
Office of Planning

www.planning.dc.gov

Telephone: 202-442-7600

Description	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Approved	FY 2013 Proposed	% Change from FY 2012
Operating Budget	\$6,357,296	\$6,725,906	\$7,346,839	9.2
FTEs	56.2	61.0	61.0	0.0

The mission of the Office of Planning (OP) is to guide 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.

Summary of Services

OP performs planning for neighborhoods, corridors, districts, historic preservation, public facilities, parks and open spaces, and individual sites. In addition, OP engages in urban design, land use, and historic preservation review. OP also conducts historic resources research and community visioning, and manages, analyzes, maps, and disseminates spatial and U.S. Census data.

The agency's FY 2013 proposed budget is presented in the following tables:

FY 2013 Proposed Gross Funds Operating Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-1 contains the proposed FY 2013 agency budget compared to the FY 2012 approved budget. It also provides FY 2010 and FY 2011 actual expenditures.

Table BD0-1
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriated Fund	Actual FY 2010	Actual FY 2011	Approved FY 2012	Proposed FY 2013	Change from FY 2012	Percent Change*
General Fund						
Local Funds	7,220	5,480	6,246	6,559	313	5.0
Special Purpose Revenue Funds	28	19	30	30	0	0.0
Total for General Fund	7,249	5,499	6,276	6,589	313	5.0
Federal Resources						
Federal Payments	0	0	0	235	235	N/A
Federal Grant Funds	574	626	450	523	73	16.2
Total for Federal Resources	574	626	450	758	308	68.5
Intra-District Funds						
Intra-District Funds	69	232	0	0	0	N/A
Total for Intra-District Funds	69	232	0	0	0	N/A
Gross Funds	7,892	6,357	6,726	7,347	621	9.2

*Percent change is based on whole dollars.

Note: If applicable, for a breakdown of each Grant (Federal and Private), Special Purpose Revenue type and Intra-District agreement, please refer to **Schedule 80 Agency Summary by Revenue Source** in the **FY 2013 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

FY 2013 Proposed Full-Time Equivalents, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-2 contains the proposed FY 2013 FTE level compared to the FY 2012 approved FTE level by revenue type. It also provides FY 2010 and FY 2011 actual data.

Table BD0-2

Appropriated Fund	Actual FY 2010	Actual FY 2011	Approved FY 2012	Proposed FY 2013	Change from FY 2012	Percent Change
<u>General Fund</u>						
Local Funds	60.9	49.9	55.5	55.5	0.0	0.0
Total for General Fund	60.9	49.9	55.5	55.5	0.0	0.0
<u>Federal Resources</u>						
Federal Payments	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Federal Grant Funds	2.4	5.9	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.0
Total for Federal Resources	2.4	5.9	5.5	5.5	0.0	0.0
<u>Intra-District Funds</u>						
Intra-District Funds	0.8	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A
Total for Intra-District Funds	0.8	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A
Total Proposed FTEs	64.2	56.2	61.0	61.0	0.0	0.0

FY 2013 Proposed Operating Budget, by Comptroller Source Group

Table BD0-3 contains the proposed FY 2013 budget at the Comptroller Source Group (object class) level compared to the FY 2012 approved budget. It also provides FY 2010 and FY 2011 actual expenditures.

Table BD0-3
(dollars in thousands)

Comptroller Source Group	Actual FY 2010	Actual FY 2011	Approved FY 2012	Proposed FY 2013	Change from FY 2012	Percent Change*
11 - Regular Pay - Continuing Full Time	5,053	4,350	4,913	5,262	350	7.1
12 - Regular Pay - Other	188	60	127	0	-127	-100.0
13 - Additional Gross Pay	144	45	0	0	0	N/A
14 - Fringe Benefits - Current Personnel	998	915	1,005	1,143	137	13.6
15 - Overtime Pay	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Subtotal Personal Services (PS)	6,383	5,370	6,045	6,405	360	6.0
20 - Supplies and Materials	16	29	38	38	0	0.0
30 - Energy, Comm. and Building Rentals	29	0	0	0	0	N/A
31 - Telephone, Telegraph, Telegram, Etc.	47	2	0	0	0	N/A
32 - Rentals - Land and Structures	183	0	0	0	0	N/A
33 - Janitorial Services	34	-4	0	0	0	N/A
34 - Security Services	6	-1	0	0	0	N/A
35 - Occupancy Fixed Costs	7	0	0	0	0	N/A
40 - Other Services and Charges	294	121	178	185	8	4.3
41 - Contractual Services - Other	607	575	182	445	263	144.6
50 - Subsidies and Transfers	199	217	230	220	-10	-4.2
70 - Equipment and Equipment Rental	87	48	54	54	0	0.0
Subtotal Nonpersonal Services (NPS)	1,509	987	681	942	261	38.4
Gross Funds	7,892	6,357	6,726	7,347	621	9.2

*Percent change is based on whole dollars.

Division Description

The Office of Planning operates through the following 4 divisions:

Development Review and Historic Preservation – assesses plans and projects that range from large, complex developments that are precedent-setting in their potential to change the character of an area, to small individual building permits affecting individual property. This division also promotes stewardship of the District’s historic and cultural resources through planning, protection, and public education; administers the District’s local preservation program under the District’s Historic Landmark and Historic District Protection Act; and acts as the certified state historic preservation program under the National Historic Preservation Act. The staff also provides recommendations to the Historic Preservation Review Board, the Board of Zoning Adjustment, and the Zoning Commission.

This division contains the following 2 activities:

- **Development/Zoning Review** – provides the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the Zoning Commission with professional analyses of large and/or complex zoning cases that may involve variances, special exceptions, campus plans, or planned unit development proposals. The staff also assesses the zoning applied to various areas to make sure that it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and recommends changes if necessary; and

- **Historic Preservation** – provides individual technical assistance to any person applying for a District building permit that affects a historic property under the city’s preservation law. The staff provides support to the Historic Preservation Review Board, which determines the appropriateness of changes to historic landmarks and historic districts.

Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning – provides a broad range of plan development, implementation, and project coordination services for District neighborhoods, central Washington, and the waterfront areas. Neighborhood Planning’s main areas of responsibility include developing small-area plans and planning studies and coordinating and tracking plan implementation. Revitalization/Design’s main areas of responsibility include developing plans and projects for districts and development areas within Center City, with a focus on design strategies and guidelines, coordinating and tracking plan implementation, managing the public space program, and incorporating environmentally sound action into the ongoing development of the District.

This division contains the following 2 activities:

- **Neighborhood Planning** – provides a team of neighborhood planners, including one assigned to each ward, to craft and oversee the implementation of small-area plans, which guide growth and development in neighborhoods in accordance with agreed-upon goals and objectives. Neighborhood planners work in collaboration with Advisory Neighborhood Commissions, citizen associations, residents, businesses, and District agencies to develop and implement the plans; and
- **Revitalization and Design** – develops comprehensive strategies for large-area development that emphasize progressive planning, high-quality urban design, and community engagement, through its expertise in urban design, real estate development, land use planning, architecture, environmental sustainability, and community engagement.

Citywide Planning – develops and monitors the District Elements of the Comprehensive Plan, and works with regional and other District agencies to create strategies for emerging employment sectors, meeting retail needs, and coordinating the city’s land use and transportation. The division provides data analysis, information, and long-range planning services to OP staff, neighborhood stakeholders, citizens, businesses, other District and federal agencies, and other decision-makers so that they can have the information needed to plan, develop, and preserve the District.

This division contains the following 3 activities:

- **Citywide Planning** – develops and monitors the District Elements of the Comprehensive Plan, the District’s 20-year blueprint for the city, and works with regional and other city agencies to create strategies for emerging employment sectors, meeting retail needs, and coordinating land use and transportation;
- **Geographic Information Systems and Information Technology** – provides mapping, spatial information, and analysis to District agencies, citizens, and a variety of other stakeholders. These services complement the automated tools available on www.dc.gov; and
- **State Data Center** – serves as the District’s official source of data. It provides a variety of demographic, social, economic, and housing data for the District by ward, census tract, block-group, and block to District agencies, residents, and other stakeholders.

Agency Management – provides for administrative support and the required tools to achieve operational and programmatic results. This division is standard for all agencies using performance-based budgeting.

Division Structure Change

The Office of Planning has no division structure changes in the FY 2013 proposed budget.

FY 2013 Proposed Operating Budget and FTEs, by Division and Activity

Table BD0-4 contains the proposed FY 2013 budget by division and activity compared to the FY 2012 approved budget. It also provides the FY 2011 actual data.

Table BD0-4

(dollars in thousands)

Division/Activity	Dollars in Thousands				Full-Time Equivalents			
	Actual FY 2011	Approved FY 2012	Proposed FY 2013	Change from FY 2012	Actual FY 2011	Approved FY 2012	Proposed FY 2013	Change from FY 2012
(1000) Agency Management								
(1010) Personnel	108	117	121	3	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.0
(1015) Training and Employee Development	23	24	25	1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1020) Contracting and Procurement	34	34	35	1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1030) Property Management	102	207	200	-7	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0
(1040) Information Technology (IT)	90	71	69	-2	0.2	0.2	0.0	-0.2
(1050) Financial Management	67	68	69	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
(1055) Risk Management	17	18	18	1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1060) Legal	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(1080) Communications	100	107	110	3	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
(1085) Customer Service	17	18	18	1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1090) Performance Management	218	411	419	8	3.1	3.2	3.2	0.0
Subtotal (1000) Agency Management	778	1,074	1,085	10	6.7	7.0	6.8	-0.2
(2000) Development Review and Historic Preservation								
(2010) Development/Zoning Review	940	993	1,006	13	8.1	9.0	8.5	-0.5
(2020) Historic Preservation	1,544	1,508	1,730	223	14.4	13.0	13.5	0.5
Subtotal (2000) Developmt Review and Historic Preservation	2,483	2,500	2,736	236	22.5	22.0	22.0	0.0
(3000) Revitalzatn/Design and Neighborhood Planng								
(3010) Neighborhood Planning	1,112	954	1,406	451	8.4	11.4	12.4	1.0
(3020) Revitalization and Design	668	677	586	-91	6.1	6.4	5.4	-1.0
Subtotal (3000) Revitalzatn/Design and Neighborhood Planng	1,780	1,631	1,992	361	14.5	17.8	17.8	0.0
(6000) Long Range Planning								
(6010) Comprehensive Planning	142	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(6020) GIS and IT	1	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(6030) State Data Center	-4	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal (6000) Long Range Planning	139	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(7000) Citywide Planning								
(7010) Citywide Planning	304	529	531	2	3.2	4.4	4.4	0.0
(7020) GIS and IT	543	598	594	-5	5.1	5.4	5.6	0.2
(7030) State Data Center	331	392	409	17	4.2	4.4	4.4	0.0
Subtotal (7000) Citywide Planning	1,178	1,520	1,534	14	12.5	14.2	14.4	0.2
Total Proposed Operating Budget	6,357	6,726	7,347	621	56.2	61.0	61.0	0.0

(Change is calculated by whole numbers and numbers may not add up due to rounding)

Note: For more detailed information regarding the proposed funding for the activities within this agency's divisions, please see **Schedule 30-PBB Program Summary by Activity** in the **FY 2013 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

FY 2013 Proposed Budget Changes

The Office of Planning's (OP) proposed FY 2013 gross budget is \$7,346,839, which represents a 9.2 percent increase over its FY 2012 approved gross budget of \$6,725,906. The budget is comprised of \$6,558,587 in Local funds, \$235,223 in Federal Payments, \$523,029 in Federal Grant funds, and \$30,000 in Special Purpose Revenue funds.

Current Services Funding Level

The Current Services Funding Level (CSFL) is a Local funds ONLY representation of the true cost of operating District agencies, before consideration of policy decisions. The CSFL reflects changes from the FY 2012 approved budget across multiple programs, and it estimates how much it would cost an agency to continue its current programs and operations into the following fiscal year. The initial adjustments in the budget proposal represent changes that should be compared to the FY 2013 CSFL budget and not necessarily changes made to the FY 2012 Local funds budget. The FY 2013 CSFL adjustments to the FY 2012 Local funds budget are described in table 5 of this agency's budget chapter. Please see the CSFL Development section within Volume 1: Executive Summary for more information regarding the methodology used and components that comprise the CSFL.

OP's FY 2013 CSFL budget is \$6,336,133, which represents a \$90,227, or 1.4 percent, increase over the FY 2012 approved Local funds budget of \$6,245,906.

Initial Adjusted Budget

Enhance: In the President's proposed FY 2013 budget, the Office of Planning will receive a Federal Payment of \$235,223 for redevelopment of the former St. Elizabeths hospital. These funds will be used across multiple programs.

Cost Increase: The Office of Planning will increase Local funding in Other Services and Charges by \$12,885 and personal services by \$354. A Federal Grant funds increase of \$61,704 will be supported by the Historic Preservation fund grant and will be allocated to the Development Review and Historic Preservation program in Contractual Services. An increase of \$10,296 will align personal services with projected costs.

Cost Decrease: The agency made Local fund reductions of \$9,734 in Subsidies and Transfers, \$1,820 in Equipment and Supplies, and \$1,684 in Contractual Services.

Additionally Adjusted Budget

Technical Adjustment: Adjustment of Fringe Benefits to restore the District Government contribution for employee health insurance from 72 percent, implemented in the FY 2011 budget, to 75 percent in FY 2013, resulting in an increase of \$22,455 in Local funds and \$1,029 in Federal Grant funds.

Policy Initiative

Enhance: The Revitalization Design and Neighborhood Planning program will receive \$200,000 in One-Time Local funding, which will be used to support the Eckington Small Area plan.

FY 2012 Approved Budget to FY 2013 Proposed Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-5 itemizes the changes by revenue type between the FY 2012 approved budget and the FY 2013 proposed budget.

Table BD0-5

(dollars in thousands)

	DIVISION	BUDGET	FTE
LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2012 Approved Budget and FTE		6,246	55.5
Removal of One-Time Funding	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-6	0.0
Fringe Benefit Rate Adjustment	Multiple Programs	67	0.0
Consumer Price Index	Multiple Programs	6	0.0
Personal Services Growth Factor	Multiple Programs	24	0.0
FY 2013 Current Services Funding Level Budget (CSFL)		6,336	55.5
Cost Increase: Other Services and Charges	Agency Management	13	0.0
Cost Increase: Align personal services with projected costs (less than \$500)	Multiple Programs	0	0.0
Cost Decrease: Subsidies and Transfers	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-10	0.0
Cost Decrease: Equipment and Supplies	Agency Management	-2	0.0
Cost Decrease: Contractual Services	Multiple Programs	-2	0.0
FY 2013 Initial Adjusted Budget		6,336	55.5
Technical Adjustment: Health insurance contribution	Multiple Programs	22	0.0
FY 2013 Additionally Adjusted Budget		6,359	55.5
FY 2013 Policy Initiative			
Enhance: One-Time funding for the Eckington Small Area plan	Revitalization /Design and Neighborhood Planning	200	0.0
LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2013 Proposed Budget and FTE		6,559	55.5
FEDERAL PAYMENTS: FY 2012 Approved Budget and FTE		0	2.0
Enhance: Redevelopment of the former St. Elizabeths hospital	Multiple Programs	235	0.0
FY 2013 Initial Adjusted Budget		235	2.0
FEDERAL PAYMENTS: FY 2013 Proposed Budget and FTE		235	2.0
FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2012 Approved Budget and FTE		450	3.5
Cost Increase: Historic Preservation fund grant	Development Review and Historic Preservation	62	0.0
Cost Increase: Align personal services with projected costs	Development Review and Historic Preservation	10	0.0
FY 2013 Initial Adjusted Budget		522	3.5
Technical Adjustment: Health insurance contribution	Multiple Programs	1	0.0
FY 2013 Additionally Adjusted Budget		523	3.5
FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2013 Proposed Budget and FTE		523	3.5
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2012 Approved Budget and FTE		30	0.0
No Changes		0	0.0
FY 2013 Initial Adjusted Budget		30	0.0
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2013 Proposed Budget and FTE		30	0.0
Gross for BD0 - Office of Planning		7,347	61.0

(Change is calculated by whole numbers and numbers may not add up due to rounding)

Agency Performance Plan

The agency has the following objectives and performance indicators for its divisions:

1. Citywide Planning

Objective 1: Use data to inform planning.

Objective 2: Better inform public and private investment decisions.

Citywide Planning

Metric	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Target	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Projection	FY 2013 Projection	FY 2014 Projection
Measure 1: Develop facility plans, identify public-private partnerships or co-location opportunities, and conduct demographic analyses for targeted agencies	5	3	3	2	2	2
Measure 2: Percentage of OP-responsible Comp Plan implementation items from the current plan and future amendments that are newly achieved during the fiscal year	36.71%	25%	37%	25%	25%	27%
Measure 3: Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline, as measured by change in Gross Sales and Use Tax	-1.76%	1.0%	+2.87%	+1.00%	+1.00%	+1.00%
Measure 4: Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline, as measured by change in Retail Trade Employment	0.68%	1.0%	-3.34%	0.00%	+1.00%	+1.00%
Measure 5: Percentage change in transit ridership	-2.19%	2.5%	+0.82%	4%	4%	4%
Measure 6: Use Walkscore to compare DC's walkability to other US cities	Ranked #7	Ranked Top 10	Ranked #7	Remain in Top 10	Remain in Top 10	Remain in Top 10
Measure 7: Positive change, in Change in median single family home sales price	-4.98%	2.2%	+3.20	+2.50%	+2.50%	+3.00%
Measure 8: Positive change, in Change in median household income	2.34%	3.0%	+2.72	+2.00%	+3.00%	+3.00%
Measure 9: Positive change, in Change in District population	1.32%	0.3%	+3.06	+1.50%	+2.00%	+2.50%
Measure 10: Percentage of customers* who have the data and analysis needed to fulfill their role in planning the city and influencing quality neighborhood outcomes	94.26%	90%	95.11%	90%	90%	90%
Measure 11: Percentage of change to citizens' access to grocery stores and farmers markets	0.8%	5.0%	0.8%	1%	1%	1%
Measure 12: Median number of hours needed to successfully complete a mapping request	TBD	1%	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

Note: * - Includes District residents and other individuals, private organizations, and government agencies.

2. Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning

Objective 1: Catalyze improvements in neighborhoods and central Washington to enhance economic competitiveness, livability, and environmental harmony.

Objective 2: Increase the transparency and predictability of the planning process to better engage stakeholders and to increase the dialogue around key planning tools and topics.

Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning

Measure	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Target	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Projection	FY 2013 Projection	FY 2014 Projection
Measure 13: Percent of OP small area plans approved by the Council	100%	90%	100%	90%	90%	90%
Measure 14: Percent of plans completed in 18 months or less	100%	65%	100%	70%	75%	78%
Measure 15: Cost of consultant services per plan completed	\$104,595	\$250,000	\$198,373	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000

3. Development Review and Historic Preservation

Objective 1: Deliver resources, clarified regulations, and technical assistance to enhance the quality of the built environment.

Development Review and Historic Preservation

Measure	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Target	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Projection	FY 2013 Projection	FY 2014 Projection
Percent of historic property permit applications reviewed over the counter	94.54%	90%	93.77%	90%	90%	90%
Dollars of historic homeowner grants issued	\$201,486	\$250,000	\$229,746	\$230,000	\$230,000	\$230,000
Percent of historic landmark designations without owner objection	100%	85%	100%	85%	85%	85%
Percent of District government project applications responded to within 5 business days	89.70%	90%	90.48%	90%	90%	90%
Percent of Development Review reports that meet the expectations of boards/commissions	93.84%	90%	94.31%	90%	90%	90%
Average cases reviewed per zoning review staff	41.06	20	37.30	20	20	20
Average cases reviewed per historic preservation staff	Not Available	500	634.86	500	500	500

4. Office of the Director

Objective 1: Efficiently manage the resources and operations of the agency.

Office of the Director

Measure	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Target	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Projection	FY 2013 Projection	FY 2014 Projection
Percentage of subgrantee's budget spent on programmatic costs ¹	Not Available	65%	77.35%	65%	65%	65%
Percentage of scheduled monitoring reports as defined in agency monitoring plan completed for each grant award ²	Not Available	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Note: These were standard for agencies for FY 2011.

Performance Plan Endnotes:

¹ The Wise Giving Alliance of the Better Business Bureau identifies 65 percent to be an industry standard for this measure <http://www.bbb.org/us/Charity-Standards/>. This metric measures all subgrantees' programmatic costs as a percentage of their overall costs.

² Pursuant to 11.4 of the Grants Manual and Source Book all District agencies must complete monitoring reports. All District agencies should be in compliance with this standard. The standard is 100 percent.

