

April 14, 2013

To: Public Safety, Civil Rights & Technology Committee

From: Peter Harris, Central Staff

Re: Council Bill transferring \$500,000 from SYVPI to Parks and HSD and removing the proviso on SYVPI expansion funding

Introduction

On April 17 the Committee will consider a Council Bill that would transfer \$500,000 from the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (Initiative) to the Department of Parks & Recreation (Parks) and the Human Services Department (HSD) for youth employment and mentoring programs, and also lift the proviso on the remaining \$520,181 in Initiative expansion funding. This bill reflects the direction the Committee gave to Central Staff on April 3.

This memo explains some features of the bill:

The Initiative also includes youth employment and mentoring programs. What's the difference?

What is the basis for the proposed appropriations to Parks and HSD?

What happens next?

The Initiative also includes youth employment and mentoring programs. What's the difference?

The main difference is that employment and mentoring opportunities are only parts of the Initiative, and not the largest parts, while employment with related mentoring is the main focus of the Parks and HSD youth employment programs.

Table 1 shows the Initiative's allocation of its 2013 budget, not including the expansion funds held by proviso. This information was provided recently by the Initiative in response to a question from CM Bagshaw. The allocations are sorted into three categories, based on their titles and my current understanding of what they contain:

Administration, management & coordination: This includes City administrative activities, the management and coordination services provided by the three neighborhood networks, and youth center coordinators.

Services indirectly related to violence prevention: This includes direct services to youth that are not claimed to directly reduce violence. Youth employment and recreation are included here because the stated purpose of each is not to reduce violence by means of employment or recreation, but rather to attract and connect youth to the initiative so they can be

provided services that do directly prevent violence. Case management is included here because it is often regarded as a service, even though much of case management consists of coordinating services for individual clients.

Services directly related to violence prevention: This includes aggression replacement training, street outreach and mentoring, and one service delivered through the community matching grant, which is a bullying prevention program. This categorization means only that these are claimed to directly reduce violence, not that there is good evidence they do so.

Table 1: Major allocations of 2013 budget for Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative		
Administration, management and coordination	\$	% of total
Contract management	\$119,390	3%
Network & Intake, Central	\$251,529	19%
Network & Intake, Southeast	\$251,529	
Network & Intake, Southwest	\$251,529	
Youth Center Coordinators	\$310,896	8%
Initiative Director	\$392,192	10%
Database consulting	\$76,083	2%
Database	\$99,240	3%
Community education	\$20,000	1%
Risk assessment tool	\$30,000	1%
Subtotal	\$1,802,388	46%
Services indirectly related to violence prevention		
Case management	\$714,000	18%
Youth employment	\$577,204	15%
Recreation	\$116,750	3%
Community matching grant	\$201,875	5%
Subtotal	\$1,609,829	41%
Services directly related to violence prevention		
Anger management	\$61,200	2%
Mentoring	\$132,000	3%
Street Outreach	\$307,755	8%
Community matching grant – Bullying prevention	\$18,300	0.5%
Subtotal	\$519,255	13%
Total	\$3,931,472	100%

Table 1 shows that the youth employment element of the Initiative accounts for 15% of the budget and mentoring accounts for 3%. My understanding is that the \$577,000 for youth employment goes entirely to place youth in the Human Services youth employment program. Among other things, this implies some additional administrative costs within this line.

Information from last fall's budget deliberations indicated that the Initiative then intended to allocate 29% of the expansion funding to youth employment and 6% to mentoring, and the rest in roughly similar proportions as the base allocations, except none more for City administrative costs in the Initiative itself. How the Initiative would allocate the \$520,181 in expansion funding remaining after passage of this ordinance would be up to the Initiative, as all these funds are in one Budget Control Level.

The 2013-2014 proposed budget for the Initiative would have increased its funding by \$1.9 million, allowing it to accommodate 450 additional youth, for an average cost of \$4222 each. Not every youth in the Initiative receives an employment opportunity, so this average may not apply to those who do. Since youth employment requires a stipend or salary, and the youth employed through the Initiative also receive case management and other Initiative services, we might expect the average cost to be higher for this group.

In response to a 2013 budget proviso on \$176,091 in the adopted Parks budget, Parks recently proposed a new Youth Career Training Program. Table 2 shows the cost breakdown from this proposal.

Table 2: 2013 Budget for Parks' proposed Youth Career Training Program		
	2013 Budget	% of total
Direct Youth Services		
Employment stipends	\$89,850	49%
Pre-employment certification classes	\$6,000	3%
Leadership training	\$3,000	2%
Training in urban design, forest restoration and ropes	\$3,500	2%
Training in aquatics and tennis	\$10,000	5%
Education and college prep	\$4,000	2%
Subtotal	\$116,350	64%
Equipment and supplies		
Meals and snacks	\$5,000	3%
Bus tokens and van rental	\$7,245	4%
Administrative supplies	\$2,250	1%
Subtotal	\$14,495	8%
Staffing		
Program management - 0.5 FTE Recreation Leader	\$21,788	12%
Case management and program support - 2 AmeriCorps staff	\$6,750	4%
Communication and outreach - 0.5 FTE IT Specialist Support	\$23,299	13%
Subtotal	\$51,837	28%
Total	\$182,682	100%

In 2013 this budget would allow the new program to accommodate 150 youth, for an average cost of \$1282 each. In 2014 the staffing costs would be greater because the program would operate for the full year. The same amount would allow the program to accommodate 110 youth in 2014, for an average cost of \$1666 each. The additional funding that would be provided by the proposed ordinance should allow Parks to accommodate more youth without increasing staffing costs pro rata. If so, the average cost per additional individual would be somewhere in between \$1282 and \$1666.

Central Staff has not yet had an opportunity to discuss these details with Parks. Nor has Central Staff had an opportunity to discuss with HSD the structure and costs of a potential expansion to its youth employment and related mentoring programs. Since the Initiative obtains its youth employment services from HSD, however, it may be safe to assume that the cost of expanded youth employment services within HSD would be about the same as the cost per individual that the Initiative is paying, without the Initiative's administrative and coordination overhead.

Another difference between the Initiative's youth employment and mentoring programs and those of Parks and HSD, of course, is that the Initiative claims that the combination of its youth employment and mentoring programs and the rest of the Initiative serves to reduce violence, while neither Parks nor HSD makes this claim for their youth employment programs, at least not as a primary benefit. But this difference leads right back to the main question for the Auditor's evaluation, which is whether the Initiative in fact reduces violence.

What is the basis for the proposed appropriations to Parks and HSD?

Because the employment opportunities provided by Parks' youth employment programs are within Parks itself, the number is limited by the available work for youth in Parks. The proposed ordinance assumes a maximum capacity of 200 youth employment opportunities in Parks per year. Using the average costs for 2013 and 2014 as a basis yields a two-year cost for expansion of

$$(200-150)*\$1218 + (200-110)*\$1666 = \$210,361$$

This is only an estimate, however, and would likely be revised by an analysis of the marginal costs of adding more youth to the new program as proposed. If the estimate is high, the ordinance would allow Parks to carry forward any unspent funds.

HSD finds employment opportunities for youth outside City government, so its program does not have this same kind of limit. Hence the ordinance allocates to HSD the remaining \$290,000 of the amount transferred from the Initiative.

What happens next?

If the proposed ordinance is passed, the Council should ask Parks and HSD to develop and report on their plans for providing more youth employment and mentoring opportunities this year. This information also would form part of the basis for this fall's budget deliberations on these topics.

Also in this event, Parks, HSD, the City Budget Office and Central Staff ideally would together review and if necessary refine the performance measures for these youth employment programs. As described in the Central Staff memo on the new Parks program that was presented to this

Committee in its last meeting, Parks' response to the proviso provided a good start on this for its new program.

Whether or not the ordinance is passed and implemented, the Auditor will hire a consultant to assist his staff and the Initiative in resolving the issues that prevented the Auditor from developing a complete evaluation plan for the Initiative. This may result in an evaluation plan later this year, perhaps in time for budget deliberations.

Conclusion

The proposed ordinance would allow the City to provide more youth employment and related mentoring opportunities while the City Auditor and Initiative management develop an evaluation plan for the Initiative, as requested by the Council last fall. The proposed ordinance makes one-time appropriations to Parks and HSD for this purpose. The Council should be prepared to address this entire domain again in budget deliberations this fall.

If you have any questions, please let me know.