

# Office of Planning

[www.planning.dc.gov](http://www.planning.dc.gov)

Telephone: 202-442-7600

Description	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Approved	FY 2016 Proposed	% Change from FY 2015
Operating Budget	\$10,959,523	\$9,948,827	\$10,312,367	3.7
FTEs	69.8	71.0	70.0	-1.4

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 reviews. OP also conducts historic resources research and community visioning, and it manages, analyzes, maps, and disseminates spatial and U.S. Census data.

The agency's FY 2016 proposed budget is presented in the following tables:

## FY 2016 Proposed Gross Funds Operating Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-1 contains the proposed FY 2016 agency budget compared to the FY 2015 approved budget. It also provides FY 2013 and FY 2014 actual expenditures.

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

Appropriated Fund	Actual FY 2013	Actual FY 2014	Approved FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	Change from FY 2015	Percent Change*
<b><u>General Fund</u></b>						
Local Funds	6,345	10,013	9,359	9,362	4	0.0
Special Purpose Revenue Funds	58	80	80	100	20	25.0
<b>Total for General Fund</b>	<b>6,403</b>	<b>10,093</b>	<b>9,439</b>	<b>9,462</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0.2</b>
<b><u>Federal Resources</u></b>						
Federal Grant Funds	601	592	509	525	16	3.1
<b>Total for Federal Resources</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3.1</b>
<b><u>Private Funds</u></b>						
Private Grant Funds	18	42	1	325	324	N/A
<b>Total for Private Funds</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b><u>Intra-District Funds</u></b>						
Intra-District Funds	601	232	0	0	0	N/A
<b>Total for Intra-District Funds</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Gross Funds</b>	<b>7,622</b>	<b>10,960</b>	<b>9,949</b>	<b>10,312</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>3.7</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 2016 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

## FY 2016 Proposed Full-Time Equivalents, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-2 contains the proposed FY 2016 FTE level compared to the FY 2015 approved FTE level by revenue type. It also provides FY 2013 and FY 2014 actual data.

**Table BD0-2**

Appropriated Fund	Actual FY 2013	Actual FY 2014	Approved FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	Change from FY 2015	Percent Change
<b>General Fund</b>						
Local Funds	54.0	66.3	67.5	66.5	-1.0	-1.5
<b>Total for General Fund</b>	<b>54.0</b>	<b>66.3</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>-1.0</b>	<b>-1.5</b>
<b>Federal Resources</b>						
Federal Grant Funds	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.0
<b>Total for Federal Resources</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total Proposed FTEs</b>	<b>57.6</b>	<b>69.8</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>-1.0</b>	<b>-1.4</b>

## FY 2016 Proposed Operating Budget, by Comptroller Source Group

Table BD0-3 contains the proposed FY 2016 budget at the Comptroller Source Group (object class) level compared to the FY 2015 approved budget. It also provides FY 2013 and FY 2014 actual expenditures.

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

Comptroller Source Group	Actual FY 2013	Actual FY 2014	Approved FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	Change from FY 2015	Percent Change*
11 - Regular Pay - Continuing Full Time	4,824	5,965	6,298	6,821	523	8.3
12 - Regular Pay - Other	337	150	239	170	-69	-28.7
13 - Additional Gross Pay	61	22	0	0	0	N/A
14 - Fringe Benefits - Current Personnel	1,000	1,224	1,350	1,441	91	6.7
15 - Overtime Pay	0	0	0	71	71	N/A
<b>Subtotal Personal Services (PS)</b>	<b>6,221</b>	<b>7,361</b>	<b>7,887</b>	<b>8,503</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>7.8</b>
20 - Supplies and Materials	35	38	38	38	0	0.0
31 - Telephone, Telegraph, Telegram, Etc.	2	0	0	0	0	N/A
40 - Other Services and Charges	225	225	202	229	27	13.5
41 - Contractual Services - Other	960	2,957	1,588	1,289	-300	-18.9
50 - Subsidies and Transfers	129	333	181	200	19	10.8
70 - Equipment and Equipment Rental	51	46	54	54	0	0.0
<b>Subtotal Nonpersonal Services (NPS)</b>	<b>1,401</b>	<b>3,598</b>	<b>2,062</b>	<b>1,809</b>	<b>-253</b>	<b>-12.3</b>
<b>Gross Funds</b>	<b>7,622</b>	<b>10,960</b>	<b>9,949</b>	<b>10,312</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>3.7</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.

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.

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 substantiality, 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 2016 proposed budget.

## FY 2016 Proposed Operating Budget and FTEs, by Division and Activity

Table BD0-4 contains the proposed FY 2016 budget by division and activity compared to the FY 2015 approved budget. It also provides the FY 2014 actual data.

**Table BD0-4**

(dollars in thousands)

Division/Activity	Dollars in Thousands				Full-Time Equivalents			
	Actual FY 2014	Approved FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	Change from FY 2015	Actual FY 2014	Approved FY 2015	Proposed FY 2016	Change from FY 2015
<b>(1000) Agency Management</b>								
(1010) Personnel	121	140	140	0	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.0
(1015) Training and Employee Development	25	28	28	0	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1020) Contracting and Procurement	34	36	38	1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1030) Property Management	247	179	189	10	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1040) Information Technology	64	73	76	2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1050) Financial Management	68	73	75	2	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.0
(1055) Risk Management	18	20	22	2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1060) Legal	28	29	30	1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1080) Communications	75	145	137	-7	1.5	1.2	1.2	0.0
(1085) Customer Service	46	48	52	3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.0
(1090) Performance Management	303	379	372	-7	2.9	2.5	2.5	0.0
<b>Subtotal (1000) Agency Management</b>	<b>1,028</b>	<b>1,149</b>	<b>1,157</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>(2000) Development Review and Historic Preservation</b>								
(2010) Development/Zoning Review	950	1,003	1,581	578	9.4	8.0	12.5	4.5
(2020) Historic Preservation	1,923	1,745	1,820	75	14.6	13.0	14.5	1.5
<b>Subtotal (2000) Development Review and Historic Preservation</b>	<b>2,873</b>	<b>2,748</b>	<b>3,401</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>
<b>(3000) Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning</b>								
(3010) Neighborhood Planning	4,175	3,637	2,458	-1,179	13.4	22.4	13.4	-9.0
(3020) Revitalization and Design	723	734	1,093	359	7.5	6.4	9.4	3.0
<b>Subtotal (3000) Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning</b>	<b>4,898</b>	<b>4,371</b>	<b>3,551</b>	<b>-820</b>	<b>20.9</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>22.8</b>	<b>-6.0</b>
<b>(7000) Citywide Planning</b>								
(7010) Citywide Planning	1,126	574	1,154	580	5.2	4.4	4.4	0.0
(7020) GIS and IT	631	662	586	-76	6.3	5.4	4.4	-1.0
(7030) State Data Center	404	445	463	18	5.2	4.4	4.4	0.0
<b>Subtotal (7000) Citywide Planning</b>	<b>2,161</b>	<b>1,681</b>	<b>2,203</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>-1.0</b>
<b>Total Proposed Operating Budget</b>	<b>10,960</b>	<b>9,949</b>	<b>10,312</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>69.8</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>70.0</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 2016 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

## **FY 2016 Proposed Budget Changes**

The Office of Planning's (OP) proposed FY 2016 gross budget is \$10,312,367, which represents a 3.7 percent increase over its FY 2015 approved gross budget of \$9,948,827. The budget is comprised of \$9,362,367 in Local funds, \$525,000 in Federal Grant funds, \$325,000 in Private Grant funds, and \$100,000 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 2015 approved budget across multiple divisions, and it estimates how much it would cost an agency to continue its current divisions and operations into the following fiscal year. The FY 2016 CSFL adjustments to the FY 2015 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 2016 CSFL budget is \$9,550,079, which represents a \$191,252, or 2.0 percent, increase over the FY 2015 approved Local funds budget of \$9,358,827.

### **CSFL Assumptions**

The FY 2016 CSFL calculated for OP included adjustment entries that are not described in detail on table 5. These adjustments include a reduction of \$100,000 to account for the removal of one-time funding appropriated in FY 2015 for the Historic Homeowner grant program. Additionally, adjustments were made for a net increase of \$226,749 in personal services to account for the impact of cost-of-living adjustments, and approved compensation agreements implemented in FY 2015, and an increase of \$31,915 in nonpersonal services based on the Consumer Price Index factor of 2.2 percent.

OP's CSFL funding for the restoration of one-time salary lapse reflects an adjustment for an increase of \$50,000. Additionally, adjustments were made for a decrease of \$17,413 for Other Adjustments to account for proper funding of compensation and classification reforms within the Workforce Investments fund for Compensation Groups 1 and 2.

### **Agency Budget Submission**

**Increase:** OP's budget proposal in Local funds reflects an increase of \$142,071 to support projected salary step and Fringe Benefit costs across all divisions. In the Development Review and Historic Preservation division's proposed budget, Local funds reflects a \$100,000 increase to support targeted home grants for historic homes located in economically challenged neighborhoods. Additionally, OP proposes an increase of \$7,236 for fleet maintenance Fixed Costs to align the budget with proposed estimates.

The FY 2016 budget proposal in Federal Grant funds for the Development Review and Historic Preservation division reflects a \$16,000 increase for salary step and Fringe Benefits adjustments. In Private Grant funds, the proposed budget for the Citywide Planning division contains an increase of \$325,000 based on funding from the Kresge Foundation for the Crossing the Street: Building DC's Inclusive Future through Creative Placemaking project.

The budget proposal in Special Purpose Revenue funds reflects an increase of \$20,000 based on the agency's forecast of fund balance and revenue trends from applicant and vendor fees collected for Historic Landmark and Historic District filings (DC Law 13-281, Subch. 6-1104.09).

**Decrease:** The proposal in OP's Local funds budget, primarily in the Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning division, reflects a decrease of \$249,307 due to a reduction to operating planning contracts for FY 2016. Additionally, the budget proposed for Private Grant funds contains a decrease of \$1,000 due to the completion of the ArtPlace America grant in the previous fiscal year.

**Technical Adjustment:** The FY 2016 proposed Local funds budget includes an increase of \$227,681 to support pay adjustments for employees converted to union pay scales.

**Mayor's Proposed Budget**

**Enhance:** The proposed Local funds budget supports \$71,000 in pay adjustments for overtime to employees converted to union pay scales.

**Reduce:** The proposed Local funds budget includes decreases of \$180,535 in funding for preservation grants in the Development Review and Historic Preservation division; \$406,133 in planning activities in the Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning division; and \$409,726 from the elimination of 4.0 vacant positions in the Citywide Planning and Development Review and Historic Preservation divisions.

**District's Proposed Budget**

**Enhance:** The Office of Planning's Local funds budget proposal reflects a total increase of \$510,000. Of this amount, \$200,000 is for 2.0 FTEs to support a DC Beautification pilot program and \$110,000 to support 1.0 FTE for a Food Policy Director. This funding also includes one-time funding of \$200,000 to create a comprehensive Cultural Plan for the District.



## FY 2015 Approved Budget to FY 2016 Proposed Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-5 itemizes the changes by revenue type between the FY 2015 approved budget and the FY 2016 proposed budget.

**Table BD0-5**

(dollars in thousands)

DESCRIPTION	DIVISION	BUDGET	FTE
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2015 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>9,359</b>	<b>67.5</b>
Removal of One-Time Funding	Multiple Programs	-100	0.0
Other CSFL Adjustments	Multiple Programs	291	0.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2016 Current Services Funding Level (CSFL) Budget</b>		<b>9,550</b>	<b>67.5</b>
Increase: To adjust personal services	Multiple Programs	142	0.0
Increase: To align resources with operational goals	Development Review and Historic Preservation	100	0.0
Increase: To align Fixed Costs with proposed estimates	Agency Management	7	0.0
Decrease: To adjust the Contractual Services budget	Multiple Programs	-249	0.0
Technical Adjustment: To support pay adjustments for employees converted to union pay scales	Multiple Programs	228	0.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2016 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>9,778</b>	<b>67.5</b>
Enhance: Union overtime	Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	71	0.0
Reduce: Reduction to grants	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-181	0.0
Reduce: Planning activities	Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	-406	0.0
Reduce: Eliminate vacant positions	Multiple Programs	-410	-4.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2016 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>8,852</b>	<b>63.5</b>
Enhance: To support the DC Beautiful pilot program, a Food Policy Director, and a Cultural Plan for the District	Multiple Programs	510	3.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2016 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>9,362</b>	<b>66.5</b>
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2015 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>509</b>	<b>3.5</b>
Increase: To align budget with projected grant awards	Development Review and Historic Preservation	16	0.0
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2016 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>525</b>	<b>3.5</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2016 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>525</b>	<b>3.5</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2016 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>525</b>	<b>3.5</b>

(Continued on next page)

**Table BD0-5 (Continued)**

(dollars in thousands)

DESCRIPTION	DIVISION	BUDGET	FTE
<b>PRIVATE GRANT FUNDS: FY 2015 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Increase: To align budget with projected grant awards	Citywide Planning	325	0.0
Decrease: To align budget with projected grant awards	Multiple Programs	-1	0.0
<b>PRIVATE GRANT FUNDS: FY 2016 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>325</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>PRIVATE GRANT FUNDS: FY 2016 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>325</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>PRIVATE GRANT FUNDS: FY 2016 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>325</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2015 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Increase: To align budget with projected revenues	Development Review and Historic Preservation	20	0.0
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2016 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2016 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2016 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Gross for BD0 - Office of Planning</b>		<b>10,312</b>	<b>70.0</b>

(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 their Divisions:

### 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.

---

## KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### Citywide Planning

Measure	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Target	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Projection	FY 2016 Projection	FY 2017 Projection
Develop facility plans, identify public-private partnerships or co-location opportunities, and conduct demographic analyses for targeted agencies	2	2	2	2	2	2
Percent of OP-responsible Comp Plan implementation items from the current plan and future amendments that are newly achieved during the fiscal year	16%	27%	21%	20%	22%	22%
Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline, as measured by change in Gross Sales and Use Tax	+2.6%	+1.0%	+2.2%	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline, as measured by change in Retail Trade Employment	+2.7%	+1.0%	+8.8%	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
Maintain DC's level of walkability compared to other US cities (as measured by Walkscore) <sup>1</sup>	7	10	7	10	10	10
Positive change in District population	+2.3%	+2.5%	+2.2%	+2.8%	+2.8%	+3.0%
Percent of customers <sup>2</sup> who indicate that they are satisfied with the data and analysis they have received from OP, and that it will enable them to fulfill their role in planning the city and influencing quality neighborhood outcomes	97%	90%	95.5%	90%	92%	92%

## 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 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Target	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Projection	FY 2016 Projection	FY 2017 Projection
Percent of OP small area plans approved by the Council	100%	90%	Not Available	90%	92%	92%
Percent of plans completed in 18 months or less	100%	78%	100%	80%	80%	85%
Cost of consultant services per small area plan completed	\$300,000	\$250,000	\$297,447	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$300,000

## 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 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Target	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Projection	FY 2016 Projection	FY 2017 Projection
Percent of historic property permit applications reviewed over the counter	95.6%	90%	91.4%	90%	90%	90%
Dollar amount of historic homeowner grants issued	\$116,115	\$230,000	\$335,912	\$180,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Percentage of historic landmark designations without owner objection	100%	85%	88.9%	85%	85%	85%
Percent of District government project reviews concluded with adverse effects resolved by consensus	100%	90%	100%	90%	90%	90%
Percent of Development Review reports that meet the expectations of boards/commissions	94.2%	90%	93.6%	90%	92%	92%
Average cases reviewed per zoning review staff	32.6	35	36	35	35	35
Average cases reviewed per historic preservation staff	818	600	878	600	600	600
Percent of PUDs that exceed minimum requirements to further the Sustainable DC plan including the provision of green roofs or other features to help reduce stormwater runoff, electric car charging stations or bike share facilities	Not Available	60%	83.3%	60%	60%	60%

## Office of the Director

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

### KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS<sup>1</sup>

#### Office of the Director

	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Measure	Actual	Target	Actual	Projection	Projection	Projection
Percent of sub-grantees' budgets spent on programmatic costs <sup>3</sup>	76.5%	65%	84.1%	65%	65%	65%
Percent of scheduled monitoring reports as defined in agency monitoring plan completed for each grant award <sup>4</sup>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### Performance Plan Endnotes:

<sup>1</sup>Remain in top 10.

<sup>2</sup>Includes District residents and other individuals, private organizations, and government agencies who have requested data and analysis, data provided in response to a survey question when information is delivered.

<sup>3</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 sub-grantees' programmatic costs as a percentage of their overall costs.

<sup>4</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.