

---

# Office of Planning

www.planning.dc.gov

Telephone: 202-442-7600

---

Description	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Approved	FY 2015 Proposed	% Change from FY 2014
Operating Budget	\$7,622,088	\$7,052,878	\$9,948,827	41.1
FTEs	57.6	60.0	71.0	18.3

---

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 2015 proposed budget is presented in the following tables:

## FY 2015 Proposed Gross Funds Operating Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-1 contains the proposed FY 2015 agency budget compared to the FY 2014 approved budget. It also provides FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual expenditures.

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

<b>Appropriated Fund</b>	<b>Actual FY 2012</b>	<b>Actual FY 2013</b>	<b>Approved FY 2014</b>	<b>Proposed FY 2015</b>	<b>Change from FY 2014</b>	<b>Percent Change*</b>
<b><u>General Fund</u></b>						
Local Funds	6,111	6,345	6,481	9,359	2,878	44.4
Special Purpose Revenue Funds	79	58	50	80	30	60.0
<b>Total for General Fund</b>	<b>6,190</b>	<b>6,403</b>	<b>6,531</b>	<b>9,439</b>	<b>2,908</b>	<b>44.5</b>
<b><u>Federal Resources</u></b>						
Federal Grant Funds	739	601	522	509	-13	-2.5
<b>Total for Federal Resources</b>	<b>739</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>-13</b>	<b>-2.5</b>
<b><u>Private Funds</u></b>						
Private Grant Funds	250	18	0	1	1	N/A
<b>Total for Private Funds</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b><u>Intra-District Funds</u></b>						
Intra-District Funds	796	601	0	0	0	N/A
<b>Total for Intra-District Funds</b>	<b>796</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Gross Funds</b>	<b>7,975</b>	<b>7,622</b>	<b>7,053</b>	<b>9,949</b>	<b>2,896</b>	<b>41.1</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 2015 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

---

## FY 2015 Proposed Full-Time Equivalents, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-2 contains the proposed FY 2015 FTE level compared to the FY 2014 approved FTE level by revenue type. It also provides FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual data.

---

**Table BD0-2**

<b>Appropriated Fund</b>	<b>Actual FY 2012</b>	<b>Actual FY 2013</b>	<b>Approved FY 2014</b>	<b>Proposed FY 2015</b>	<b>Change from FY 2014</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
<b><u>General Fund</u></b>						
Local Funds	53.5	54.0	56.5	67.5	11.0	19.5
<b>Total for General Fund</b>	<b>53.5</b>	<b>54.0</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>19.5</b>
<b><u>Federal Resources</u></b>						
Federal Grant Funds	2.9	3.6	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.0
<b>Total for Federal Resources</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total Proposed FTEs</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>57.6</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>18.3</b>

## FY 2015 Proposed Operating Budget, by Comptroller Source Group

Table BD0-3 contains the proposed FY 2015 budget at the Comptroller Source Group (object class) level compared to the FY 2014 approved budget. It also provides FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual expenditures.

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

Comptroller Source Group	Actual FY 2012	Actual FY 2013	Approved FY 2014	Proposed FY 2015	Change from FY 2014	Percent Change*
11 - Regular Pay - Continuing Full Time	4,798	4,824	5,256	6,298	1,042	19.8
12 - Regular Pay - Other	78	337	0	239	239	N/A
13 - Additional Gross Pay	24	61	0	0	0	N/A
14 - Fringe Benefits - Current Personnel	915	1,000	1,138	1,350	213	18.7
<b>Subtotal Personal Services (PS)</b>	<b>5,816</b>	<b>6,221</b>	<b>6,394</b>	<b>7,887</b>	<b>1,493</b>	<b>23.4</b>
20 - Supplies and Materials	37	35	38	38	0	0.0
31 - Telephone, Telegraph, Telegram, Etc.	1	2	0	0	0	N/A
40 - Other Services and Charges	103	225	174	202	28	15.9
41 - Contractual Services - Other	1,731	960	202	1,588	1,386	685.1
50 - Subsidies and Transfers	234	129	191	181	-11	-5.7
70 - Equipment and Equipment Rental	53	51	54	54	0	0.0
<b>Subtotal Nonpersonal Services (NPS)</b>	<b>2,159</b>	<b>1,401</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>2,062</b>	<b>1,403</b>	<b>212.9</b>
<b>Gross Funds</b>	<b>7,975</b>	<b>7,622</b>	<b>7,053</b>	<b>9,949</b>	<b>2,896</b>	<b>41.1</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 2015 proposed budget.

## FY 2015 Proposed Operating Budget and FTEs, by Division and Activity

Table BD0-4 contains the proposed FY 2015 budget by division and activity compared to the FY 2014 approved budget. It also provides the FY 2013 actual data.

**Table BD0-4**

(dollars in thousands)

Division/Activity	Dollars in Thousands				Full-Time Equivalents			
	Actual FY 2013	Approved FY 2014	Proposed FY 2015	Change from FY 2014	Actual FY 2013	Approved FY 2014	Proposed FY 2015	Change from FY 2014
<b>(1000) Agency Management</b>								
(1010) Personnel	120	121	140	18	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.0
(1015) Training and Employee Development	25	25	28	3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1020) Contracting and Procurement	33	35	36	2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1030) Property Management	179	180	179	-1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1040) Information Technology	68	72	73	1	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1050) Financial Management	67	70	73	3	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
(1055) Risk Management	17	18	20	1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1060) Legal	28	28	29	1	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0
(1080) Communications	101	140	145	5	1.0	1.2	1.2	0.0
(1085) Customer Service	45	46	48	2	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.0
(1090) Performance Management	349	349	379	30	3.2	2.5	2.5	0.0
<b>Subtotal (1000) Agency Management</b>	<b>1,031</b>	<b>1,084</b>	<b>1,149</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>6.6</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	798	926	1,003	77	7.8	8.0	8.0	0.0
(2020) Historic Preservation	2,007	1,662	1,745	82	12.9	13.0	13.0	0.0
<b>Subtotal (2000) Development Review and Historic Preservation</b>	<b>2,805</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>2,748</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>(3000) Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning</b>								
(3010) Neighborhood Planning	1,549	1,119	3,637	2,517	11.1	11.4	22.4	11.0
(3020) Revitalization and Design	674	664	734	70	5.2	6.4	6.4	0.0
<b>Subtotal (3000) Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning</b>	<b>2,223</b>	<b>1,783</b>	<b>4,371</b>	<b>2,588</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>11.0</b>
<b>Planning</b>								
<b>(7000) Citywide Planning</b>								
(7010) Citywide Planning	533	546	574	27	4.3	4.4	4.4	0.0
(7020) GIS and IT	614	628	662	35	5.4	5.4	5.4	0.0
(7030) State Data Center	417	424	445	21	4.3	4.4	4.4	0.0
<b>Subtotal (7000) Citywide Planning</b>	<b>1,563</b>	<b>1,598</b>	<b>1,681</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total Proposed Operating Budget</b>	<b>7,622</b>	<b>7,053</b>	<b>9,949</b>	<b>2,896</b>	<b>57.6</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>11.0</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 2015 Operating Appendices** located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

## **FY 2015 Proposed Budget Changes**

The Office of Planning's (OP) proposed FY 2015 gross budget is \$9,948,827, which represents a 41.1 percent increase over its FY 2014 approved gross budget of \$7,052,878. The budget is comprised of \$9,358,827 in Local funds, \$509,000 in Federal Grant funds, \$1,000 in Private Grant funds, and \$80,000 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 2014 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 FY 2015 CSFL adjustments to the FY 2014 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 2015 CSFL budget is \$6,808,827, which represents a \$327,949, or 5.1 percent, increase over the FY 2014 approved Local funds budget of \$6,480,878.

### **CSFL Assumptions**

The FY 2015 CSFL calculated for OP included adjustment entries that are not described in detail on table 5. These adjustments were made for increases of \$271,665 in personal services to account for Fringe Benefit costs based on trend and comparative analyses and the impact of cost-of-living adjustments implemented in FY 2013, and \$6,284 in nonpersonal services based on the Consumer Price Index factor of 2.4 percent. Additionally, OP's CSFL funding for removal of one-time salary lapse reflects an increase of \$50,000.

### **Agency Budget Submission**

**Increase:** OP's Local funds budget reflects adjustments for projected step increases, position changes and Fringe Benefits that amount to an increase of \$159,601 and 2.0 FTEs across all divisions. The proposed budget in the Agency Management division is increased by \$9,384 to account for a contractual obligation for the receptionist. In the Development Review and Historic Preservation division's budget, Federal Grant funds reflect a \$6,096 increase for salary step and Fringe Benefits adjustments. In Private Grant funds, the budget for the Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning division is increased by \$1,000. The Special Purpose Revenue funds budget reflects an increase of \$30,000 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 OP Local funds budget decreased by \$50,624 and 2.0 FTEs across multiple divisions to reflect adjustments to salaries and agency positions. The budget decreased by \$118,361 in the Agency Management and Development Review and Historic Preservation divisions to offset the increases in personal services costs. The Federal Grant funds budget decreased by \$19,096 based on grant spending plans allocated between the FY 2014 and FY 2015 grant budget period.

**Technical Adjustment:** The Office of Planning's budget proposal reflects an increase of \$2,500,000 in the Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning division for projects previously funded with Capital funds. This is comprised of \$1,393,677 in nonpersonal services and \$1,106,323 in personal services for 11.0 FTEs. The District Public Plans and Studies project funds planning, zoning, historic preservation studies and projects, and facility plans linked to important city and other development projects that are to be implemented by the District and/or its partners.

### Mayor's Proposed Budget

**No Change:** The Office of Planning's budget proposal reflects no change from the agency budget submission to the Mayor's proposed budget.

### District's Proposed Budget

**Enhance:** The Local funds budget increased by \$100,000 to reflect one-time funding in the Development Review and Historic Preservation division to support Historic Homeowner grants.

**Reduce:** In Local funds, OP's budget includes a reduction of \$50,000 to reflect an adjustment of personal services costs based on projected salary lapse savings.

---

## FY 2014 Approved Budget to FY 2015 Proposed Budget, by Revenue Type

Table BD0-5 itemizes the changes by revenue type between the FY 2014 approved budget and the FY 2015 proposed budget.

---

**Table BD0-5**

(dollars in thousands)

DESCRIPTION	DIVISION	BUDGET	FTE
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2014 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>6,481</b>	<b>56.5</b>
Other CSFL Adjustments	Multiple Programs	328	0.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2015 Current Services Funding Level Budget (CSFL)</b>		<b>6,809</b>	<b>56.5</b>
Increase: To adjust personal services	Multiple Programs	160	2.0
Increase: To adjust Contractual Services budget	Agency Management	9	0.0
Decrease: To adjust personal services	Multiple Programs	-51	-2.0
Decrease: To offset projected increases in personal services	Multiple Programs	-118	0.0
Technical Adjustment: Moving project previously funded with capital to operating	Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	2,500	11.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2015 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>9,309</b>	<b>67.5</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2015 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>9,309</b>	<b>67.5</b>
Enhance: To support the Historic Homeowner grant program (one-time)	Development Review and Historic Preservation	100	0.0
Reduce: Personal services to reflect salary lapse savings	Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	-50	0.0
<b>LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2015 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>9,359</b>	<b>67.5</b>

(Continued on next page)

**Table BD0-5 (Continued)**

(dollars in thousands)

DESCRIPTION	DIVISION	BUDGET	FTE
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2014 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>522</b>	<b>3.5</b>
Increase: To adjust personal services	Development Review and Historic Preservation	6	0.0
Decrease: To align with projected revenues	Development Review and Historic Preservation	-19	0.0
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2015 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>509</b>	<b>3.5</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2015 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>509</b>	<b>3.5</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS: FY 2015 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>509</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>PRIVATE GRANT FUNDS: FY 2014 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Increase: To align budget with projected revenues	Revitalization/Design and Neighborhood Planning	1	0.0
<b>PRIVATE GRANT FUNDS: FY 2015 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>PRIVATE GRANT FUNDS: FY 2015 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>PRIVATE GRANT FUNDS: FY 2015 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2014 Approved Budget and FTE</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Increase: To align with projected revenues	Development Review and Historic Preservation	30	0.0
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2015 Agency Budget Submission</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2015 Mayor's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>0.0</b>
No Change		0	0.0
<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS: FY 2015 District's Proposed Budget</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Gross for BD0 - Office of Planning</b>		<b>9,949</b>	<b>71.0</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 2015:

### 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 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Target	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection	FY 2016 Projection
Develop facility plans, identify public-private partnerships or co-location opportunities, and conduct demographic analyses for targeted agencies	2	2	2	2	3	3
Percent of OP-responsible Comp Plan implementation items from the current plan and future amendments that are newly achieved during the fiscal year	26%	25%	16%	27%	29%	25%
Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline, as measured by change in Gross Sales and Use Tax	+9.6%	+1.0%	+2.6%	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
Change in retail indicators relative to the baseline, as measured by change in Retail Trade Employment	+8.5%	+1.0%	+2.7%	+1.0%	+1.0%	+1.0%
Percent change in transit ridership	-2.1%	4%	0.1%	4%	4%	4%
Use Walkscore to compare the District's walkability to other U.S. cities (Remain in top 10)	7	1-10	1	1- 10	1-10	1- 10
Positive change in change in median single family home sales price	+3.1%	+2.5%	+7.9%	+3.0%	+3.0%	+2.7%
Positive change in change in median household income	+3.6%	+3.0%	+5.4%	+3.0%	+3.0%	+3.0%
Positive change in District population [One City Action Plan Indicator 3A]	+2.2%	+3.0%	+2.3%	+2.5%	+3.0%	+3.0%
Percent of customers <sup>1</sup> who have the data and analysis needed to fulfill their role in planning the city and influencing quality neighborhood outcomes	96.8%	90%	96.9%	90%	90%	92%
Percent change to citizens' access to grocery stores and farmers markets [One City Action Plan Action 3.4.1]	0.5%	1.0%	1.6%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%

## 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 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Target	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection	FY 2016 Projection
Percent of OP small area plans approved by the Council	100%	90%	100%	90%	90%	92%
Percent of plans completed in 18 months or less	100%	75%	100%	78%	80%	80%
Cost of consultant services per plan completed	\$175,953	\$250,000	\$300,000	\$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 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Target	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection	FY 2016 Projection
Percent of historic property permit applications reviewed over the counter	93.7%	90%	95.6%	90%	90%	90%
Dollars of historic homeowner grants issued	\$246,048	\$230,000	\$116,115 <sup>2</sup>	\$230,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Percent of historic landmark designations without owner objection	100%	85%	100%	85%	85%	85%
Percent of District government project reviews concluded with adverse effects resolved by consensus	97.8%	90%	100%	90%	90%	90%
Percent of Dev. Rev. reports that meet the expectations of boards/commissions	93.4%	90%	94.2%	90%	90%	92%
Average cases reviewed per zoning review staff	70.8	20	32.6	35	35	35
Average cases reviewed per historic preservation staff	814	500	818	600	600	600
Percent of Planned Unit Development that exceed minimum requirements to further the Sustainable D.C. 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	Not Available	Not Available	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

Measure	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Target	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Projection	FY 2015 Projection	FY 2016 Projection
Percent of sub-grantee's budget spent on programmatic costs <sup>3</sup>	79.9%	65%	76.5%	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> Includes District residents and other individuals, private organizations, and government agencies.

<sup>2</sup> Will report end-of-year.

<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.