

2013 - 2014 Seattle City Council Green Sheet

Ready for Notebook

Tab	Action	Option	Version
107	1	C	1

Budget Action Title: Cut \$176,091 in 2013 and \$184,555 in 2014 of GSF to DPR and proviso \$100,000 each year for structured programming at community centers.

Councilmembers: Bagshaw; Clark; Conlin

Staff Analyst: Kathy Nyland; Traci Ratzliff

Council Bill or Resolution:

Date		Total	SB	BH	TR	RC	TB	NL	JG	SC	MO
	Yes										
	No										
	Abstain										
	Absent										

Summary of Dollar Effect

See the following pages for detailed technical information

	2013 Increase (Decrease)	2014 Increase (Decrease)
General Subfund		
General Subfund Revenues	\$0	\$0
General Subfund Expenditures	(\$176,091)	(\$184,555)
Net Balance Effect	\$176,091	\$184,555
Other Funds		
Park and Recreation Fund (10200)		
Revenues	(\$176,091)	(\$184,555)
Expenditures	(\$176,091)	(\$184,555)
Net Balance Effect	\$0	\$0
Total Budget Balance Effect	\$176,091	\$184,555

Budget Action description:

This Green Sheet would reduce GSF support to the Department of Parks and Recreation by \$176,091 in 2013 and \$184,555 in 2014, thus eliminating the Mayor’s proposed additional hours at seven community centers. It would leave an add of \$100,000 GSF in both 2013 and 2014 for community centers hours in the proposed budget; but this Green Sheet would proviso those funds for structured programming for teens.

This Green Sheet would impose the following budget proviso:

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
107	1	C	1

“Of the appropriation in the 2013 budget for the Department of Parks and Recreation’s (DPR’s) Recreation Facilities and Programs BCL, \$100,000 is appropriated (and of the amount endorsed for 2014, \$100,000 is expected to be appropriated) solely for structured programming for teens and may be spent for no other purpose. Furthermore, none of the money so appropriated in 2013 may be spent until authorized by future ordinance. The Council anticipates that such authority will not be granted until DPR reports to the Council Parks and Neighborhoods Committee describing the teen structured programming proposed to be implemented at which identified Community Centers.”

The Mayor’s 2013-2014 proposed budget includes \$276,091 in 2013 and \$284,555 in 2014 to increase the public hours or drop-in hours at seven community centers that are currently classified as either 2a or 2b centers. The seven centers were chosen based on rankings related to the following crime statistics for 2012: number of violent crimes committed within 3000 feet of a center; number of shots fired within 3000 feet of a center, and number of violent youth crimes that occurred within 3000 feet of a center. Only 2a and 2b community centers were considered for additional hours based on a ranking of these three crime statistics.

There have been some questions about the analysis behind the rankings, including whether there is strong enough evidence supporting the assumption that those additional community centers hours lead to reduced criminal activity. There does not seem to be a strong correlation behind the analysis presented, the statistics and the selection of community centers.

Rather than just funding additional hours to 2a and 2b sites at this time, Council would rely on the alternative management and staffing model for the City’s community centers which was announced, discussed, and implemented earlier this year. This new management model relies on data, needs, and ties allotted hours to the performance of a center. There is flexibility so geographic team managers can adjust hours and programming at individual centers to meet the demand and need of different centers within a cluster and this can be done at any time.

DPR has stated that is premature to make modifications to the geographic teams and tiered levels at this time. They would prefer to gather 15 to 18 months of data before adjustments are discussed. By eliminating the Mayor’s proposed approach to additional hours, Council would abide by DPR’s approach and not make changes until data is gathered. Council would also make available \$100,000 for DPR to use for structured programming for teens at sites where warranted.

DPR would need to report back to the Council’s Parks and Neighborhoods Committee showing how the \$100,000 of funds would be used for structured programming and where these programs would occur. These funds could not be spent until Council reviews the proposed programs. DPR should report to City Council by March 15, 2013, describing the teen structured programming proposed and at which community centers.

<i>Tab</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Option</i>	<i>Version</i>
107	1	C	1

Budget Action Transactions

Budget Action Title: Cut \$176,091 in 2013 and \$184,555 in 2014 of GSF to DPR and proviso \$100,000 each year for structured programming at community centers.

#	Transaction Description	Position Title	Number of Positions	FTE	Dept	BCL or Revenue Source	Summit Code	Fund	Year	Revenue Amount	Expenditure Amount
1	Reduce GSF support to DPR for community centers.				FG	Parks and Recreation Fund	Q5971020	00100	2013		(\$176,091)
2	Reduce revenue from GSF for community centers.				DPR	General Subfund Support	587001	10200	2013	(\$176,091)	
3	Decrease appropriation for community centers.				DPR	Recreation Facilities and Programs	K310D	10200	2013		(\$176,091)
4	Reduce GSF support to DPR for community centers.				FG	Parks and Recreation Fund	Q5971020	00100	2014		(\$184,555)
5	Reduce revenue from GSF for community centers.				DPR	General Subfund Support	587001	10200	2014	(\$184,555)	
6	Decrease appropriation for community centers.				DPR	Recreation Facilities and Programs	K310D	10200	2014		(\$184,555)