

---

# Office of Planning

www.planning.dc.gov

Telephone: 202-442-7600

---

Description	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Approved	FY 2014 Proposed	% Change from FY 2013
Operating Budget	\$7,974,947	\$7,111,616	\$7,288,101	2.5
FTEs	56.4	59.0	60.0	1.7

---

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 FY 2014 proposed budget is presented in the following tables:

## FY 2014 Proposed Gross Funds Operating Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-1 contains the proposed FY 2014 agency budget compared to the FY 2013 approved budget. It also provides FY 2011 and FY 2012 actual expenditures.

**Table BD0-1**  
(dollars in thousands)

<b>Appropriated Fund</b>	<b>Actual FY 2011</b>	<b>Actual FY 2012</b>	<b>Approved FY 2013</b>	<b>Proposed FY 2014</b>	<b>Change from FY 2013</b>	<b>Percent Change*</b>
<b>General Fund</b>						
Local Funds	5,480	6,111	6,559	6,481	-78	-1.2
Special Purpose Revenue Funds	19	79	30	50	20	66.7
<b>Total for General Fund</b>	<b>5,499</b>	<b>6,190</b>	<b>6,589</b>	<b>6,531</b>	<b>-58</b>	<b>-0.9</b>
<b>Federal Resources</b>						
Federal Payments	0	0	0	235	235	N/A
Federal Grant Funds	626	739	523	522	-1	-0.2
<b>Total for Federal Resources</b>	<b>626</b>	<b>739</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>44.8</b>
<b>Private Funds</b>						
Private Grant Funds	0	250	0	0	0	N/A
<b>Total for Private Funds</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Intra-District Funds</b>						
Intra-District Funds	232	796	0	0	0	N/A
<b>Total for Intra-District Funds</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Gross Funds</b>	<b>6,357</b>	<b>7,975</b>	<b>7,112</b>	<b>7,288</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>2.5</b>

\*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 2014 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

## FY 2014 Proposed Full-Time Equivalents, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-2 contains the proposed FY 2014 FTE level compared to the FY 2013 approved FTE level by revenue type. It also provides FY 2011 and FY 2012 actual data.

**Table BD0-2**

<b>Appropriated Fund</b>	<b>Actual FY 2011</b>	<b>Actual FY 2012</b>	<b>Approved FY 2013</b>	<b>Proposed FY 2014</b>	<b>Change from FY 2013</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
<b><u>General Fund</u></b>						
Local Funds	49.9	53.5	55.5	56.5	1.0	1.8
<b>Total for General Fund</b>	<b>49.9</b>	<b>53.5</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>
<b><u>Federal Resources</u></b>						
Federal Grant Funds	5.9	2.9	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.0
<b>Total for Federal Resources</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b><u>Intra-District Funds</u></b>						
Intra-District Funds	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A
<b>Total for Intra-District Funds</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Total Proposed FTEs</b>	<b>56.2</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.7</b>

## FY 2014 Proposed Operating Budget, by Comptroller Source Group

Table BD0-3 contains the proposed FY 2014 budget at the Comptroller Source Group (object class) level compared to the FY 2013 approved budget. It also provides FY 2011 and FY 2012 actual expenditures.

**Table BD0-3**  
(dollars in thousands)

Comptroller Source Group	Actual FY 2011	Actual FY 2012	Approved FY 2013	Proposed FY 2014	Change from FY 2013	Percent Change*
11 - Regular Pay - Continuing Full Time	4,350	4,798	5,068	5,256	188	3.7
12 - Regular Pay - Other	60	78	0	0	0	N/A
13 - Additional Gross Pay	45	24	0	0	0	N/A
14 - Fringe Benefits - Current Personnel	915	915	1,101	1,138	37	3.3
15 - Overtime Pay	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
<b>Subtotal Personal Services (PS)</b>	<b>5,370</b>	<b>5,816</b>	<b>6,170</b>	<b>6,394</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>3.6</b>
20 - Supplies and Materials	29	37	38	38	0	0.0
31 - Telephone, Telegraph, Telegram, Etc.	2	1	0	0	0	N/A
33 - Janitorial Services	-4	0	0	0	0	N/A
34 - Security Services	-1	0	0	0	0	N/A
40 - Other Services and Charges	121	103	185	174	-11	-5.9
41 - Contractual Services - Other	575	1,731	445	438	-8	-1.7
50 - Subsidies and Transfers	217	234	220	191	-29	-13.2
70 - Equipment and Equipment Rental	48	53	54	54	0	0.0
<b>Subtotal Nonpersonal Services (NPS)</b>	<b>987</b>	<b>2,159</b>	<b>942</b>	<b>894</b>	<b>-48</b>	<b>-5.1</b>
<b>Gross Funds</b>	<b>6,357</b>	<b>7,975</b>	<b>7,112</b>	<b>7,288</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>2.5</b>

\*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](http://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 2014 proposed budget.

## FY 2014 Proposed Operating Budget and FTEs, by Division and Activity

Table BD0-4 contains the proposed FY 2014 budget by division and activity compared to the FY 2013 approved budget. It also provides the FY 2012 actual data.

**Table BD0-4**

(dollars in thousands)

Division/Activity	Dollars in Thousands				Full-Time Equivalents			
	Actual FY 2012	Approved FY 2013	Proposed FY 2014	Change from FY 2013	Actual FY 2012	Approved FY 2013	Proposed FY 2014	Change from FY 2013
<b>(1000) Agency Management</b>								
(1010) Personnel	121	121	121	1	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.0
(1015) Training and Employee Development	32	25	25	0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1020) Contracting and Procurement	42	35	35	0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1030) Property Management	150	200	180	-20	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.0
(1040) Information Technology	78	69	72	3	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2
(1050) Financial Management	76	69	70	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
(1055) Risk Management	26	18	18	0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1060) Legal	36	0	28	28	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
(1080) Communications	133	110	140	29	1.0	1.0	1.2	0.2
(1085) Customer Service	53	18	46	28	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.2
(1090) Performance Management	69	419	349	-71	3.1	3.2	2.5	-0.8
<b>Subtotal (1000) Agency Management</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>1,085</b>	<b>1,084</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>
<b>(2000) Development Review and Historic Preservation</b>								
(2010) Development/Zoning Review	1,098	945	926	-20	8.2	8.0	8.0	0.0
(2020) Historic Preservation	1,667	1,676	1,662	-13	11.6	13.0	13.0	0.0
<b>Subtotal (2000) Development Review and Historic Preservation</b>	<b>2,765</b>	<b>2,621</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>-33</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>(3000) Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning</b>								
(3010) Neighborhood Planning	1,315	1,286	1,354	69	10.0	11.4	11.4	0.0
(3020) Revitalization and Design	560	586	664	78	6.2	5.4	6.4	1.0
<b>Subtotal (3000) Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning</b>	<b>1,875</b>	<b>1,872</b>	<b>2,018</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>
<b>(6000) Long Range Planning</b>								
(6010) Comprehensive Planning	169	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Subtotal (6000) Long Range Planning</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>(7000) Citywide Planning</b>								
(7010) Citywide Planning	1,364	531	546	15	4.2	4.4	4.4	0.0
(7020) GIS and IT	590	594	628	34	5.2	5.6	5.4	-0.2
(7030) State Data Center	395	409	424	15	4.2	4.4	4.4	0.0
<b>Subtotal (7000) Citywide Planning</b>	<b>2,350</b>	<b>1,534</b>	<b>1,598</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>-0.2</b>
<b>Total Proposed Operating Budget</b>	<b>7,975</b>	<b>7,112</b>	<b>7,288</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>

(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 2014 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

## **FY 2014 Proposed Budget Changes**

The Office of Planning's (OP) proposed FY 2014 gross budget is \$7,288,101, which represents a 2.5 percent increase over its FY 2013 approved gross budget of \$7,111,616. The budget is comprised of \$6,480,878 in Local funds, \$522,000 in Federal Grant funds, \$235,223 in Federal Payment funds, and \$50,000 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 2013 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 2014 CSFL budget and not necessarily changes made to the FY 2013 Local funds budget. The FY 2014 CSFL adjustments to the FY 2013 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 2014 CSFL budget is \$6,409,643, which represents a \$148,944, or 2.3 percent, decrease from the FY 2013 approved Local funds budget of \$6,558,587.

### **Major CSFL Cost Drivers**

The FY 2014 CSFL calculated for OP included the removal of \$200,000 in one-time funding, which was used to support the Eckington Small Area plan in Ward 5 in FY 2013. These funds were used to finance economic development and neighborhood revitalization in emerging and distressed neighborhoods. The goal is to achieve a critical mass of investment needed to make a significant and visible impact in targeted neighborhoods.

The FY 2014 CSFL calculated for OP included an adjustment entry that is not described in detail on table 5. This adjustment was made for an increase of \$43,749 in personal services to account for the Fringe Benefit growth rate adjustment of 4.2 percent year-over-year growth, and \$7,307 in nonpersonal services based on the Consumer Price Index factor of 2.4 percent. During the development of the CSFL, some adjustments such as these were categorized as "other adjustments".

### **Agency Budget Submission**

**Increase:** OP's budget proposal includes net increases of \$78,930 in Local funds and \$15,760 in Federal Grant funds to support projected salary step increases and Fringe Benefit costs. The budget for Special Purpose Revenue funds is proposed to increase by \$20,000 due to increased revenue projections from the Historic Landmark and Historical District fund. The agency will allocate these funds to professional fees and contracts.

**Decrease:** In order to partially absorb the Local funds increases in personal services, the agency proposes adjustments in nonpersonal services. OP will improve operating efficiency by saving \$35,501 across multiple services and programs. This includes reducing Supplies and Materials, Other Services and Charges, Contractual Services – Other, and Equipment and Equipment Rental. A reduction of \$28,995 in Subsidies and Transfers will offer additional savings. The fixed cost IT Assessment from the Office of the Chief Technology Officer will be reduced by \$14,434. A portion of the contractual service responsibilities will be carried out by current personnel, providing \$16,789 in Federal Grant funds savings.

### **Mayor's Proposed Budget**

**Cost-of-Living Adjustment:** This agency received a proposed cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) in both Local and non-Local funds. This adjustment includes \$14,535 in Federal Grant funds. For more information about the Local funds portion of the COLA, please see the Workforce Investments chapter contained in Volume 3 (Agency Budget Chapters – Part II) of the FY 2014 Proposed Budget and Financial Plan.

**Increase:** A Federal Payment in the amount of \$235,223 will be used for the redevelopment of the former St. Elizabeths hospital. This will align the agency with the FY 2014 President's Budget Request.

**Decrease:** OP will reduce Contractual Services by \$14,535 to offset the proposed COLA increase.

**Transfer In:** A total of \$121,234 and 1.0 FTE will transfer in from Capital funds to Local funds.

### District's Proposed Budget

**Increase:** In Local funds, the budget includes an increase of \$80,617 and 1.0 FTE to focus primarily on activities involving historical preservation.

**Decrease:** The Local funds reduction of \$80,617 and 1.0 FTE better aligns resources to achieve operational goals. The Local budget also includes a reduction of \$50,000 to reflect a one-time adjustment of personal services costs in FY 2014 based on projected salary lapse savings.

## FY 2013 Approved Budget to FY 2014 Proposed Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-5 itemizes the changes by revenue type between the FY 2013 approved budget and the FY 2014 proposed budget.

**Table BD0-5**  
(dollars in thousands)

	DIVISION	BUDGET	FTE
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2013 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>6,559</b>	<b>55.5</b>
Removal of One-Time Funding	Multiple Programs	-200	0.0
Other CSFL Adjustments	Multiple Programs	51	0.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2014 Current Services Funding Level Budget (CSFL)</b>		<b>6,410</b>	<b>55.5</b>
Increase: Planned salary step increases and Fringe Benefit costs	Multiple Programs	79	0.0
Decrease: Streamline nonpersonal services to offset personal services increases	Multiple Programs	-36	0.0
Decrease: Subsidies and Transfers	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-29	0.0
Decrease: OCTO IT assessment	Agency Management	-14	0.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2014 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>6,410</b>	<b>55.5</b>
Transfer In: FTE from capital funds	Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	121	1.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2014 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>6,531</b>	<b>56.5</b>
Increase: Historical preservation activities	Development Review and Historic Preservation	81	1.0
Decrease: Align resources to achieve operational goals	Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	-81	-1.0
Decrease: Personal Services to represent one-time salary lapse savings	Multiple Programs	-50	0.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2014 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>6,481</b>	<b>56.5</b>

(Continued on the next page)



**Table BDO-5 (Continued)**  
(dollars in thousands)

	DIVISION	BUDGET	FTE
<b>FEDERAL PAYMENTS: FY 2013 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Changes		0	0.0
<b>FEDERAL PAYMENTS: FY 2014 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Increase: To align with the President's FY 2014 Budget Request	Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	235	0.0
<b>FEDERAL PAYMENTS: FY 2014 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>235</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Changes		0	0.0
<b>FEDERAL PAYMENTS: FY 2014 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>235</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2013 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>523</b>	<b>3.5</b>
Increase: Planned salary step increases and Fringe Benefit rate adjustment	Development Review and Historic Preservation	16	0.0
Decrease: Contractual Services	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-17	0.0
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2014 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>522</b>	<b>3.5</b>
Cost-of-Living Adjustment: FY 2014 proposed adjustment	Multiple Programs	15	0.0
Decrease: To offset the proposed cost-of-living adjustment	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-15	0.0
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2014 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>522</b>	<b>3.5</b>
No Changes		0	0.0
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2014 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>522</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2013 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Increase: Historic Landmark and Historic District fund	Development Review and Historic Preservation	20	0.0
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2014 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Changes		0	0.0
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2014 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Changes		0	0.0
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2014 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Gross for BDO - Office of Planning</b>		<b>7,288</b>	<b>60.0</b>

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

## Agency Performance Plan

The agency's performance plan has the following objectives for FY 2014:

### Citywide Planning

**Objective 1:** Use data to inform planning.

**Objective 2:** Better inform public and private investment decisions by leveraging the District's planned growth and competitive strengths (Fiscal Stability, Job Creation, Sustainability) to enhance livability, fiscal stability, and urban sustainability (One City Action Plan Actions 3.4.1, 3.5.3 and Indicator 3A).

## KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### Citywide Planning

Measure	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Target	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Projection	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection
Develop facility plans, identify public-private partnerships or co-location opportunities, and conduct demographic analyses for targeted agencies	3	2	1	2	2	3
Percentage of OP-responsible Comp Plan implementation items from the current plan and future amendments that are newly achieved during the fiscal year	36.8%	25%	17%	25%	27%	29%
Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline, as measured by change in Gross Sales and Use Tax	2.9%	+1%	+9.6%	+1%	+1%	+1%
Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline, as measured by change in Retail Trade Employment	-3.3%	0.0%	+8.5%	+1%	+1%	+1%
Percentage change in transit ridership	0.8%	4%	-2.1%	4%	4%	4%
Use Walkscore to compare D.C.'s walkability to other U.S. cities (rank)	7	<10	7	< 10	< 10	< 10
Positive change, in median single family home sales price	3.2%	2.5%	+3.1%	+2.5%	+3%	+3%
Positive change, in median household income	2.7%	2%	+3.7%	+3%	+3%	+3%
Positive change in District population (One City Action Plan Indicator 3A) <sup>1</sup>	3.1%	1.5%	+2.2%	+3%	+2.5%	+3%
Percentage of customers who have the data and analysis needed to fulfill their role in planning the city and influencing quality neighborhood outcomes	95.1%	90%	97.2%	90%	90%	90%
Percentage change to citizens' access to grocery stores and farmers markets (One City Action Plan Action 3.4.1) <sup>1</sup>	0.8%	1%	0.3%	1%	1%	1%

## 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.

### KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

#### Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning

Measure	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Target	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Projection	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection
Percentage of OP small area plans approved by the Council	100%	90%	100%	90%	90%	90%
Percentage of plans completed in 18 months or less	100%	70%	100%	75%	78%	80%
Cost of consultant services per plan completed	\$198,373	\$250,000	\$175,953	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000

## Development Review and Historic Preservation

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

### KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

#### Development Review and Historic Preservation

Measure	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Target	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Projection	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection
Percentage of historic property permit applications reviewed over the counter	93.8%	90%	96.3%	90%	90%	90%
Dollars of historic homeowner grants issued	\$229,746	\$230,000	\$246,048	\$230,000	\$230,000	\$250,000
Percentage of historic landmark designations without owner objection	100%	85%	100%	85%	85%	85%
Percentage of D.C. government project reviews concluded with adverse effects resolved by consensus	Not Available	90%	96%	90%	90%	90%
Percentage of Development Review reports that meet the expectations of boards/commissions	94.3%	90%	93.2%	90%	90%	90%
Average cases reviewed per zoning review staff	37.3	20	41.6	20	20	20
Average cases reviewed per historic preservation staff	634.9	500	571.3	500	500	500

## Office of the Director

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

---

### KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

#### Office of the Director

Measure	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Target	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Projection	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection
Percentage of subgrantee's budget spent on programmatic costs <sup>2</sup>	77.4%	65%	79.9%	65%	65%	65%
Percentage of scheduled monitoring reports as defined in agency monitoring plan completed for each grant award <sup>3</sup>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### Performance Plan Endnotes:

<sup>1</sup> <http://mayor.dc.gov/page/one-city-action-plan>

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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.