\$38.00</del> \$30.00	Doubles
-\$1.00	-\$1.00	Senior Adult/Special Populations discount per court
\$45.00	<del>\$50.00</del> \$45.00	Telephone Reservation Card (annual) for indoor/outdoor courts

- **Tennis Lessons**

*Private/Semi-Private Lessons*

2009	2010	
\$48.00	<del>\$60.00</del> \$48.00	One person
\$50.00	<del>\$64.00</del> \$50.00	Two people
\$60.00	<del>\$75.00</del> \$60.00	Three people
\$70.00	<del>\$90.00</del> \$70.00	Four people
\$10.00	\$10.00	Surcharge for lessons on City holidays

DPR's 2010 Fee Schedule, C.B. 116689, Attachment 1, page 14, is revised as follows:

- **Adult Sports Fees**

2009	2010	
\$25.00	\$25.00	Indoor Sports League Fee, per hour
\$30.00	\$30.00	Adult Sports Team Administration fee/team
\$50.00	<del>\$65.00</del> \$50.00	Adult Outdoor Games, per hour – all field surfaces
\$20.00	\$20.00	Adult Outdoor Practices, per hour – all field surfaces
\$20.00/hr	\$20.00/hr	Staff Fee (applies when using the scoreboard at Lower Woodland #1)
\$20.00	\$20.00	Outdoor Field Lighting Fee, per hour (adult play only)
\$2.00	\$2.00	Adults Gymnasium Drop-In Sports Activity Fee, per session
\$1.00	\$1.00	Seniors Gymnasium Drop-In Sports Activity Fee, per session

**Background:** See Central Staff paper behind Tab 73, pages 3-6.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
73	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Amend C.B. 116689, DPR's 2010 Fee Schedule, eliminating proposed 2010 fee increases for Amy Yee Tennis Center and Adult Athletic Field fees, and pass as amended.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Reduce DPR's recreational activity fees.				DPR	Recreational Activity Fees	447300	10200	2010	(\$102,800)	
2	Reduce DPR's appropriation.				DPR	Recreation Facilities and Programs	K310D	10200	2010		(\$102,800)

## 2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
73	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** DPR Fee Schedule Policies

**Councilmembers:** Clark; Conlin; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Christa Valles

### Budget Committee Vote:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<i>11/12/2009</i>	<i>Pass 8- 1-Absent</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>Y</i>						

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The City Council requests the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to submit a fee policy proposal no later than March 31, 2010.

As part of its deliberations to adopt fee policies for DPR recreational programs, Council will need to understand program costs (both direct and indirect) for various activities and user groups. It will also need to understand the amount DPR currently recovers in fees to assess the impacts of various cost recovery goals on both the end-user and the City's ability to fund delivery of services.

In addition to considering how fee policies factor in to DPR's role in promoting active recreation for all ages, the Council will evaluate DPR's proposal based on the following:

- Equity and fairness
- Cost recovery
- Affordability
- Transparency

In addition, Council is open to considering differential fees for residents vs. non-residents and for user groups that have robust scholarship programs.

DPR should also present information regarding its own scholarship fund for various park-sponsored fee-based activities, including:

- Availability
- Accessibility
- Eligibility

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
73	2	A	1

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks and Seattle Center

**Date Due to Council:** March 31, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
74	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Cut \$136,215 GSF to Parks for position reclassification costs

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; McIver; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Kieu-Anh King

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b>General Subfund Expenditures</b>	(\$136,215)
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$136,215</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	(\$136,215)
<b>Other Funds Expenditures</b>	(\$136,215)
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$136,215</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet reduces \$136,215 GSF to the Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks). This action would require Parks to use or redirect resources within the Mayor's Proposed 2010 Budget for Parks to implement nine position reclassifications. Council intends that the resources be redirected from Parks administration expenses, rather than direct public services.

**Background.**

In the 2010 Proposed Budget, the Mayor has proposed appropriating \$136,215 (0.104% of Parks' operating budget) to support the reclassification of nine Parks Department employees in various

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
74	1	A	2

Parks Department BCLs. These position reclassifications have been approved by the Personnel Department and Parks is required, under Personnel rules, to compensate these employees at the increased levels associated with the new classifications determined by Personnel.

Although these positions are revenue-supported, Council would like to have Parks implement the reclassifications without the GSF increase contained in the Mayor's 2010 Proposed Budget. This action will not impede Parks ability to implement the reclassifications required by Personnel.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
74	1	A	2

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Cut \$136,215 GSF to Parks for position reclassification costs

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Cut salary appropriation for position reclassification expenses				DPR	Policy Direction and Leadership	K390B	10200	2010		(\$68,107)
2	Cut salary appropriation for position reclassification expenses				DPR	Finance and Administration	K390A	10200	2010		(\$68,108)
3	Reduce revenue from GSF for position reclassification expenses				DPR	General Subfund Support	587001	10200	2010	(\$136,215)	
4	Reduce transfer to Parks for position reclassification expenses				FG	Parks and Recreation Fund	Q5971020	00100	2010		(\$136,215)

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
75	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Cut \$105,000 GSF transfer to Parks for Supplies and Minor Equipment expenses, and abrogate one vacant Administrative Specialist I position.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; McIver; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Kieu-Anh King

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>(\$105,000)</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$105,000</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	(\$105,000)
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>(\$105,000)</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$105,000</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet cuts the appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses by \$105,000 and abrogates one vacant Administrative Specialist I position (Position # 10004456) at Parks in 2010 and reduces the GSF transfer to Parks by a like amount.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
75	1	A	1

### Budget Action Transactions

**Budget Action Title:** Cut \$105,000 GSF transfer to Parks for Supplies and Minor Equipment expenses, and abrogate one vacant Administrative Specialist I position.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Cut appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses				DPR	Environmental Learning and Programs	K430A	10200	2010		(\$2,170)
2	Cut appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses				DPR	Facility and Structure Maintenance	K320A	10200	2010		(\$12,206)
3	Cut appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses				DPR	Finance and Administration	K390A	10200	2010		(\$2,534)
4	Cut appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses				DPR	Natural Resources Management	K430B	10200	2010		(\$2,344)
5	Cut appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses				DPR	Park Cleaning, Landscaping, and Restoration	K320B	10200	2010		(\$8,877)
6	Cut appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses				DPR	Planning, Development, and Acquisition	K370C	10200	2010		(\$764)
7	Cut appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses				DPR	Policy Direction and Leadership	K390B	10200	2010		(\$506)
8	Cut appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses				DPR	Recreation Facilities and Programs	K310D	10200	2010		(\$8,039)
9	Cut appropriation for supplies and minor equipment expenses				DPR	Swimming, Boating, and Aquatics	K310C	10200	2010		(\$2,560)
10	Abrogate position and associated funding	Admin Spec I-BU - FT	-1	-1	DPR	Facility and Structure Maintenance	K320A	10200	2010		(\$65,000)

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
75	1	A	1

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
11	Reduce revenue from GSF for supplies, minor equipment and salary expenses				DPR	General Subfund Support	587001	10200	2010	(\$105,000)	
12	Reduce support to Parks for supplies, minor equipment and salary expenses				FG	Parks and Recreation Fund	Q5971020	00100	2010		(\$105,000)

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
76	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Cut \$55,000 of GSF to Parks for Citywide Special Events Coordination and impose a budget proviso

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; McIver; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Kieu-Anh King

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	(\$55,000)
Net Balance Effect	\$55,000
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	(\$55,000)
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	(\$55,000)
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	\$55,000

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet cuts \$55,000 GSF support to the Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks) for professional services for Citywide special events coordination, and imposes the following budget proviso:

“No more than \$55,000 appropriated in the 2010 budget may be spent for Professional Services related to Citywide Special Events Coordination.”

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
76	1	A	1

This 50 percent reduction in the \$110,000 GSF included in the Mayor's 2010 Proposed Budget provides the equivalent of six months of professional services costs for Citywide Special Events Coordination in 2010. The City Council requests that Parks work to transition this body of work to an existing Executive Department employee by mid-2010. This green sheet does not include any additional appropriation or position authority to the Executive Department to manage this body of work.

**Background.**

In the 2010 Proposed Budget, the Mayor has proposed restoring \$110,000 of GSF to the Consultant/Professional Services budget at Parks. This is a partial restoration of a \$150,000 reduction Council made to unspecified Consultant/Professional Services in the 2010 Endorsed Budget at Parks, via 2009-2010 Green Sheet 120-1-A-2.

Parks has proposed using this funding to support a long-running consultant contract, supported in 2009 with Parks fund balance, for a former Parks employee who manages Citywide special events, including the coordination of staff-level working groups comprised of SDOT, Parks, Police, Fire and other City departments.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
76	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Cut \$55,000 of GSF to Parks for Citywide Special Events Coordination and impose a budget proviso

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Cut appropriation for Professional Services / Citywide Special Events Coordination				DPR	Recreation Facilities and Programs	K310D	10200	2010		(\$55,000)
2	Reduce revenue from GSF for Professional Services / Citywide Special Events Coordination				DPR	General Subfund Support	587001	10200	2010	(\$55,000)	
3	Reduce GSF support to Parks for Professional Services / Citywide Special Events Coordination				FG	Parks and Recreation Fund	Q5971020	00100	2010		(\$55,000)

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
77	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Abrogate two new Park Ranger positions and cut \$140,356 GSF to Parks

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; McIver; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Kieu-Anh King

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>(\$140,356)</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$140,356</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	(\$140,356)
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>(\$140,356)</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$140,356</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet abrogates two new full-time Park Ranger positions and cuts \$140,356 GSF for the Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks).

A related Statement of Legislative Intent, in Budget Tab # 77, Action #2, provides guidance on the upcoming evaluation of the Park Ranger Program, which is due to the Council in July of 2010. The City Council intends to review the program evaluation before making any decision to expand or contract the program.

**Background.**

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
77	1	A	1

The Mayor has proposed a \$140,356 GSF increase to the Park Rangers Program, including two new full-time Park Ranger positions and \$10,000 of non-personnel expenses. This expansion would increase patrol operations from six to seven days per week and would allow Park Rangers to flex their work time to accommodate seasonal changes in downtown park use.

In the 2008 Adopted Budget, Council approved \$462,000 of GSF to support the creation of the Park Rangers Program, which began patrol operations in downtown parks in June of 2008. The program currently includes five full-time (all filled) and two part-time (both vacant) Park Ranger positions, whose overall goal is to increase public use and enjoyment of and safety at Seattle's downtown parks. Council also approved 2008 SLI 114-1-A-3, which directed the Executive to perform an evaluation of the program, due in July of 2010, and to provide recommendations on contraction, expansion or discontinuation of the program. This evaluation has yet to be done.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
77	1	A	1

### Budget Action Transactions

**Budget Action Title:** Abrogate two new Park Ranger positions and cut \$140,356 GSF to Parks

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Cut appropriation for Park Ranger program expansion				DPR	Facility and Structure Maintenance	K320A	10200	2010		(\$140,356)
2	Reduce revenue from GSF for Park Ranger program expansion				DPR	General Subfund Support	587001	10200	2010	(\$140,356)	
3	Reduce GSF transfer to Parks for Park Ranger program expansion				FG	Parks and Recreation Fund	Q5971020	00100	2010		(\$140,356)
4	Abrogate two new Park Ranger positions at DPR	Park Ranger - FT	-2	-2	DPR	Facility and Structure Maintenance	K320A	10200	2010		\$0

## 2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
77	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Criteria for Evaluation of Park Ranger Pilot Program

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; McIver; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Kieu-Anh King

### Budget Committee Vote:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

### Statement of Legislative Intent:

In 2008 the City Council approved Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) 114-1-A-3, which requested that the Executive provide a written evaluation of the Department of Parks & Recreation's (Parks') Park Rangers Pilot Program (Program) by July 1, 2010. Through this new SLI, the Council is providing supplemental guidance to the Executive in the development of this evaluation. The Council intends to use this evaluation to inform its decisions on whether to expand, keep, or eliminate the pilot Program as part of its review of the 2011-2012 Proposed Budget.

The evaluation should be quantitative and qualitative in nature and should explicitly quantify the public safety improvements attributable to or correlated with the Program's presence at City parks. When discussing public safety improvements and other program outcomes Parks should detail the assumptions used to arrive at the evaluation's conclusions.

Council requests that the Parks Department provide a report and briefing, detailing the parameters of the program evaluation, to the Council's Parks & Seattle Center Committee by Monday, February 8, 2010.

The evaluation should address the following questions about the Program:

- 1) How has it reduced or eliminated crime and antisocial behavior in parks?
- 2) How has it encouraged people to use parks legally and to respect other users' rights?
- 3) How has it encouraged the local community to take ownership of parks, where applicable?
- 4) How has it otherwise improved conditions and user experiences / perception at parks? Has it resulted in increases in the number of people who feel safe using parks?

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
77	2	A	1

The evaluation should also address the following questions about the effects of the Program:

- A. Is there evidence of a change in the way people are using parks, so that legitimate use is dominant?
- B. Is there evidence of increased recreational and social use of parks?
- C. Is there evidence that the local community is actively ensuring that there is less crime and disorder in parks?
- D. What is the Program's impact on quality of life infractions and public property damage, such as graffiti, vandalism, loitering, illegal camping and drug dealing?
- E. How does Parks propose measuring or documenting the changes to communities that are adjacent to parks? This might be accomplished through direct observation and interviews, focus groups and/or community surveys.
- F. What is the total number of citations for Parks Code violations issued by Park Rangers? Are there any measurable impacts to Parks Code compliance? Is there any indication about a trend or change from citations since inception of the Program?

With the exception of statistics on Parks Code citations issued, Parks should exercise restraint in using evaluation measures that rely on "widget-counting" to assess the benefits of the program.

Examples of "widget-counting" evaluation measures might include:

- Number of minutes of park patrol provided.
- Number of visits / "ranger patrols" provided.
- Number of positive public interactions / "positive encounters" recorded.

Parks might, instead, develop measures such as:

- Reduction in calls for police assistance by park users.
- Reduction in incidents of harassment / violent crime / antisocial and criminal behavior at parks.
- Increase in legitimate use of parks, as measured by frequency / number of community events scheduled at parks, or other parks-use measures.

### **Background.**

The Executive has proposed adding two Park Ranger positions, costing \$140,000 GSF, to Parks in 2010. Through the green sheet in Tab #77, Action #1, Option A the Council has recommended against expansion prior to the completion of the Program evaluation.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks and Seattle Center

**Date Due to Council:** February 8, 2010; July 1, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
78	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Othello Park Public Safety Improvements -- Short-Term and Long-Term Improvement Plans

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; McIver; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Kieu-Anh King

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/10/2009</b>	<b>Pass 7-2-Absent</b>	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

The City Council requests that the Department of Parks and Recreation (Parks):

- a) Conduct a public input process and begin implementing short-term public safety improvements at Othello Park no later than Wednesday, March 31, 2010, and,
- b) Provide a written report on the short-term improvements to the Council's Parks & Seattle Center Committee, also no later than Wednesday, March 31, 2010, and,
- c) Provide a written report and briefing on long-term improvements (2010 - 2012) proposed for or possible at the Park to the Council's Parks & Seattle Center Committee no later than Monday, August 16, 2010.

Short-term public safety improvements in Items (a) and (b) above are proposed to include landscaping improvements, vegetation management (e.g., removal or trimming of bushes, shrubs and/or trees, to improve sightlines at the Park) and lighting improvements in the Mayor's 2010-2015 Proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Long-term public safety improvements in Item (c) above might consist of major park redevelopment or renovation or construction of additional park features (play areas, picnic areas, etc.). Improvements might also include increased programming and public events at the park, with a focus on increasing legitimate park usage and discouraging antisocial behavior and crime at the park and in surrounding communities.

The Council intends that Parks work with local community groups, including groups such as Friends of Othello Park and the Othello Park Alliance, to devise short- and long-term improvement plans that address community members' concerns about public safety and park use.

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
78	1	A	2

**Background.**

The Mayor has proposed appropriating \$250,000 of 2008 Parks Levy funding, in Parks CIP Project # K730106, to increase legitimate park usage and address chronic public safety issues at Othello Park, located in Southeast Seattle. Improvements will not be major or comprehensive, but will include landscaping modifications, vegetation management and lighting improvements. Final design concepts will be determined through a community process. Additionally, the City's Neighborhood Matching Fund recently awarded a grant to Friends of Othello Park, which will support a needs assessment for future Park improvements and community-oriented programming.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks and Seattle Center

**Date Due to Council:** March 31, 2010; August 16, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
86	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:**       DOF -- Review use of reserve funds vs. issuing debt for periodic replacement of City equipment, hardware, software, etc.

**Councilmembers:**         Conlin; Harrell; McIver

**Staff Analyst:**             Martha Lester

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/10/2009</b>	<b>Pass 7-2-Absent</b>	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Council requests that the Department of Finance (DOF) report back to the Council to address City policy on how best to pay for periodic replacement of City equipment, hardware, software, etc. DOF is requested to address questions including:

- What do the City's existing financial policies say about this issue?
- What has been the recent practice in various departments?
- What are the pros and cons of using sinking or reserve funds vs. issuing debt, including considerations such as net present value (NPV) analysis, preservation of debt capacity for other uses, sustainability in a "down" economy, etc.?
- How do other comparable cities fund similar expenditures? Is there a "best practices" approach?
- How might the City revise its financial policies to address this issue?
- What current or anticipated projects, in what departments, would be affected by a change in City policy?

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Finance and Budget

**Date Due to Council:** March 31, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
87	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** DoIT -- Pass C.B. 116724 to reduce size of Citizens' Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Board

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Martha Lester

**Council Bill or Resolution:** C.B. 116724 (tab #27 in gray notebooks)

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/10/2009	Pass 7- 2-Absent	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet recommends passage of C.B. 116724 to reduce the size of the Citizens' Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Board (CTTAB).

CTTAB currently has 15 members plus 1 Get Engaged member. C.B. 116724 would reduce the size to 9 members plus 1 Get Engaged member. The Department of Information Technology (DoIT) advises that a smaller CTTAB will reduce staff time devoted to tasks involved in selecting CTTAB members – reduced advertising, recruiting, reference checks, follow-up with potential candidates, interviews, and preparing Clerk Files for appointments. This green sheet has no budget effect because DoIT's reduced staffing is already reflected in the proposed budget.

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
88	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Transfer \$50,000 from Cable Television Franchise Subfund to DoIT Fund and appropriate for Technology Matching Fund grant program

**Councilmembers:** Clark; Conlin; Harrell

**Staff Analyst:** Martha Lester

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$100,000
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$100,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would transfer \$50,000 from the Cable Television Franchise Subfund to the Department of Information Technology's (DoIT's) Information Technology Fund, and appropriate this amount for Technology Matching Fund (TMF) projects. The Cable Television Franchise Subfund gets its revenue from franchise fees paid to the City, and it is forecast to have sufficient unreserved fund balance to cover this appropriation.

In 2008, \$175,000 was allocated for TMF projects. In fall 2008, the Council added funding for TMF projects, bringing the total TMF budget for 2009 and 2010 to \$250,000 per year. This green sheet would add another \$50,000 for 2010, bringing the total for 2010 to \$300,000 for TMF projects.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
88	1	A	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Transfer \$50,000 from Cable Television Franchise Subfund to DoIT Fund and appropriate for Technology Matching Fund grant program

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Transfer from Cable Subfund to DoIT Fund for technology matching grants				CBLFEE	Cable Fee Support to Information Technology Fund	D160B	00160	2010		\$50,000
2	Reduce fund balance in Cable Subfund for technology matching grants				CBLFEE	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	379100	00160	2010	\$50,000	
3	Increase revenue in DoIT Fund for technology matching grants				DOIT	Community Technology - Cable Fund	542810	50410	2010	\$50,000	
4	Increase appropriation for technology matching grants				DOIT	Office of Electronic Communications	D4400	50410	2010		\$50,000

## 2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
89	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** DoIT -- Citywide Computer Inventory

**Councilmembers:** Harrell; Licata; McIver

**Staff Analyst:** Martha Lester; Vinh Tang

### Budget Committee Vote:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/10/2009	Pass 6-3-Absent	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Council requests that the Department of Information Technology (DoIT), working with other City departments, compile an inventory report of all City-owned or City-leased personal computers and laptop computers used by City staff. This report will help Council evaluate current hardware and software replacement policies and potential hardware and software upgrades in the future. Based on the inventory report the Council receives in 2010, it may consider institutionalizing this reporting request for future years.

**Background:** The current City policy reads in part, "Each City department shall prepare a replacement plan for desktop and laptop personal computers, owned or leased. The replacement plan shall have a four year horizon; shall be updated annually; shall be approved by the Chief Technology Officer (CTO); and shall be submitted to the City Budget Office with the department's proposed budget for the following year. The replacement plan shall include: an inventory of computers; shall schedule the replacement of each computer; and shall estimate the cost of the replacements." The current policy does not require DoIT to submit an annual inventory report to Council.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Energy and Technology

**Date Due to Council:** June 30, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
90	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Open Data Initiative, DoIT -- Transfer \$40,000 from Cable Television Franchise Subfund to DoIT fund and appropriate for the Open Data Initiative, and impose budget provisos.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Harrell; Licata; McIver

**Staff Analyst:** Martha Lester; Vinh Tang

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$80,000
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$80,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would transfer \$40,000 in 2010 from the Cable Television Franchise Subfund to the Department of Information Technology's (DoIT's) Information Technology Fund, and appropriate this amount for the Open Data Initiative. The Cable Television Franchise Subfund gets its revenue from franchise fees paid to the city, and it is forecast to have sufficient unreserved fund balance to cover this appropriation. This green sheet would also impose two budget provisos.

The Open Data Initiative is a project that will begin the process of migrating public City data to an open machine readable format for public use. If data are available in open machine readable

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
90	1	A	1

formats, the public will have the opportunity to enhance the data's original purpose by data collaboration and integration through mashups and semantic web technologies. The City can reduce costs associated with creating new online data contents and consulting studies by allowing the public to create these online tools, contents, and reports.

The City's current Geographic Information System (My Neighborhood Map) datasets are: 1) Cemeteries, 2) Computer/Media Center, 3) Family Support Center, 4) Farmers Markets, 5) Food Banks, 6) Health Centers - Community, 7) Health Centers - Public, 8) Heritage Trees, 9) Hospitals, 10) Landmarks, 11) Libraries, 12) Parks, 13) Neighborhood Service Centers, 14) P-Patches, 15) Pet License sales, 16) Public Toilets, 17) Public Spaces, 18) Fire Stations, 19) Police Precincts, 20) Airports, 21) Light Rail, 22) Ferry Terminal, 23) Monorail, 24) Motorcycle Parking, 25) ParkNRide, 26) South Lake Union Trolley, 27) Traffic Cameras, 28) Water Taxi, 29) Transfer Stations, 30) Museums and Galleries, 31) Public Art, 32) Seattle Center, 33) Basketball Courts, 34) Boat Launches, 35) Ceremonies, 36) Children's Play Areas, 37) Community Centers, 38) Environmental Learning Centers, 39) Firepits, 40) Fishing, 41) Golf Courses, 42) Off Leash Areas, 43) Picnic Sites, 44) Playfields, 45) Gardens, 46) Beaches, 47) Pools, 48) Tennis Courts, 49) Viewpoints, 50) Wading Pools, 51) Waterfront, 52) Elementary Schools, 53) Middle Schools, 54) High Schools, 55) Alternative Schools, and 56) Higher Education. Additional datasets may include: streetlights, project grants, shelters, flood data, overlay districts, historical area data, human service locations, water fountains, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) sites, parking data, block watches, and other datasets from City departments. The City will also seek feedback from the public on what datasets to prioritize first and indexed online in open machine readable formats.

The City currently creates much of this data both internally and externally with consultants, but the data is currently not in open machine readable formats and indexed appropriately for public use. Council requests that DoIT work with other City departments and Council staff that heavily create data in developing the proposal.

Council will also ask DoIT to evaluate the development of an application programming interface (API) for current Geographic Information Systems. An API will allow third party tools to interact with the City's online Geographic Information System. This evaluation will be included on the 2010 work program for the Energy and Technology Committee.

This green sheet would also impose the following budget provisos:

"Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Department of Information Technology's Office of Electronic Communications BCL, \$40,000 is appropriated solely for the Open Data Initiative and may be spent for no other purpose."

"Of the money appropriated in the 2010 budget for the Department of Information Technology's (DoIT's) Office of Electronic Communications BCL, \$40,000 may not be spent for the Open Data Initiative until authorized by future ordinance. Council anticipates that such authority will not be granted until DoIT provides a proposal for how this initiative will be implemented and how funding will be spent."

Tab	Action	Option	Version
90	1	A	1

### Budget Action Transactions

**Budget Action Title:** Open Data Initiative, DoIT – Transfer \$40,000 from Cable Television Franchise Subfund to DoIT fund and appropriate for the Open Data Initiative, and impose budget provisos.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Transfer to DoIT for Open Data Initiative				CBLFEE	Cable Fee Support to Information Technology Fund	D160B	00160	2010		\$40,000
2	Use fund balance for Open Data Initiative				CBLFEE	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	379100	00160	2010	\$40,000	
3	Increase revenue in DoIT Fund for Open Data Initiative				DOIT	Web Support - Cable Fund	542810	50410	2010	\$40,000	
4	Increase appropriation for Open Data Initiative				DOIT	Office of Electronic Communications	D4400	50410	2010		\$40,000

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
91	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Apps for Seattle, DoIT -- Transfer \$20,000 from Cable Television Franchise Subfund to DoIT fund and appropriate for the Apps for Seattle Contest, and impose budget provisos

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Harrell; McIver

**Staff Analyst:** Martha Lester; Vinh Tang

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$40,000
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$40,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would transfer \$20,000 in 2010 from the Cable Television Franchise Subfund to the Department of Information Technology's (DoIT's) Information Technology Fund, and appropriate this amount for the Apps for Seattle Contest. The Cable Television Franchise Subfund gets its revenue from franchise fees paid to the city, and it is forecast to have sufficient unreserved fund balance to cover this appropriation. This green sheet would also impose two budget provisos.

The Apps for Seattle Contest will call upon local web developers and the general public to create innovative applications, websites, and tools using the index of machine readable datasets. The Apps

---

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
91	1	A	2

for Seattle Contest will not occur until after DoIT completes the Open Data Initiative proposal of migrating to machine readable formats and indexing the machine readable format datasets.

This green sheet would also impose the following budget provisos:

“Of the appropriation in the 2010 budget for the Department of Information Technology’s Office of Electronic Communications BCL, \$20,000 is appropriated solely for the Apps for Seattle Contest and may be spent for no other purpose.”

“Of the money appropriated in the 2010 budget for the Department of Information Technology’s (DoIT’s) Office of Electronic Communications BCL, \$20,000 may not be spent for the Apps for Seattle Contest until authorized by future ordinance. Council anticipates that such authority will not be granted until DoIT provides a proposal for how this project will be implemented and how funding will be spent.”

Tab	Action	Option	Version
91	1	A	2

### Budget Action Transactions

**Budget Action Title:** Apps for Seattle, DoIT -- Transfer \$20,000 from Cable Television Franchise Subfund to DoIT fund and appropriate for the Apps for Seattle Contest, and impose budget provisos

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Transfer to DoIT for Apps for Seattle				CBLFEE	Cable Fee Support to Information Technology Fund	D160B	00160	2010		\$20,000
2	Use fund balance for Apps for Seattle				CBLFEE	Use of (Contribution to) Fund Balance	379100	00160	2010	\$20,000	
3	Increase revenue in DoIT Fund for Apps for Seattle				DOIT	Web Support - Cable Fund	542810	50410	2010	\$20,000	
4	Increase appropriation for Apps for Seattle				DOIT	Office of Electronic Communications	D4400	50410	2010		\$20,000

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
92	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** DoIT -- Study a possible new assistance program to help provide high-speed Internet access to low income households

**Councilmembers:** Conlin; Harrell; McIver

**Staff Analyst:** Martha Lester; Vinh Tang

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/10/2009</b>	<b>Pass 5- 4-Absent</b>	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Council requests that the Department of Information Technology (DoIT), working with Council staff, study a possible new assistance program for low income households to obtain high-speed Internet Access. The study should identify: 1) cost to manage and administer a sustainable assistance program, 2) income threshold for a household to qualify for the assistance program, 3) Internet Service Providers (Comcast, Broadstripe, Qwest) the City can partner with to administer this voluntary program, 4) means by which the system could receive voluntary donations from the public, 5) policy mandating that 100% of any donation go directly to households that qualify for the program, and 6) promotional activities that will encourage donations to the assistance program.

**Background:** Approximately 46% of households in Seattle with incomes averaging under \$30,000 receive high-speed Internet compared to 84% of households with incomes above \$50,000, according to the 2009 DoIT Technology Indicators' Survey.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Energy and Technology

**Date Due to Council:** March 31, 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
94	1	C	1

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$860,000 to SPL in 2010 to restore library operating hours.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Godden; Harrell; Licata; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Sara Belz; Patricia Lee

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	<b>2010 Increase (Decrease)</b>
<b>General Subfund</b>	
<b>General Subfund Revenues</b>	\$0
<b><u>General Subfund Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$860,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>(\$860,000)</b>
<b>Other Funds</b>	
<b>Other Funds Revenues</b>	\$860,000
<b><u>Other Funds Expenditures</u></b>	<u>\$860,000</u>
<b>Net Balance Effect</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
<b>Total Budget Balance Effect</b>	<b>(\$860,000)</b>

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would increase General Subfund (GSF) support for library services by \$860,000 in 2010. The Mayor's 2010 Proposed Budget includes a significant restructuring of library operating hours that would have the net effect of reducing open hours throughout the Seattle Public Library (SPL) system by 330 hours per week. This green sheet would restore 140 of the library operating hours that would be eliminated per the 2010 Proposed Budget. Increasing GSF support for library services by \$860,000 would also allow the Library Board to reinstate some of the 27 staff positions (18.8 FTE) that would be eliminated under the 2010 Proposed Budget.

Since 2006, the Central Library has been open 62 hours per week and the 26 branch libraries have

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
94	1	C	1

maintained schedules of 50-55 hours per week. The proposed restructuring of SPL operating hours in the 2010 Proposed Budget would expand the hours at five geographically dispersed branches (Ballard, Douglass-Truth, Lake City, Rainier Beach, and Southwest) to match the hours of the Central Library. It would also significantly reduce the operating hours of the 21 remaining branch libraries to a five day, 35 hour weekly operating schedule. Proposed cuts for those branches include eliminating all existing Friday and Sunday hours and reducing hours on Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays.

The proposed restructuring of SPL operating hours would produce a cost savings of \$1,203,000 GSF in 2010. This green sheet would add \$860,000 GSF to SPL's 2010 budget and reinstate SPL operating hours as shown in the table below:

<b>Proposed Restoration of Operating Hours</b>	<b>2010 (Cost)/ Savings</b>
Increase the 2010 operating schedules of six branch libraries (Beacon Hill, Broadview, Capitol Hill, Greenwood, Northeast, and West Seattle) from five days and 35 hours per week to seven days and 60 hours per week. (These branches would only be open from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. on Sundays.)	(\$917,000)
Decrease Sunday operating hours at the seven day branches included in the 2010 Proposed Budget (Ballard, Douglass-Truth, Lake City, Rainier Beach, and Southwest) from noon - 6 p.m. to 1 p.m. - 5 p.m. to make them consistent with the other seven day branches.	\$57,000
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$860,000</b>

The net effect of these changes would be to keep 11 geographically dispersed branches open seven days and 60 hours per week and offer five day, 35 hour operating schedules at the remaining 15 branches. The Central Library would maintain its current seven day, 62 hour weekly schedule.

Tab	Action	Option	Version
94	1	C	1

**Budget Action Transactions**

**Budget Action Title:** Add \$860,000 to SPL in 2010 to restore library operating hours.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Increase support for library operating hours				FG	Library Fund	Q5971041	00100	2010		\$860,000
2	Increase revenue from GSF for library operating hours				SPL	General Subfund Support	587001	10410	2010	\$860,000	
3	Increase appropriation for library operating hours				SPL	Library Services Division	B4PUB	10410	2010		\$860,000

**2010 City Council Budget Action (SLI)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
95	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Library Funding Options

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Conlin; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Sara Belz; Patricia Lee

**Budget Committee Vote:**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>TB</i>	<i>SC</i>	<i>RC</i>	<i>JD</i>	<i>JG</i>	<i>BH</i>	<i>NL</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>TR</i>
<b>11/12/2009</b>	<b>Pass 9-</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:** The Council requests that the City Librarian work with the Library Board, the Executive, the City Attorney’s office and Council staff in 2010 to explore potential new sources of ongoing revenue for the Seattle Public Library (SPL). This work should include the preparation of a written report for the Council’s review. The written report should include, but not be limited to: (1) information on revenue sources used to fund libraries in other jurisdictions, (2) the pros and cons of any potential new revenue sources, (3) the amount and stability of those revenue sources, and (4) any changes in state or municipal law that would be required.

Background. General Subfund (GSF) support accounts for most of SPL’s total annual revenues. However, the City’s ability to provide GSF support to SPL fluctuates with the City’s revenues. SPL receives some funding from library fines, copy and printing services, and other sources. The amount that can be raised from these sources is limited.

SPL also receives private donations which are not part of their operating budget but are used to enhance specific library programs. This annual amount also fluctuates depending on the amount of private donations or grants SPL receives in a given year.

The City anticipates a \$72 million reduction in revenues for 2009 and 2010 requiring significant reductions to most City services and programs. The reduction of GSF support to the SPL in 2010 will result in the reduction of library operating hours, a week-long closure of the library system and the layoff of staff. Consequently Council is interested in finding a stable, ongoing new revenue source for the SPL.

Council requests that the written report be submitted by no later than June 2010 to the Council’s Culture, Civil Rights, Health and Personnel Committee.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Culture, Civil Rights, Health, and Personnel

**Date Due to Council:** No later than June 2010

**2010 City Council Budget Action (Green Sheet)**

Approved

Tab	Action	Option	Version
98	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Use CDBG funds and excess fund balance in Low-Income Housing Fund to support certain programs and administration costs and impose a budget proviso

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Traci Ratzliff

**Council Bill or Resolution:**

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	TB	SC	RC	JD	JG	BH	NL	RM	TR
11/12/2009	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Summary of Dollar Effect**

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2010 Increase (Decrease)
<b>General Subfund</b>	
General Subfund Revenues	\$0
<u>General Subfund Expenditures</u>	(\$460,000)
Net Balance Effect	\$460,000
<b>Other Funds</b>	
Other Funds Revenues	(\$160,000)
<u>Other Funds Expenditures</u>	(\$160,000)
Net Balance Effect	\$0
<b>Total All Funds</b>	
Total Budget Balance Effect	\$460,000

**Description of proposed budget action:**

This green sheet would reduce CDBG funding in the 2010 budget to the Office of Housing (OH) by \$460,000 for the Housing First Project. OH has existing fund balance in the Low-Income Housing Fund, including interest earnings from fund balance, that can be used for the project without requiring additional CDBG dollars. In addition, this green sheet reduces \$460,000 in General Subfund (GSF) supported staffing and program activities in HSD, OED, OH, and Finance General and uses the freed up CDBG funding to fund these and other activities, as well as \$50,000 in funding for tenant improvements for a new shelter for Mary's Place, a non-profit organization that serves low-

\* Has Proviso

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
98	1	A	2

income women. This green sheet results in providing additional GSF of \$460,000 to be used to fund other Council priorities. This green sheet also imposes a budget proviso (see below).

The Mayor's 2010 Proposed Budget included CDBG funding and HOME funding for the capital costs of the Housing First Project. The availability of existing housing funds to support the Housing First Project recently came to light and permits the Council to free up \$460,000 in CDBG funds to be used for additional Council priorities.

This green sheet adopts the following budget proviso:

"None of the money appropriated in the 2010 budget for the Community Development Block Grant, Human Services Department BCL may be spent for tenant improvements in a new shelter for Mary's Place until the Human Services Department has executed a contract with Mary's Place for public benefits consisting of shelter and services for homeless women. The Council anticipates that the Human Services Department will not execute a contract until Mary's Place secures a new permanent location for the shelter and provides business, fundraising, development and operating plans that show how the new shelter will be funded."

Tab	Action	Option	Version
98	1	A	2

### Budget Action Transactions

**Budget Action Title:** Use CDBG funds and excess fund balance in Low-Income Housing Fund to support certain programs and administration costs and impose a budget proviso

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Cut appropriation for Housing First Project.				CDBG	Office of Housing	6XZ10	17810	2010		(\$460,000)
2	Cut appropriation for Commercial Corridor Revitalization Program.				OED	Office of Economic Development	X1D00	00100	2010		(\$100,000)
3	Cut GSF support for staffing costs for homeless planning.				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		(\$36,000)
4	Cut revenue from GSF for staffing costs for homeless planning.				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	(\$36,000)	
5	Cut appropriation for staffing costs for homeless planning.				HSD	Emergency and Transitional Services	H30ET	16200	2010		(\$36,000)
6	Cut GSF support for CDBG Administration.				FG	Human Services Operating Fund	Q5971620	00100	2010		(\$74,000)
7	Cut revenue from GSF for CDBG Administration.				HSD	General Subfund Support	587001	16200	2010	(\$74,000)	
8	Cut appropriation for CDBG Administration.				HSD	Community Facilities	H30CF	16200	2010		(\$74,000)
9	Cut GSF support for staffing in multifamily program.				FG	Housing Operating Fund	QA-OHFUND	00100	2010		(\$50,000)
10	Cut revenue from GSF for staffing in multifamily program.				OH	General Subfund Support	587001	16600	2010	(\$50,000)	
11	Cut appropriation for staffing in multifamily program.				OH	Office of Housing Operating Fund 16600	XZ600	16600	2010		(\$50,000)

Tab	Action	Option	Version
98	1	A	2

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
12	Cut appropriation for CASA Latina.				FG	Support to Community Development	2QF00	00100	2010		(\$200,000)
13	Increase appropriation for Commercial Corridor Revitalization Program.				CDBG	Office of Economic Development	6XD10	17810	2010		\$100,000
14	Increase appropriation for staffing costs for homeless planning, staffing and rent for CDBG Admin Staff, funding for Casa Latina and funding for tenant improvements for Mary's Place.				CDBG	Human Services Department	6HSD10	17810	2010		\$360,000