
Office of Planning

www.planning.dc.gov

Telephone: 202-442-7600

Description	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Approved	FY 2012 Proposed	% Change from FY 2011
Operating Budget	\$7,892,063	\$6,485,578	\$24,725,906	281.2
FTEs	64.2	58.5	61.0	4.3

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 2012 proposed budget is presented in the following tables:

FY 2012 Proposed Gross Funds Operating Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-1 contains the proposed FY 2012 agency budget compared to the FY 2011 approved budget. It also provides FY 2009 and FY 2010 actual expenditures.

Table BD0-1
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriated Fund	Actual FY 2009	Actual FY 2010	Approved FY 2011	Proposed FY 2012	Change from FY 2011	Percent Change*
General Fund						
Local Funds	8,614	7,220	5,956	6,246	290	4.9
Special Purpose Revenue Funds	21	28	18	30	12	66.7
Total for General Fund	8,635	7,249	5,974	6,276	302	5.1
Federal Resources						
Federal Payments	0	0	0	18,000	18,000	N/A
Federal Grant Funds	530	574	449	450	1	0.3
Total for Federal Resources	530	574	449	18,450	18,001	4,012.3
Intra-District Funds						
Intra-District Funds	59	69	63	0	-63	-100.0
Total for Intra-District Funds	59	69	63	0	-63	-100.0
Gross Funds	9,224	7,892	6,486	24,726	18,240	281.2

*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 2012 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

FY 2012 Proposed Full-Time Equivalents, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-2 contains the proposed FY 2012 FTE level compared to the FY 2011 approved FTE level by revenue type. It also provides FY 2009 and FY 2010 actual data.

Table BD0-2

Appropriated Fund	Actual FY 2009	Actual FY 2010	Approved FY 2011	Proposed FY 2012	Change from FY 2011	Percent Change
<u>General Fund</u>						
Local Funds	68.0	60.9	52.5	55.5	3.0	5.7
Total for General Fund	68.0	60.9	52.5	55.5	3.0	5.7
<u>Federal Resources</u>						
Federal Payments	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Federal Grant Funds	1.9	2.4	3.0	3.5	0.5	16.7
Total for Federal Resources	1.9	2.4	5.0	5.5	0.5	10.0
<u>Intra-District Funds</u>						
Intra-District Funds	4.6	0.8	1.0	0.0	-1.0	-100.0
Total for Intra-District Funds	4.6	0.8	1.0	0.0	-1.0	-100.0
Total Proposed FTEs	74.5	64.2	58.5	61.0	2.5	4.3

FY 2012 Proposed Operating Budget, by Comptroller Source Group

Table BD0-3 contains the proposed FY 2012 budget at the Comptroller Source Group (object class) level compared to the FY 2011 approved budget. It also provides FY 2009 and FY 2010 actual expenditures.

Table BD0-3
(dollars in thousands)

Comptroller Source Group	Actual FY 2009	Actual FY 2010	Approved FY 2011	Proposed FY 2012	Change from FY 2011	Percent Change*
11 - Regular Pay - Cont Full Time	5,563	5,053	4,707	5,104	397	8.4
12 - Regular Pay - Other	225	188	54	127	73	136.3
13 - Additional Gross Pay	52	144	0	0	0	N/A
14 - Fringe Benefits - Current Personnel	1,044	998	857	1,043	187	21.8
15 - Overtime Pay	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Subtotal Personal Services (PS)	6,883	6,383	5,617	6,275	658	11.7
20 - Supplies and Materials	39	16	38	38	0	0.0
30 - Energy, Comm. and Bldg Rentals	0	29	0	0	0	N/A
31 - Telephone, Telegraph, Telegram, Etc.	45	47	0	0	0	N/A
32 - Rentals - Land and Structures	586	183	0	0	0	N/A
33 - Janitorial Services	0	34	0	0	0	N/A
34 - Security Services	0	6	0	0	0	N/A
35 - Occupancy Fixed Costs	0	7	0	0	0	N/A
40 - Other Services and Charges	210	294	213	178	-36	-16.7
41 - Contractual Services - Other	498	607	221	17,952	17,731	8,015.4
50 - Subsidies and Transfers	892	199	333	230	-103	-30.9
70 - Equipment and Equipment Rental	71	87	64	54	-10	-15.8
Subtotal Nonpersonal Services (NPS)	2,341	1,509	869	18,451	17,583	2,024.5
Gross Funds	9,224	7,892	6,486	24,726	18,240	281.2

*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 recommen-

dations 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 Area. Neighborhood Planning's main areas of responsibility include developing small-area plans and planning studies and coordinating and tracking plan implementation. Revitalization and 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 city 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 for the District so that they can have information needed to plan, develop, and preserve the city.

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 organizations. These services complement the automated tools 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 2012 Proposed Budget.

FY 2012 Proposed Operating Budget and FTEs, by Division and Activity

Table BD0-4 contains the proposed FY 2012 budget by division and activity compared to the FY 2011 approved budget. It also provides the FY 2010 actual data.

Table BD0-4

(dollars in thousands)

Division/Activity	Dollars in Thousands				Full-Time Equivalents			
	Actual FY 2010	Approved FY 2011	Proposed FY 2012	Change from FY 2011	Actual FY 2010	Approved FY 2011	Proposed FY 2012	Change from FY 2011
(1000) Agency Management								
(1010) Personnel	170	116	117	1	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.0
(1015) Training and Employee Development	41	26	24	-2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1020) Contracting and Procurement	82	34	34	1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1030) Property Management	518	198	207	9	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1040) Information Technology	126	106	71	-35	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1050) Financial Management	77	67	68	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
(1055) Risk Management	32	17	18	0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1060) Legal	34	0	0	0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
(1080) Communications	125	104	107	3	1.2	1.0	1.0	0.0
(1085) Customer Service	74	17	18	0	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1090) Performance Management	67	404	411	7	2.5	3.2	3.2	0.0
Subtotal (1000) Agency Management	1,348	1,089	1,074	-15	7.0	7.0	7.0	0.0
(2000) Development Review and Historic Preservation								
(2010) Development/Zoning Review	1,366	877	1,052	175	12.0	9.0	9.0	0.0
(2020) Historic Preservation	1,697	1,664	1,561	-103	13.2	13.0	13.0	0.0
Subtotal (2000) Development Review and Historic Preservation	3,063	2,540	2,613	73	25.2	22.0	22.0	0.0
(3000) Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning								
(3010) Neighborhood Planning	1,168	803	18,842	18,038	12.4	9.9	11.4	1.5
(3020) Revitalization and Design	545	666	677	11	6.4	6.4	6.4	0.0
Subtotal (3000) Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	1,713	1,470	19,519	18,049	18.8	16.3	17.8	1.5
(5000) Long-Range Planning								
(5010) Comprehensive Planning	39	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal (5000) Long-Range Planning	39	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(6000) Long Range Planning								
(6010) Comprehensive Planning	496	0	0	0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
(6020) GIS and IT	594	0	0	0	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
(6030) State Data Center	638	0	0	0	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal (6000) Long Range Planning	1,728	0	0	0	13.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

(Continued on next page)

Table BD0-4 (Continued)

(dollars in thousands)

Division/Activity	Dollars in Thousands				Full-Time Equivalents			
	Actual FY 2010	Approved FY 2011	Proposed FY 2012	Change from FY 2011	Actual FY 2010	Approved FY 2011	Proposed FY 2012	Change from FY 2011
(7000) Citywide Planning								
(7010) Citywide Planning	0	406	529	123	0.0	3.4	4.4	1.0
(7020) GIS and IT	0	591	598	8	0.0	5.4	5.4	0.0
(7030) State Data Center	0	389	392	3	0.0	4.4	4.4	0.0
Subtotal (7000) Citywide Planning	0	1,386	1,520	134	0.0	13.2	14.2	1.0
Total Proposed Operating Budget	7,892	6,486	24,726	18,240	64.2	58.5	61.0	2.5

(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 2012 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

FY 2012 Proposed Budget Changes

Inter-Agency Adjustments: The Office of Planning (OP) increased Local funds by \$109,861 for personal services to align the budget with projected expenditures and to allocate for the historical growth rate in fringe benefits. The Development Review and Historic Preservation (DRHP) program will decrease subsidies and transfers from Local funds by \$102,801 to help offset the increase in personal services. The agency will further decrease the Local funds budget by \$10,006 in equipment and \$3,611 in other services and charges. OP will also increase contractual services by \$6,262 in Local funds. A one-time Local assessment in the amount of \$6,000 will be used to support the DRHP program. The DRHP program will increase its Federal Grant funds by a net \$1,350. This is the result of an increase of \$66,996 and 0.5 FTE, reducing other services and charges by \$20,231, and reducing contractual services by \$45,415. OP will also receive an additional \$18 million in the form of a Federal Payment for redevelopment of the former St. Elizabeths hospital. These funds will be used across multiple programs.

Intra-Agency Adjustments: The agency ended a prior year Intra-District agreement with the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs and will eliminate 1.0 FTE for a savings of \$63,397.

Transfers In: OP transferred 3.0 FTEs and \$314,483 from the capital budget to the Local funds operating budget. This move reflects a transfer to the following programs: 0.5 FTE to Historic Preservation; 1.0 FTE to Citywide Planning; and 1.5 FTEs to Neighborhood Planning.

Transfers Out: Information technology assessment Local funding in the amount of \$17,813 will be transferred to the Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO).

Shift: OP will shift \$12,000 from Local funds to Special Purpose Revenue funds to reflect a shift of an existing fee.

FY 2011 Approved Budget to FY 2012 Proposed Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-5 itemizes the changes by revenue type between the FY 2011 approved budget and the FY 2012 proposed budget.

Table BD0-5

(dollars in thousands)

	PROGRAM	BUDGET	FTE
LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2011 Approved Budget and FTE		5,956	52.5
Cost Decrease: Decrease funding for subsidies and transfers	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-103	0.0
Cost Decrease: Decrease equipment budget	Agency Management	-10	0.0
Cost Decrease: Decrease other services and charges	Agency Management	-4	0.0
Cost Increase: Align personal services to projected expenditures	Multiple Programs	110	0.0
Cost Increase: Increase contractual services	Development Review and Historic Preservation	6	0.0
Transfer In: FTEs from Capital	Multiple Programs	314	3.0
FY 2012 Initial Adjusted Budget		6,270	55.5
Transfer Out: Transfer Local portion of the IT assessment to OCTO	Agency Management	-18	0.0
Cost Increase: One-time funding	Development Review and Historic Preservation	6	0.0
Shift: Shift to new Special Purpose Revenue source	Agency Management	-12	0.0
LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2012 Proposed Budget and FTE		6,246	55.5
FEDERAL PAYMENTS: FY 2011 Approved Budget and FTE		0	2.0
Enhance: Redevelopment efforts at the site of the former St. Elizabeths hospital	Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	18,000	0.0
FY 2012 Initial Adjusted Budget		18,000	2.0
FEDERAL PAYMENTS: FY 2012 Proposed Budget and FTE		18,000	2.0
FEDERAL GRANT FUND: FY 2011 Approved Budget and FTE		449	3.0
Cost Decrease: Decrease contractual services	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-45	0.0
Cost Decrease: Decrease other services and charges	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-20	0.0
Cost Increase: Increase FTE	Development Review and Historic Preservation	67	0.5
FY 2012 Initial Adjusted Budget		450	3.5
FEDERAL GRANT FUND: FY 2012 Proposed Budget and FTE		450	3.5
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2011 Approved Budget and FTE		18	0.0
Cost Increase: Increase other services and charges	Development Review and Historic Preservation	6	0.0
FY 2012 Initial Adjusted Budget		24	0.0
Cost Decrease: Decrease other services and charges	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-6	0.0
Shift: Shift from Local funds to reflect dedication of Historic Preservation Filing fee	Agency Management	12	0.0
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2012 Proposed Budget and FTE		30	0.0
INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS: FY 2011 Approved Budget and FTE		63	1.0
Reduce: Eliminate FTE	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-63	-1.0
FY 2012 Initial Adjusted Budget		0	0.0
INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS: FY 2012 Proposed Budget and FTE		0	0.0
Gross for BD0 - Office of Planning		24,726	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 their divisions:

1. Citywide Planning

Objective 1: Use data to inform planning.

Objective 2: Better inform decisions about public and private investments.

Citywide Planning

Metric	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Target	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Projection	FY 2012 Projection	FY 2013 Projection
Develop facility plans, identify public-private partnerships or co-location opportunities, and conduct demographic analyses for targeted agencies	2	3	5	3	4	4
Percentage of OP-responsible Comprehensive Plan implementation items from the current plan and future amendments that are newly achieved during the fiscal year	Not Available	25%	36.71%	25%	25%	27%
Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline, as measured by change in Gross Sales and Use Tax (Note: Baseline established in FY 2009)	\$969.5M Annual	1%	-1.76%	1.0%	TBD	TBD
Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline as measured by change in Retail Trade Employment (Note: Baseline established in FY 2009)	47,684 Annual Average	1%	0.68%	1.0%	TBD	TBD
Percentage change in transit ridership	2.17%	3%	-2.19%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
Use Walkscore to compare the District's walkability to other U.S. cities ¹	Not Available	Ranked #7	Ranked #7	Remain in Top 10	Remain in Top 10	Remain in Top 10
Positive change in median single family home sales price	-2.28%	≥6.6%	-4.98%	2.2%	TBD	TBD
Positive change in median household income	+6.66%	≥+0.90%	2.34%	3.0%	TBD	TBD
Change in District population	+0.67%	≥+0.30%	1.32%	0.3%	TBD	TBD
Percentage of customers ² who have the data and analysis needed to fulfill their role in planning the city and influencing quality neighborhood outcomes ²	94.14%	90%	94.26%	90%	90%	90%
Percentage change to citizens' access to fresh and healthy food relative to the baseline (which was 51.9 percent as of FY 2008)	10%	5%	0.8%	5.0%	TBD	TBD
Percentage change in number of green jobs in District	Not Available	Set Baseline	TBD	1%	2%	3%
Median number of hours needed to successfully complete a mapping request	Not Available	5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0

2. Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning

Objective 1: Catalyze improvements in neighborhoods and central Washington to continue economic competitiveness, enhanced 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 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Target	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Projection	FY 2012 Projection	FY 2013 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	Not Available	60%	100%	65%	70%	75%
Cost of consultant services per plan completed	Not Available	\$250,000	\$104,595	\$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 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Target	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Projection	FY 2012 Projection	FY 2013 Projection
Percentage of permit applications reviewed over the counter	Not Available	90%	94.54%	90%	90%	90%
Dollar amount of historic homeowner grants issued	\$892,261	\$350,000	\$201,486	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Percentage of historic landmark designations without owner objection	Not Available	85%	100%	85%	85%	85%
Percentage of District government project applications responded to within 5 business days	Not Available	90%	89.70%	90%	90%	90%
Percentage of Development Review reports that meet the expectations of boards/commissions	92.69%	90%	93.84%	90%	90%	90%
Average number of cases reviewed per zoning review staff	Not Available	20	41.06	20	20	20
Average number of cases reviewed per historic preservation staff	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	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 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Target	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Projection	FY 2012 Projection	FY 2013 Projection
Percentage of subgrantees budget spent on programmatic costs ³	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	65%	65%	65%
Percentage of scheduled monitoring reports as defined in agency monitoring plan completed for each grant award ⁴	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	100%	100%	100%

Performance Plan Endnotes:

1. Walk Score measures how easy it is to live a “car-lite” lifestyle. The Walk Score algorithm awards points based on the distance to amenities in each category. Currently, the District of Columbia is ranked number seven in the country with a score of 70. This information was collected from <http://www.walkscore.com/rankings/>.
2. Includes District residents and other individuals, private organizations, and government agencies.
3. 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.
4. Pursuant to section 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.

