

**ATTACHMENT A  
 2015 STATEMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT (SLI) BY COUNCIL COMMITTEE**

**Section 1: Summary List of SLIs**

No.	SLI No.	TITLE	RESPONSE DUE DATE(S)
<b>BUDGET COMMITTEE:</b>			
1.	120-2-A-1	General Sub-fund revenue update and proposed plan to address underspend.	4/7/2015 9/30/2015
<b>COUNCIL BRIEFING:</b>			
2.	75-2-A-2	Reports on the Domestic Violence Response Center (DVRC).	3/30/2015 8/31/2015
<b>HOUSING AFFORDABILITY, HUMAN SERVICES and ECONOMIC RESILIENCY COMMITTEE</b>			
3.	21-1-A-1	Development of an Affordable Housing Preservation Program.	3/31/2015
4.	56-1-A-2	Report by HSD and CBO on the cost to maintain existing human service delivery in light of minimum wage progression, including alternatives and assessment of capacity building for non-profit providers.	6/1/2015 9/1/2015
5.	69-1-A-1	Report by HSD on actions to respond to the findings of the Washington State Auditor's Office.	6/1/2015
6.	73-1-A-1	Locker Program for People Experiencing Homelessness.	6/30/2015
7.	80-1-A-1	Assessment of City owned Property for Host Locations for Shelters.	6/30/2015
8.	130-1-A-2	Investigate a capital project and bond sale to build housing.	4/1/2015
<b>FINANCE AND CULTURE COMMITTEE:</b>			
9.	33-1-A-1	Four-Year Plan to Increase the Balance of OAC's Arts Account Operating Reserve.	7/1/2015
10.	132-1-A-2	Investigate progressive measures like a "millionaire's tax" in Seattle.	4/1/2015
<b>PARKS, SEATTLE CENTER, LIBRARY AND GENDER PAY EQUITY COMMITTEE:</b>			
11.	47-2-A-2	Develop guidelines and recommendations concerning the Open Space Opportunity Fund.	7/31/2015
12.	54-1-A-2	Lake City Community Center Improvements.	Interim Report 6/2/2015 Final Report 9/4/2015
<b>PLANNING, LAND USE and SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE</b>			
13.	28-1-A-1	DPD Planning division work program development and reporting.	3/31/2015 6/30/2015 9/30/2015 12/31/2015
14.	41-1-A-2	Prepare legislation to increase penalties and remedies for violations of Seattle's labor laws.	4/1/2015
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY, CIVIL RIGHTS, and TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE</b>			
15.	89-3-A-1	Requesting the Seattle Police Department to regularly report to Council on hiring, staffing, and overtime.	3/31/2015 6/30/2015 9/30/2015 12/31/2015
<b>TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE</b>			
16.	101-2-A-2	Heavy Haul Corridor Implementation.	4/3/2015

**Section 2: Statements of Legislative Intent**

**BUDGET COMMITTEE:**

**1. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
120	2	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** General Sub-fund revenue update and proposed plan to address underspend

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Rebecca Herzfeld

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

In Green Sheet 120-1-A, the Council took several steps to eliminate the General Subfund (GSF) underspend assumed in the 2015 and 2016 proposed budgets. To follow up on these steps, Council requests that the Mayor provide the Council with the following:

1. A financial update that includes a full accounting of the actual 2014 GSF year-end fund balance and an update of 2015-2016 General Subfund revenue projections;
2. A proposed plan detailing how the Mayor will address the \$5.4 million cut in GSF appropriations to the departments that receive the largest amounts of GSF. The Council determined that this interim cut was necessary to eliminate the underspend in the proposed 2015 budget. The Mayor’s plan should indicate whether the Mayor intends to follow the interim across-the-board cuts to GSF funding or some other distribution among departments and Budget Control Levels;
3. The final GSF underspend targets for GSF departments that the Mayor is requesting for 2015; and
4. A proposed budget for 2016 that does not assume a GSF underspend.

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

**Date Due to Council:** Items 1, 2, and 3: April 7, 2015, Item 4: September 30, 2015

**COUNCIL BRIEFING:**

**2. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
75	2	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Reports on the Domestic Violence Response Center (DVRC)

**Councilmembers:** Clark; Godden; Harrell

**Staff Analyst:** Mark Baird; Jennifer Samuels

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

This Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) requests that the Human Services Department (HSD), in coordination with the Seattle Police Department (SPD), and Law Department (LAW), update the City Council on the implementation of its Domestic Violence Response Center (DVRC) strategic plan and identify investments for 2015 and 2016.

**Background:**

Entities from the City of Seattle and King County who are involved with various aspects of domestic violence response came together to explore options for a center to help victims. These law enforcement, City Attorney’s Office, Prosecutor’s Office, and advocate partners formed a leadership team and with help of the Seattle Police Foundation commissioned a feasibility study. From there, the team began to construct a strategic plan for making a resource center a reality.

The Seattle Domestic Violence Response Center (DVRC) Leadership Team proposes to finalize a strategic planning process, and develop an implementation plan for a DVRC in Seattle using a “family justice center 2.0” approach. This approach involves the co-location of a multi-disciplinary team of professionals who work together to provide coordinated services to victims of family violence. The basic partners include police officers, prosecutors, civil legal service providers, and community-based advocates. The concept is to provide one location where victims can go to talk to an advocate, plan for their safety, communicate with a police officer, meet with a prosecutor, get medical assistance, and receive information on things like shelter and transportation. It will involve creative forms of collaboration and capacity building that moves beyond a major reliance on physical co-location. A two-pronged approach would include:

- (1) Building upon the “initial co-location” scenario proposed in the feasibility analysis (focusing on co-locating various components of the criminal-legal system -- including County and City programs that intersect around Seattle DV cases) and

- (2) Increasing the capacity of related programs and services such as mobile or community-based domestic violence advocacy services. These advocates go to victims rather than have victims come to a location for advocacy and help with services.

A key component of the project is to realize greater overall capacity to serve victims and families, including utilization of advocates at multiple locations based on the needs of the victim. The DVRC would also explore the use of technology, such as secure video conferencing, to leverage existing resources and communicate with victims who are unable to visit the DVRC in person and for victims at the DVRC to communicate with offsite partners.

The City Council requests that HSD take a lead role in developing an inter-departmental response to Council and submit two written summaries detailing progress toward implementing the DVRC strategic plan to the City Council at a full Council Briefing. The first summary is due no later than March 30, 2015. The second summary is due no later than August 31, 2015. This report should include details of the planned investment by HSD, SPD, and LAW for the DVRC.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Council Briefing  
**Date Due to Council:** 3/30/2015; 8/31/2015

**HOUSING AFFORDABILITY, HUMAN SERVICES and ECONOMIC RESILIENCY COMMITTEE**

**3. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
21	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Development of an Affordable Housing Preservation Program

**Councilmembers:** Bagshaw; Burgess; Clark

**Staff Analyst:** Traci Ratzliff

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

In response to the growing loss of affordable rental housing units in Seattle, the City Council desires that the City develop a comprehensive program to preserve both subsidized and non-subsidized units that are affordable to households at or below 80% of area median income.

Office of Housing staff currently tracks potentially expiring subsidized units, but the effort should also explore feasibility of expanding City efforts to include non-subsidized units affordable to lower-income households. Therefore, the Council requests that the Executive develop an Affordable Housing Preservation (AHP) program. The goal of this program is to preserve rental housing units affordable to households with incomes at below 80% of area median income that could be lost as “affordable” due to: termination or expiration of a governmental funding contract, sale to a new owner, redevelopment by the existing owner, or other actions. Affordable rental housing includes those units that have received federal, state, and/or local subsidies or land use concessions that include rental rate restrictions, as well as market rate housing that is affordable to households at or below 80% of median income.

Elements of an Affordable Housing Preservation program could include:

- Enforcement of contract or subsidy termination notice requirements;
- Monitoring housing projects with contracts or subsidies that are expiring or could be terminated;
- Conducting outreach to property owners, tenants and stakeholders; and
- Facilitating property transactions that preserve affordable units.

The Executive is requested to submit an AHP program plan to the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda Advisory Committee established in Resolution 31546, no later than March 31, 2015. The Council’s Committee on Housing Affordability, Human Services and Economic Resiliency will consider recommendations from the advisory committee in the latter half of 2015.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing Affordability, Human Services, and Economic Resiliency

**Date Due to Council:** 3/31/2015

**4. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
56	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Report by HSD and CBO on the cost to maintain existing human service delivery in light of minimum wage progression, including alternatives and assessment of capacity building for non-profit providers.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; O'Brien

**Staff Analyst:** Ketil Freeman

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

The Council requests that the Human Services Department (HSD) and the City Budget Office report to the Council on the cost to maintain current City-funded human services delivery levels with the increased minimum wage. The report should be delivered to Council in two phases.

The first phase report, delivered by June 1, 2015, should quantify the impact of the minimum wage increase on City-funded human services providers, assuming current levels of human service delivery. The Executive is encouraged to complete this work in the context of continued development of HSD's "Outcomes Framework;" the need to prioritize City investments given revenue challenges and declining regional, state and federal revenues for human services; as well as recognition that Seattle alone cannot shoulder the full impacts of minimum wage increases on human services providers. At a minimum this report should include the following:

- An inventory of HSD contracts including services and funding levels, by Human Services Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) program; and
- A quantification by SIP program of the incremental budget increase that would be necessary to maintain existing services with scheduled minimum wage increases in 2016, 2017, and 2018.

The purpose of this first phase analysis is for the City and other funders to understand the cost impacts of the increased minimum wage and any changes in services provided. It is anticipated that this analysis would be done in partnership with human services providers. Data is needed from the providers in order to accurately estimate the cost to maintain existing services.

The second phase report, delivered by September 1, 2015, should examine the broader landscape of human services provision and stability given scheduled minimum wage increases and the changing priorities of other funders. At a minimum this report should include the following:

- An analysis and prioritization of potential service reductions in 2016, if funding levels are not increased to mitigate the impact to current City-funded human services providers of minimum wage increases;
- An analysis by SIP program of how service delivery and contract costs could change based on implementation of the results-based accountability “Outcomes Framework;”
- An analysis of how service delivery and contract costs could change based on the performance-based budgeting, which the Mayor has indicated will inform HSD’s proposed budget for 2016; and
- An assessment, based on consultation with other public funders and private philanthropic organizations and entities with expertise in non-profit management and finance, of potential programs, such as capacity building and development of new business models, to help human services providers adapt to the shifting revenue climate.

Both reports should be informed by interviews and information gathered from Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 employers who are current human services providers to the City. The second report should make recommendations for further action to strengthen Seattle’s human service providers.

**Background:**

In June the Council passed [Ordinance 124490](#), which establishes a new hourly minimum wage and minimum compensation for most employers with employees that work in Seattle. Ordinance 124490 sets out a schedule for minimum wage increases that begins on April 1, 2015. There are no exceptions to minimum wage requirements for non-profit employers. For the biennium, the required minimum wage or minimum compensation, whichever is higher, is shown in the table below.

	Beginning April 1, 2015	Beginning January 1, 2016
<i>Schedule 1: Employers with More than 500 Employees</i>	\$11 / hour	\$13 / hour*
<i>Schedule 2: Employers with 500 or Fewer Employees</i>	\$11 / hour	\$12 / hour

\*Large employers that provide healthcare are given a \$.50 credit in 2016.

Many non-profit human services providers that contract with the City currently pay some of their employees less than the required minimum wage that will be applicable on April 1, 2015. Consequently, many of these providers will struggle to maintain delivery of services at current levels, which is driven for most by staffing costs, without increased revenue to maintain staffing levels.

Over the biennium the cost of City contracts for maintaining current human service delivery levels will rise because of the increased minimum wage. In anticipations of this, as a companion piece of legislation to Ordinance 124490 the Council also adopted [Resolution 31542](#). Resolution 31542 requests that the Mayor submit a plan that, “address[es] steps the City should take to ensure human services providers and others with City contracts will be able to meet policy and service objectives while also meeting the new wage schedules.” Such a plan was not submitted to Council.

Patrick Wigren  
ATT A LEG SLI Resolution 2015 v6  
February 9, 2015

In addition, the proposed 2015 City budget and contemplated Council changes to the proposed budget include several “backfill” items; adds to previous spending to make up for funding losses to critical services. These reductions have stemmed from changes in funding by federal, state and private funders. The City will not be able to fill these gaps on an ongoing basis.

Wage changes and seemingly permanent changes in the funding environment indicate structural pressures the City and providers should address in order to ensure long-term service provision to those in need.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing Affordability, Human Services, and Economic Resiliency  
**Date Due to Council:** 6/1/2015 (Phase 1 Report); 9/1/2015 (Phase 2 Report)



**5. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
69	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Report by HSD on actions to respond to the findings of the Washington State Auditor's Office.

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; Licata

**Staff Analyst:** Ketil Freeman

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

The Council requests that the Human Services Department (HSD) report to the Council on progress towards completing short-term and long-term action steps to address the findings of the Washington State Auditor's Office (Auditor) in the *Federal Single Audit Report for the City of Seattle* published on September 30, 2014.

The report should detail steps implemented to address audit findings and any potential one-time or ongoing costs that may be associated with long-term action steps, such as costs associated with separation of job functions and reassignment of staff.

**Background:**

On September 30, 2014 the Auditor released audit findings for 2013 related to how HSD administers federal grant funding from a variety of sources including the Supportive Housing Program, the Continuum of Care Program, and the Community Development Block Grant Program. The Auditor found that inadequate contracting controls at the Human Services Department (HSD) led to reimbursement of approximately \$2.6M of questioned costs.

Among other things the Auditor recommended 1) separating grant making and contract administration functions into two positions and 2) assigning contract administration responsibilities by contractor rather than by HSD division. HSD has undertaken some immediate steps to respond to the audit findings. Additionally, in 2015 HSD will undertake further long-term action steps to respond to the findings including increasing separations in job functions. These steps may come with increased administrative costs. Long-term action steps include, but are not limited to:

- Developing and implementing a new monitoring practice for contracting compliance and quality control;

Patrick Wigren  
ATT A LEG SLI Resolution 2015 v6  
February 9, 2015

- Developing and implementing a strategy for continued separation of contracting job functions;
- Working with the Department of Human Resources to examine current job classifications; and
- Developing and implementing a plan to increase internal fiscal / compliance monitoring and oversight.

The Council has an ongoing interest in ensuring that reimbursement for human service provider costs are for eligible services and activities that benefit the target population for the service.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing Affordability, Human Services, and Economic Resiliency  
**Date Due to Council:** 6/1/2015

**6. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
73	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Locker Program for People Experiencing Homelessness

**Councilmembers:** Bagshaw; Clark; Harrell; O'Brien

**Staff Analyst:** Eric McConaghy; Lilly Rehrmann

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

This Statement of Legislative Intent requests that the Human Services Department (HSD) provide a report to the Committee for Housing Affordability, Human Services and Economic Resiliency (CHAHSER) outlining a strategy for the safe storage of unsheltered people’s belongings in Seattle. This report should include:

- A needs assessment for this storage program;
- Current City of Seattle funding for storage programs that meet this need;
- Alignment between a “safe storage program,” with other City of Seattle investments; and
- A proposed implementation plan that includes staffing, oversight, potential locations, and budget.

**Background:**

Currently in Seattle, people who are homeless have limited options for storing personal belongings, especially during the day when shelter programs are closed. As a result of the lack of storage facilities, personal belongings must be carried during the day and are often left out in the open throughout downtown Seattle, leading to a greater likelihood of loss or damage to important documents and items of great personal value.

Some shelters provide storage for people with designated beds in the shelter and Seattle Housing and Resource Effort (SHARE) operates a program with 200 lockers. There are few spaces available in any program.

HSD is a key partner involved in the City’s efforts to address homelessness as well as the quality of life for residents in Seattle.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing Affordability, Human Services, and Economic Resiliency  
**Date Due to Council:** 6/30/2015

**7. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
80	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Assessment of City owned Property for Host Locations for Shelters

**Councilmembers:** Bagshaw; Clark; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Jesse Gilliam

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

**Assessment of City owned Property for Host Locations for Shelters**

The Council requests the Human Services Department (HSD) work with Finance and Administrative Services (FAS) to assess the FAS annual surplus property list, Department of Parks and Recreation properties, Seattle Center properties, and other City owned properties to determine possible locations to host winter only, year round day and/or year round night shelter.

HSD is requested to share information about how the assessment process was conducted to member organizations of the King County Committee to End Homelessness as a model for other jurisdictions to investigate their publically owned properties.

**Background:**

The City of Seattle is committed to the Committee to End Homelessness plan to make homelessness rare, brief, and one time. While this requires investment in medium and long term services to provide access to housing, there is still a strong need for short term shelters. On a single night in January 2014, the One Night Count found more than 3,123 individuals living outside and another 6,171 in shelters or transitional housing within King County. Currently City Hall and Seattle Center operate shelters in public spaces successfully. This SLI will explore options for use of public spaces to provide shelter.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing Affordability, Human Services, and Economic Resiliency

**Date Due to Council:** 6/30/2015

**8. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
130	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Investigate a capital project and bond sale to build housing.

**Councilmembers:** Licata; Rasmussen; Sawant

**Staff Analyst:** Ted Virdone

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

Council requests the Mayor’s Office, the Office of Policy and Innovation, and the Office of Housing investigate/study a capital project finance by a large public bond sale to build or finance publicly owned or land trust owned high quality housing that is affordable to working people in Seattle on City owned surplus properties. The City has additional bond capacity in excess of \$1,000,000,000 and 133 acres of excess property, 61.5 acres of which are vacant, excess property. The bonds could be paid off and the properties maintained with below market rate rents paid by tenants of these publically owned properties and by progressive taxes.

**Background**

Working and poor people in Seattle face an extreme crisis of affordable housing. Rents are rising faster in Seattle than in any other major city in the country and average Seattle area home prices are at record highs. Homelessness has dramatically increased as well; the annual one-night count in 2014 found 3,123 people without shelter in the city, up from 2,736 from the 2013 count. The affordable housing crisis is also shown by the Seattle Housing Authority report that 24,000 people applied for just 2,000 spots on its Voucher waiting list. A City-wide program to build a large amount of publicly owned affordable housing would not only benefit the tenants living in these units, it would also put downward pressure on the cost of housing, benefiting Seattle’s renters in general.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Housing Affordability, Human Services, and Economic Resiliency

**Date Due to Council:** 4/1/2015

**FINANCE AND CULTURE COMMITTEE:**

**9. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
33	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Four-Year Plan to Increase the Balance of OAC's Arts Account Operating Reserve

**Councilmembers:** Budget Committee

**Staff Analyst:** Sara Belz; Frank Video

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

The City Council requests that the Office of Arts and Culture (OAC) work with the City Budget Office to develop a plan for increasing the minimum balance of the operating reserve in the Arts Account to \$600,000 by January 1, 2019. The current balance of the reserve is \$400,000. The plan to increase the balance of the reserve should be based on the most recent Admission Tax forecast data available and outline a reasonable, phased approach that could be implemented over the next four years. To the extent possible, implementation of the plan should minimize cuts to OAC's existing programs. The Council requests the plan be submitted to the Council's Finance and Culture Committee by no later than July 1, 2015.

**Background:**

The Arts Account supports all OAC programs, except those associated with the 1% for Art initiative, and is almost entirely funded by Admission Tax revenues. Consistent with Resolution 31507, which was adopted by the Council in March of 2014, a minimum operating reserve of \$400,000 is maintained in the Arts Account to address short-term fluctuations in Admission Tax revenues that could undermine OAC's ability to fund its existing programs. Beginning in 2016, the Resolution calls for the minimum reserve balance to be adjusted annually by CPI. In the event the reserve remains underfunded for more than two years, the policies outlined in the Resolution call for OAC appropriations to be adjusted to allow the reserve fund to be replenished.

With the City currently experiencing healthy increases in annual Admission Tax revenues, the Council is interested in raising the minimum balance for the Arts Account operating reserve to \$600,000 by 2019. This would have the effect of further shielding OAC programs from Admission Tax revenue declines that could occur in the future.

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

**Date Due to Council:** 7/1/2015

**10. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
132	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Investigate progressive measures like a "millionaires tax" in Seattle

**Councilmembers:** Licata; Rasmussen; Sawant

**Staff Analyst:** Ted Virdone

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

Council requests the Law Department research the legal possibilities that exist to impose an excise tax on annual individual or household earnings in excess of \$1,000,000. This will prepare council and advocates of progressive revenue sources to draft legislation to institute progressive measures like a millionaires tax in 2016.

It is intended to mitigate the effects of Washington State's tax structure, the most regressive in the United States, which forces the poorest 20% of the population to pay 16.9% of their income in local taxes while the wealthiest 1% pay only 2.8%. An excise tax on households earning \$1,000,000 or more per year could generate revenue to address Seattle's affordable housing crisis, expand human services, which are currently underfunded and facing cuts, and fund mass transportation projects. Households earning less than \$1,000,000 per year would not be affected.

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

**Date Due to Council:** 4/1/2015

**PARKS, SEATTLE CENTER, LIBRARY AND GENDER PAY EQUITY COMMITTEE:**

**11. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
47	2	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Develop guidelines and recommendations concerning the Open Space Opportunity Fund

**Councilmembers:** Bagshaw; Burgess; Clark; Godden; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Evan Clifthorne; Traci Ratzliff

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

Council requests that the City Budget Office and the Department of Parks and Recreation will create an Interdepartmental Team which will include the Department of Finance and Administrative Services, the Department of Neighborhoods, the Office of Sustainability & Environment, the Legislative Department, and other appropriate departments to evaluate the concept and the need for a new Open Space Opportunity Fund.

The Open Space Opportunity Fund is envisioned as a City-managed program that would work with community members or organizations to assist in the purchase or retention of surplus City property for use as publicly accessible “open space” which will be defined here as including greenbelts, wildlife and natural areas, P-Patch sites, or similar real property.

The Council further envisions that the purchase of surplus real property through the OSOF could ultimately be supplemented with funds from those community members or organizations that express interest in or benefit from retaining the property as open space.

**This evaluation should include the following:**

1. Review current resources of the Parks and Recreation or other departments for property acquisition for open space purposes;
2. Review current surplus property and new property acquisition policies of the Parks and Recreation Department or other City Departments that acquire property for public use or enjoyment;
3. Review of how or whether current City goals related to Urban Forest Stewardship and the Climate Action Plan are considered when the City acquires or determines to surplus property. Should existing surplus property policies be modified to address these goals?
4. Review the open space standards of the City’s Comprehensive Plan and quantify the need for additional resources to acquire open space to meet the standards.
5. Identify new and innovative funding, ownership and management strategies for retaining surplus city property as open space.



6. Identify any legal barriers to the City funding a program which would assist in the purchase or retention of surplus City property by community members or organizations for use as publically accessible open spaces, natural areas, P-Patches or similar uses.

**If the evaluation leads to a recommendation to create a new Open Space Opportunity Fund, the SLI response should address the following questions:**

7. What are the criteria for selecting properties to be eligible for purchase through the OSOF, and how would those properties be prioritized?
8. What policies or strategies would help to ensure administration of an OSO fund in a fair and equitable fashion throughout the city?
9. What are the options for funding the OSOF?
10. How should the appropriate level of financial contribution from community members or organizations toward the purchase of a given property be determined, and should the contribution levels be uniform or should they vary based on geographic and/or demographic conditions?
11. If some level of community contribution is required as part of the OSOF purchase of surplus property, what is the appropriate course of action if the community contribution levels are not met in a timely manner? What is an appropriate timeline for requiring any such contribution?
12. What options exist for final disposition of purchased surplus property? Should the property remain under City ownership and management, or should the property be transferred to a third party for the purpose of conserving that property as an open space or natural area? What are the pros and cons of each approach?
  - a. If a third party is more appropriate, what if any restrictive covenants should run with the property? What guidelines should exist concerning the sale of the property, and with whom might potential partnerships be formed concerning the purchase and maintenance of the property?
13. How would ongoing maintenance and operations of these properties be funded or assured?
14. What options exist concerning public outreach to neighborhoods who may wish to participate in this program? What partnerships might help facilitate the implementation of those options?
15. What entity would most appropriately serve as the managing entity for the OSOF, and what staffing would be required for that entity?

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Seattle Center, Libraries and Gender Pay Equity

**Date Due to Council:** 7/31/2015

**12. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
54	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Lake City Community Center Improvements

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; O'Brien

**Staff Analyst:** Meg Moorehead

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

The Council requests the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to prepare a report that outlines the next steps for improvements at the Lake City Community Center. The report should include:

1. Any proposed changes in the use of the Lake City Community Center that are recommended by Community Center Strategic Plan scheduled for completion in 2015.
2. Alternatives (including a preferred alternative) for rehabilitation or rebuilding of the Lake City Community Center including an alternative for construction of a new facility.
3. Costs and financing options for the preferred alternative, including the option of using Limited Tax General Obligation Bonds to finance the project.
4. A schedule for implementing the preferred alternative.

The Council requests that capital funds for the preferred alternative be included in the proposed 2016 Budget and 2016-2021 Capital Improvement Program even if it means deferring other DPR capital priorities.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks, Seattle Center, Libraries and Gender Pay Equity

**Date Due to Council:** Interim Report: 6/2/2015

Final Report: 9/4/2015

**PLANNING, LAND USE and SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE**

**13. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
28	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** DPD Planning Division work program development and reporting

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; O'Brien

**Staff Analyst:** Lish Whitson

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

Council requests that the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) report to the Council periodically on work program development for the Planning Division. Among other things, the Planning Division contains functions in DPD that develop policy and regulations that are incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan, the Land Use Code, and other policy and regulatory documents that govern development of the built environment.

In the 2014 adopted budget, the Council included Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) 43-1-A-1 that directed DPD to prepare a work program that could be used as a shared tool by the Council and Mayor to prioritize resources among projects in the Planning Budget Control Level (BCL). Consistent with SLI 43-1-A-1, the Planning Director reports quarterly on work program development and briefs the Planning, Land Use and Sustainability (PLUS) Committee on proposed new projects. This budget action continues the required work program reporting.

**Frequency of Report:**

Written reports should be provided quarterly to the Council in advance of the quarterly supplemental budget and grant acceptance ordinances and never later than March 31, June 30, September 30, and December 31, 2015. Reports may be provided concurrently with regularly scheduled reports by the DPD Director to the PLUS Committee.

**Contents of Report:**

Each report shall contain the following:

- An up-to-date work program;
- A narrative description of any new or changed projects proposed by the Executive or Council;
- Approximate FTE assignments by project; and
- A summary table identifying by project and fund source all anticipated resources likely to flow from quarterly grant acceptance and supplemental budget ordinances or from

Patrick Wigren  
ATT A LEG SLI Resolution 2015 v6  
February 9, 2015

any other sources not required to be appropriated through a supplemental budget ordinance.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Planning, Land Use and Sustainability

**Date Due to Council:** 3/31/2015; 6/30/2015; 9/30/2015; 12/31/2015

**PUBLIC SAFETY, CIVIL RIGHTS, and TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**

**14. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
89	3	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Requesting the Seattle Police Department to regularly report to Council on hiring, staffing, and overtime

**Councilmembers:** Bagshaw; Burgess; Harrell

**Staff Analyst:** Mark Baird

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

Hiring, staffing, and overtime are important aspects of the Seattle Police Department’s operations. They impact the number of sworn officers that are available to maintain the public’s safety and the costs associated with it. Hiring new police officers to keep up with levels of attrition and grow the force has been a challenge. Likewise, maintaining a consistently adequate number of officers assigned to the precincts has also been difficult. SPD overtime has been an issue for years and was recently highlighted as an ongoing problem. The City Council is concerned about each of these issues and their impact on SPD and the budget. This Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) requests that the Seattle Police Department provide regular written reports on several important aspects of its operation to the Public Safety, Civil Rights and Technology Committee as follows:

**Hiring Process and Progress Update**

Provide a quarterly written report containing the following:

- Progress on examining and retooling the department’s hiring process completed during the quarter and
- The quarterly hiring and staffing update that includes the updated quarterly and annual hiring forecast.

**Precinct Staffing**

Provide a quarterly written report on the following:

- The number of sworn officers assigned to 9-1-1 response per precinct (as currently provided) and
- A table depicting the sworn officer on loan numbers by precinct and the unit on loan to.

**Overtime**

Provide a monthly written update on the following:

- The overtime overview and training process and overtime spent by resource code for the previous month and year-to-date.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Public Safety, Civil Rights and Technology

**Date Due to Council:** Report on Hiring and Staffing quarterly and Overtime monthly.

**15. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
41	1	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Prepare legislation to increase penalties and remedies for violations of Seattle's labor laws

**Councilmembers:** O'Brien; Rasmussen; Sawant

**Staff Analyst:** Ted Virdone

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

Council requests the Mayor’s Office prepare legislation to be discussed in the Select Committee on the Minimum Wage and Income Inequality or successor select committee to increase the penalties levied on employers who violate labor law in Seattle, and to increase the remedies for the workers who are the victims of these crimes. Wage theft is a serious and widespread problem in Seattle, and the 2014 audit of paid safe and sick leave found a lack of effective enforcement.

Council has not had a discussion about penalties and remedies to dissuade labor law scofflaws. The enforcement language in the minimum wage legislation was described as a “placeholder,” but that language was not amended by the proposed legislation to enact the new Office of Labor Standards. This SLI would provide Council with the opportunity to discuss those remedies and penalties.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Select Committee on the Minimum Wage and Income Inequality

**Date Due to Council:** 4/1/2015

**TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**16. 2015 - 2016 Seattle City Council Statement of Legislative Intent**

**Approved**

Tab	Action	Option	Version
101	2	A	2

**Budget Action Title:** Heavy Haul Corridor Implementation

**Councilmembers:** Burgess; Clark; O'Brien

**Staff Analyst:** Peter Lindsay

**Budget Committee Vote:**

Date	Result	SB	BH	SC	TR	NL	TB	JG	MO	KS
11/14/2014	Pass 9-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

**Statement of Legislative Intent:**

This Statement of Legislative Intent requests SDOT to prepare a written report on the proposed Heavy Haul Corridor that includes the following information:

1. An analysis of the costs associated with transporting oversized container loads between the Port of Seattle's container terminals and the rail yards on City streets. The report should identify who pays the direct cost of trucking equipment modifications related to oversized container loads and describe any cost impacts to drayage drivers operating between the container terminals and the rail yards.
2. Identification of the policy rationale for a City contribution to developing a Heavy Haul Corridor and an explanation of why the City should pay any of the costs related to creation of the Corridor.
3. Identification of the core principles framing cost sharing negotiations between the Port of Seattle and the City of Seattle with regards to:
  - a. the proportionate responsibility for capital investment on streets included in the Heavy Haul Corridor, and
  - b. the proportionate responsibility for operating and capital costs associated with enforcing equipment and haul regulations along the Heavy Haul Corridor.
4. Detailed reporting of the proposed Heavy Haul Corridor enforcement and inspection process including a description of the anticipated enforcement activities, any anticipated capital requirements supporting enforcement, any estimates of potential on-going operating costs related to enforcement, and an analysis of potential permit fee revenues.
5. Evaluation of how the proposed Heavy Haul Corridor capital improvements and operating elements are linked to or reflected in the Freight Master Plan.
6. Descriptions and timing of anticipated Council actions related to the planning and implementation of the Heavy Haul Corridor.

7. Identification of the proposed Heavy Haul Corridor routes and discussion of the process and rationale that justifies the specific routing structure.

Council requests that a written report be submitted to the Council's Transportation Committee by April 3, 2015.

**Background:**

SDOT is working with the Port of Seattle to implement upgrades for a Heavy Haul Corridor to facilitate oversized container loads between the container terminals and the Union Pacific and Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail yard facilities. The Port of Seattle maintains that Seattle port operations are at a competitive disadvantage because City of Seattle truck weight regulations create a burden on shippers. In order to remain a competitive point of entry for discretionary international cargo, the Port would like to increase truck weight limits along designated City streets. Allowing heavier vehicles along the route would lower logistical costs and provide a time savings; potential shippers would find the Port of Seattle a more attractive entry point for international cargo.

Port operations generate nearly 200,000 jobs throughout our region and the goods that move through the Port of Seattle reach families and households throughout the United States. The City is committed to being a strong partner with the Port of Seattle to ensure that goods and services can move in and out of the City in efficient and cost effective ways.

The Mayor's 2016 proposed budget includes a \$1.5M investment in the Heavy Haul Corridor. The Council is interested in understanding more about the potential impacts of the proposed investment, the principles framing negotiations with the Port of Seattle, and what role (if any) does the Heavy Haul Corridor play in the Freight Master Plan. It is the Council's intent to provide the \$1.5M in 2016 contingent upon the report's findings.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Transportation  
**Date Due to Council:** 4/3/15