Form revised: February 26, 2014

FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
City Budget Office	Jeanette Blankenship 615-0087	Lisa Mueller 684-5339

Legislation Title:

AN ORDINANCE related to the Office of Housing; lifting a budget proviso imposed on the Office of Housing Operating Fund Budget Control Level to allow spending for a predevelopment study that would evaluate the feasibility of expanding Legacy House and an International Community Health Services clinic as provided in Ordinance 124349, which adopted the 2014 Budget.

Summary of the Legislation:

This ordinance lifts a budget proviso imposed on \$295,000 in the Office of Housing Operating Fund Budget Control Level for a predevelopment study that would evaluate the feasibility of expanding Legacy House and an International Community Health Services (ICHS) clinic as provided in Ordinance 124349, which adopted the 2014 Budget.

Background:

The 2014 Adopted City Budget includes \$295,000 GSF in 2014 for a pre-development study that would evaluate the feasibility of expanding Legacy House, a low-income senior housing facility.

The City Council placed a budget proviso on funds such that the Office of Housing cannot expend funds on a predevelopment study for Legacy House and International Community Health Services clinic until the City Council has reviewed a detailed budget for the predevelopment study that includes non-City funding to the extent that such resources are available.

Please c	heck one of the following:
X	This legislation does not have any financial implications.
	This legislation has financial implications.

Other Implications:

- a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications? Yes. This legislation removes a proviso and allows the Office of Housing to spend funds appropriated in the 2014 Adopted Budget for a predevelopment study to expand Legacy House and add a new International Community Health Services clinic.
- b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?

 If this legislation is not implemented, the Office of Housing will not be able to spend funds appropriated for a predevelopment study for Legacy House.
- c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department? Office of Housing.
- d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives? $N\!/\!A$
- e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?
- f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?
 No.
- g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property? No.
- h) Other Issues:

List attachments to the fiscal note below:

Attachment A: Budget for SCIDpda/ICHS Predevelopment Study

Budget for SCIDpda/ICHS Predevelopment Study

6/20/2014		Sources				
		City Funds 2014 Adopted		KC	Other	Total
Dhaca 1	FEACIDILITY CTUDY	Budget	Kind	Brownfields	Funds	Sources
Phase 1	FEASIBILITY STUDY					
	market demand analysis PACE	30,000				20,000
						30,000
	Assisted living/senior housing project management	8,000 3,800				8,000
	Subtotal Phase 1	41,800				3,800 41,800
	Subtotal Hase 1	41,000	-	-	-	41,000
Phase 2	SITE SELECTION ANALYSIS ³					
	space program analysis					
	PACE	10,000				10,000
	Assisted living/senior housing	5,000				5,000
	site suitability analysis					
	environmental analysis ¹	-		30,000		30,000
	geotech analysis	20,000				20,000
	legal/title search	4,000				4,000
	other impacts	13,000				13,000
	conceptual design	35,000				35,000
	capital cost analysis	10,000				10,000
	project management	12,700				12,700
	Subtotal Phase 2	109,700	-	30,000	-	139,700
Phase 3	SITE IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS ⁴					
	operational proforma					
	PACE	15,000				15,000
	Assisted living/senior housing	5,000				5,000
	ownership options	6,000				6,000
	financing options	11,000				11,000
	financial feasibilty	14,000				14,000
	final report/presentations	7,000				7,000
	project management	5,800				5,800
	Subtotal Phase 3	63,800	-	-	-	63,800
Devt Reserves	SOFT COST RESERVES FOR DEVT ⁵	79,700				79,700
PACE Program	PACE Demand Analysis ⁶		35,000		45,000	80,000
PACE Program	PACE Program implementation ⁷				295,000	295,000
	Total Cost/Contribution	295,000	35,000	30,000	340,000	700,000

Lisa Mueller
CBO Feasability Study FISC ATT A
June 24,2014
Version #2

Notes

- ¹ King County Brownfields grant will be pursued for this item. If it is not able to be secured, the City would use 2014 Adopted Budget funds, which will reduce the Soft Costs reserves by approximately \$30,000.
- ² City funds from 2014 will be provided to SCIDpda on reimbursable basis for actual costs. Soft cost reserves will increase or decrease based on budgeted-to-actual expenditures.
- ³ Phase 2 costs will only be incurred if the market demand analysis performed in Phase 1 concludes that sufficient demand exists, SCIDpda provides a report to the City on the findings.
- ⁴ Phase 3 costs would not be incurred until SCIDpda provides a report to the City on the findings from Phase 2.
- ⁵ Reserves for soft costs associated with development, if the project moves forward to construction.
- ⁶ All costs reflected in this row were incurred over past year in preparation for potential PACE program. Future In Kind is not reflected.
- 7 Funds pledged from the Coulter Foundation.