

(BD0) OFFICE OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING

MISSION

The Office of Planning (OP) guides development of the District of Columbia, including the preservation and revitalization of our distinctive neighborhoods, by informing decisions, advancing strategic goals, encouraging the highest quality development outcomes, and engaging all communities.

BACKGROUND

The scope of responsibility for OP is the District of Columbia – an area of almost 69 square miles with 601,723 residents and more than 760,000 jobs. There are 130 neighborhoods with 43 historic districts that include more than 26,000 contributing structures and 550 individually-designated historic landmarks within the District. Guiding OP's work is the Comprehensive Plan, the District's 20-year blueprint and policy document for growth and development. Based on guidance in the Comprehensive Plan, OP continues to focus its work program and priorities around three themes: 1) Creating Successful Neighborhoods, 2) Increasing Access to Education and Employment, and 3) Connecting the Whole City.

CAPITAL PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

- 1) Ensure District agencies become better stewards of their capital assets and their utilization to bring about specific improvements in outcomes for citizens and neighborhoods. Various efforts for ensuring this include facility planning, asset management, Comprehensive Plan and small area plan implementation, shared performance measures, co-location, and public-private partnerships.
- 2) Ensure that major development and revitalization efforts support sustainable development and smart growth principles by focusing planning efforts on federal sites, area corridors, and urban mobility.

RECENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Completed and obtained Council approval for four Small Area Plans: 1) Florida Avenue Market Small Area Plan, 2) Chinatown Cultural Development Strategy, 3) Bellevue Small Area Plan, and 4) Mt. Pleasant Street Commercial Revitalization Strategy. These plans provide supplemental guidance to the Comprehensive Plan.
- Completed the District's Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) in partnership with DMPED and the Washington DC Economic Partnership. In September 2010, the Economic Development Administration (EDA) of the U.S. Department of Commerce approved the District's CEDS, which now makes the District eligible to receive EDA funding. Subsequently, OP and DMPED applied for and received a \$300,000 EDA grant to develop an innovation cluster strategy for the former Saint Elizabeths campus.
- Provided CIP and facilities planning services to DHCD, DMPED, DPR, DCPS, and DCPL. To assist DHCD, OP completed a land use and zoning analysis, and analyzed previous assessments of the Crummell School site. In May 2010, OP co-sponsored the Crummell School community charrette with DHCD, ANC 5B, and the Office of Councilmember Harry Thomas, Jr. OP also assisted DHCD in sponsoring the Ivy City Community Fair in June 2010. OP created a design for a new park and playground at the former Bruce Monroe School site; construction was completed in August 2010. OP coordinated with DPR and NCPC to complete the revised draft of the State Conservation and Resource Plan (SCRIP) for the District. In collaboration with DDOE, OP researched and wrote a new section on "wetlands protection and prioritization" for the document. By completing and submitting this document to the National Park Service, the District was able to save \$250,000 in federal funding from being returned to NPS and preserved eligibility for future funding. OP provided demographic reports to DCPS for Turner, Green, Malcolm X and Van Ness Elementary Schools. DCPS is using this information for enrollment and facilities planning purposes. OP provided a demographic analysis, including a series of maps to examine library branch locations with respect to transportation, school enrollment, and development activity. DCPL presented this information to its board in October and December 2010.
- Developed and published "Moving from Vision to Reality: A Comprehensive Plan Progress Report." The Report measures the District's progress on key elements of the 2006 Comprehensive Plan, and provides a status update on the implementation of the 626 actions included in Plan. While 30 percent of the action items were slated to begin before 2010, District agencies had actually begun 75 percent of those items.

Elements on this page of the Agency Summary include:

- n **Funding Tables:** Past budget allotments show the allotment balance, calculated as allotments received to date less all obligations (the sum of expenditures, encumbrances, intra-District advances and pre-encumbrances). Agencies are allowed to encumber and pre-encumber funds up to the limit of a capital project's budget authority, which might be higher than allotments received to date. For this reason, a negative balance on a projectsheet does not necessarily indicate overspending or an anti-deficiency violation. A negative balance is permitted in this calculation of remaining allotment authority.
- n **Additional Appropriations Data (\$000):** Provides a summary of the budget authority over the life of the project. The table can be read as follows:
 - 4 **Original 6-Year Budget Authority:** Represents the authority from the fiscal year in which budget was first appropriated through the next 5 years.
 - 4 **Budget Authority Thru FY 2017 :** Represents the lifetime budget authority, including the 6 year budget authority for FY 2012 through 2017
 - 4 **FY 2012 Budget Authority Revisions:** Represents the changes to the budget authority as a result of reprogramming, redirections and rescissions (also reflected in Appendix F) for the current fiscal year.
 - 4 **6-Year Budget Authority Thru 2017 :** This is the total 6-year authority for FY 2012 through FY 2017 including changes from the current fiscal year.
 - 4 **Budget Authority Request for 2013 through 2018 :** Represents the 6 year budget authority for 2013 through 2018
 - 4 **Increase (Decrease) :** This is the change in 6 year budget requested for FY 2013 - FY 2018 (change in budget authority is shown in Appendix A).
- n **Estimated Operating Impact:** If a project has operating impacts that the agency has quantified, the effects are summarized in the respective year of impact
- n **FTE Data (Total budget in FTE Table might differ from actual budget due to rounding):** Provides the number for Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees approved as eligible to be charged to capital projects by, or on behalf of, the agency. Additionally it provides the total budget for these employees (Personal Services), the non personnel portion of the budget in the agency's capital plan and, the percentage of the agency CIP budget from either expense category.
- n **Facility Location Map:** For those agencies with facilities projects, a map reflecting projects and their geographic location within the District of Columbia.

(Dollars in Thousands)

Funding By Phase/Task - Prior Funding						Proposed Funding						
Task	Allotments	Spent	Enc/ID-Adv	Pre-Enc	Balance	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
(01) Design	17,770	14,790	1,060	558	1,363	10,250	2,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	0	24,250
(03) Project Management	6,958	6,381	325	0	252	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(05) Equipment	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	24,773	21,216	1,385	558	1,615	10,250	2,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	0	24,250

Funding By Source - Prior Funding						Proposed Funding						
Source	Allotments	Spent	Enc/ID-Adv	Pre-Enc	Balance	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
GO Bonds - New	24,232	20,675	1,385	558	1,615	10,250	2,500	3,500	2,000	2,000	0	20,250
Pay Go	496	496	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	2,000	0	4,000
Equipment Lease	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	24,773	21,216	1,385	558	1,615	10,250	2,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	0	24,250

Additional Appropriation Data		Estimated Operating Impact Summary						
First Appropriation FY	2003	Expenditure (+) or Cost Reduction (-)						
Original 6-Year Budget Authority	27,848	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
Budget Authority Thru FY 2012	41,273	No estimated operating impact						
FY 2012 Budget Authority Changes	0							
Current FY 2012 Budget Authority	41,273							
Budget Authority Request for FY 2013	49,023							
Increase (Decrease)	7,750							

Full Time Equivalent Data			
Object	FTE	FY 2013 Budget	% of Project
Personal Services	8.5	885	8.6
Non Personal Services	0.0	9,365	91.4

BD0-PLN37-DISTRICT PUBLIC PLANS & STUDIES

Agency: OFFICE OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING (BD0)
Implementing Agency: OFFICE OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING (BD0)
Project No: PLN37
Ward:
Location: DISTRICT-WIDE
Facility Name or Identifier: PLANS & STUDIES
Status: Ongoing Subprojects

Useful Life of the Project:

Estimated Full Funding Cost:\$22,824,000

Description:

This project funds planning, zoning, and historic preservation studies and projects, and facility plans linked to important city and other development projects that are to be implemented by the District and/or its partners. Analogous to a private developer's "pre-development" costs, these funds are used to undertake planning studies for large-scale capital and neighborhood-focused projects and serve as a small upfront investment that leverages substantial public and private resources. This project also helps ensure District agencies become better stewards of their capital assets and maximize utilization through plan implementation projects, co-location, public-private partnerships, and grants. District-owned property through FY 2018, including a small area plan for the Bates-Hannover neighborhood.

Justification:

By carrying out planning, zoning, and historic preservation projects/plans, this line item supports the Mayor's policy priorities of education, jobs, and public safety. OP also helps agencies develop facilities plans, including updating demographic and economic trends analysis, identifying partnership/sponsorship opportunities, developing standards and benchmarks, identifying co-location opportunities with other agencies, and prioritizing future location of facilities.

Progress Assessment:

OP uses funds from this line item to carry out an ambitious annual program of planning studies, zoning projects, and historic preservation projects.

Related Projects:

None

(Dollars in Thousands)

Task	Funding By Phase/Task - Prior Funding					Proposed Funding						
	Allotments	Spent	Enc/ID-Adv	Pre-Enc	Balance	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
(01) Design	6,074	3,309	845	558	1,363	2,750	2,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	0	16,750
TOTALS	6,074	3,309	845	558	1,363	2,750	2,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	0	16,750

Source	Funding By Source - Prior Funding					Proposed Funding						
	Allotments	Spent	Enc/ID-Adv	Pre-Enc	Balance	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
GO Bonds - New	6,074	3,309	845	558	1,363	2,750	2,500	3,500	2,000	2,000	0	12,750
Pay Go	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	2,000	0	4,000
TOTALS	6,074	3,309	845	558	1,363	2,750	2,500	3,500	4,000	4,000	0	16,750

Additional Appropriation Data

First Appropriation FY	2010
Original 6-Year Budget Authority	17,843
Budget Authority Thru FY 2012	22,574
FY 2012 Budget Authority Changes	0
Current FY 2012 Budget Authority	22,574
Budget Authority Request for FY 2013	22,824
Increase (Decrease)	250

Estimated Operating Impact Summary

Expenditure (+) or Cost Reduction (-)	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
No estimated operating impact							

Milestone Data

	Projected	Actual
Environmental Approvals		
Design Start (FY)		
Design Complete (FY)		
Construction Start (FY)		
Construction Complete (FY)		
Closeout (FY)		

Full Time Equivalent Data

Object	FTE	FY 2013 Budget	% of Project
Personal Services	8.5	885	32.2
Non Personal Services	0.0	1,865	67.8

BD0-PLN38-SUSTAINABLE DC - AGENCY COMPETITION FUND

Agency: OFFICE OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING (BD0)
Implementing Agency: OFFICE OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING (BD0)
Project No: PLN38
Ward:
Location: DISTRICT-WIDE
Facility Name or Identifier: VARIOUS
Status: New
Useful Life of the Project: 15
Estimated Full Funding Cost:\$5,000,000

Description:

While implementation of the Sustainability Plan will largely result from deploying existing capital and operating dollars in different ways to achieve a broader range of objectives, initially agencies may need to conduct feasibility studies or run small demonstration projects to test the efficacy of some new approaches: e.g., studying the feasibility of using DC government buildings to host solar collectors or wind turbines, or grow food; or the scalability of neighborhood or Ward-level composting facilities as part of a Zero Waste strategy. This initiative will jump start the first Sustainability Plan projects and test their feasibility or demonstrate how they might work at a larger scale.

Justification:

While implementation of the Sustainability Plan will largely result from deploying existing capital and operating dollars in different ways to achieve a broader range of objectives, initially agencies may need to conduct feasibility studies or run small demonstration projects to test the efficacy of some new approaches: e.g., studying the feasibility of using DC government buildings to host solar collectors or wind turbines, or grow food; or the scalability of neighborhood or Ward-level composting facilities as part of a Zero Waste strategy. This initiative will jump start the first Sustainability Plan projects and test their feasibility or demonstrate how they might work at a larger scale.

Progress Assessment:

New Project

Related Projects:

NA

(Dollars in Thousands)

Task	Funding By Phase/Task - Prior Funding						Proposed Funding					
	Allotments	Spent	Enc/ID-Adv	Pre-Enc	Balance	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
(01) Design	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000
TOTALS	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000

Source	Funding By Source - Prior Funding						Proposed Funding					
	Allotments	Spent	Enc/ID-Adv	Pre-Enc	Balance	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
GO Bonds - New	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000
TOTALS	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000

Additional Appropriation Data

First Appropriation FY	
Original 6-Year Budget Authority	
Budget Authority Thru FY 2012	
FY 2012 Budget Authority Changes	0
Current FY 2012 Budget Authority	
Budget Authority Request for FY 2013	
Increase (Decrease)	5,000

Estimated Operating Impact Summary

Expenditure (+) or Cost Reduction (-)	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
No estimated operating impact							

Milestone Data

	Projected	Actual
Environmental Approvals		
Design Start (FY)		
Design Complete (FY)		
Construction Start (FY)		
Construction Complete (FY)		
Closeout (FY)		

Full Time Equivalent Data

Object	FTE	FY 2013 Budget	% of Project
Personal Services	0.0	0	0.0
Non Personal Services	0.0	5,000	100.0

BD0-PLN39-WARD 8 CITIZENS' SUMMIT CHALLENGE

Agency: OFFICE OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING (BD0)
Implementing Agency: OFFICE OF MUNICIPAL PLANNING (BD0)
Project No: PLN39
Ward: 8
Location: WARD 8
Facility Name or Identifier: VARIOUS
Status: New
Useful Life of the Project: 15
Estimated Full Funding Cost: \$2,500,000

Description:

This initiative will challenge two or more agencies to form a partnership to develop and implement projects that support priorities from the Mayor's Ward 8 Citizen's Summit. Agency teams would compete against each other for the funds based on the results they can achieve and they would be encouraged to leverage formula funds (e.g., CDBG) and federal funding received, especially when the project would expand the impact of a project limited by the scope of those funding sources. Extra points would be given to agencies that propose community partnerships as part of the project implementation. Short and long term performance metrics would be required of applicants.

Justification:

This initiative will challenge two or more agencies to form a partnership to develop and implement projects that support priorities from the Mayor's Ward 8 Citizen's Summit. Agency teams would compete against each other for the funds based on the results they can achieve and they would be encouraged to leverage formula funds (e.g., CDBG) and federal funding received, especially when the project would expand the impact of a project limited by the scope of those funding sources. Extra points would be given to agencies that propose community partnerships as part of the project implementation. Short and long term performance metrics would be required of applicants.

Progress Assessment:

New Project

Related Projects:

NA

(Dollars in Thousands)

Task	Funding By Phase/Task - Prior Funding						Proposed Funding					
	Allotments	Spent	Enc/ID-Adv	Pre-Enc	Balance	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
(01) Design	0	0	0	0	0	2,500	0	0	0	0	0	2,500
TOTALS	0	0	0	0	0	2,500	0	0	0	0	0	2,500

Source	Funding By Source - Prior Funding						Proposed Funding					
	Allotments	Spent	Enc/ID-Adv	Pre-Enc	Balance	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
GO Bonds - New	0	0	0	0	0	2,500	0	0	0	0	0	2,500
TOTALS	0	0	0	0	0	2,500	0	0	0	0	0	2,500

Additional Appropriation Data		
First Appropriation FY		
Original 6-Year Budget Authority		
Budget Authority Thru FY 2012		
FY 2012 Budget Authority Changes		0
Current FY 2012 Budget Authority		
Budget Authority Request for FY 2013		
Increase (Decrease)		2,500

Estimated Operating Impact Summary							
Expenditure (+) or Cost Reduction (-)	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	6 Yr Total
No estimated operating impact							

Milestone Data	Projected	Actual
Environmental Approvals		
Design Start (FY)		
Design Complete (FY)		
Construction Start (FY)		
Construction Complete (FY)		
Closeout (FY)		

Full Time Equivalent Data			
Object	FTE	FY 2013 Budget	% of Project
Personal Services	0.0	0	0.0
Non Personal Services	0.0	2,500	100.0

This page is intentionally left blank.