



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

To: Members, Planning Commission
Members, Historic Preservation Commission

From: John Rahaim, Director of Planning

Date: January 26, 2010

Subject: **FY 2010-2011 Budget Development: Draft Budget and Options for Resolving the Remaining Deficit**

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Introduction

At the December 17 Planning Commission meeting, staff presented the City's and Department's financial condition, projected budget deficit for FY2010-2011, and offered preliminary balancing options. On January 20 and January 21, staff presented the Department's goals and proposed work program to the Historic Preservation and Planning Commissions, respectively. Since that time, staff has refined the revenue and expenditure estimates for next fiscal year, and is now submitting budget details for the Commissions' review. The proposed budget is not yet balanced. Staff continues to develop solutions to our shortfall in coordination with the Joint Labor Management Committee and the Mayor's Office. A balanced budget and work program will be presented to the Planning Commission on February 11, 2010 for final review and approval.

In preparation for making the trade-off decisions needed to balance the work program to our resources, staff prepared for the Commissions' review a work program that reallocated existing staff resources to address changes in the workload, and to staff priority efforts for next year. The reason for preparing a work program that requires more resources than we have identified, was to show the Commissions how the Department would allocate staff if reductions were not necessary. This draft work program (Attachment C) should be used as a tool to (1) understand the Department's work efforts and services, (2) review the Department's recommendations on how to reallocate existing resources, (3) make educated trade-off decisions, and (4) to make clearer the impacts of reductions to our staff resources if necessary.

On January 20, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) prioritized completing the surveys underway, including initiation of Historic Districts, over new initiatives; recommended against increasing fees, most especially if the fee increases would impact

smaller projects; and encouraged the Department to fund Code Enforcement in part through penalty revenues. Planning Commissioner comments on January 21st included a recommendation that Code Enforcement be adequately staffed and that Administration be adequately staffed especially with respect to answering the public's questions and responding to information requests. Commissioner comments also included a recommendation that the Department focus attention on Transit-Oriented Development as it relates to the State's SB 375 requirement.

How This Document is Organized

This document at the outset explains high-level changes from the projected budget deficit of \$4.46M reported at earlier hearings, and then in more detail describes the proposed but as yet unbalanced budget resource allocation at the department level. Notably, the draft budget does not include final details on the cost of services of other departments, such as the Department of Technology, and only includes assumptions of work-order agreements and grants, which need to be formalized. In response to Commissioner direction, Code Enforcement staffing and funding, administrative staffing, the Department's proposal for completion of preservation surveys, and potential fee increases will be covered in more detail. This document also includes a discussion of the decisions the Department faces to balance the proposed budget and quantifies the trade-off decisions. Finally, the memo provides a summary of the external process the budget will follow over the next few months after the Planning Commission's final review and approval on February 11, 2010.

The following Attachments are also included:

- A – FY2011 Proposed Budget Summary
- B – FY2011 Expenditure Summary
- C – FY2011 Draft Work Program (*One change from prior version to allocate 0.40 more FTE to Japantown from the Sustainable Growth Strategy in the Citywide program. This draft work program is not balanced to Department resources.*)

As a first pass, we believe we can safely reduce a substantial portion of the budget deficit, taking it from \$4.46M to \$1.47M, through the following actions:

- Assuming improved revenue projections based on the second quarter of the current year and a positive outlook of a 2.5 percent recovery in the next year.
- Adopting a fee increase of 4.65 percent to recover costs for programs previously supported through the General Fund – mostly for Code Enforcement.
- Assuming an increased amount of penalty revenues generated by the Code Enforcement and General Advertising Sign programs.
- Assuming a more positive projection for Grants, likely possible since we will soon have a grant writer on staff.

- Using the savings generated in the Citywide long-range planning program to offset FY2011 costs.
- Using existing vacancies to fund critical un-funded positions, and reallocating existing staff positions to areas of key need.
- Keeping the majority of remaining vacancies unfilled, thereby increasing attrition savings and reducing the budget deficit.
- Further reducing materials and supplies and other non-salary costs.

Summary of Reductions to the Deficit since December

Source Changes:

Sources on December 14, 2009 \$19,137,412

Increases:

Fee and Penalty Changes

- *Improvement in projections based on the current year* 884,516
- *Economic Recovery for next year at 2.5 percent* 407,431
- *Fee increase of 4.65 percent* 757,821
- *General Advertising Sign Program Penalties/ Judgments* 468,608
- *Code Enforcement Inspection Fees and Penalties* 104,000

Grant Support 450,049

Citywide Savings 600,000

Offset by Reductions in:

Work Order Support (330,046)

Impact Fee Revenue (104,532)

General Fund Allocation (12,525)

Sources on January 26, 2010 \$22,362,734

Difference **\$3,225,322**

Use Changes:

Uses on December 14, 2009 \$23,593,048

Increases:

Fringe Benefits 431,448

Services of Other Departments 289,564

Offset by Reductions in:

Salary Reductions (405,881)

Materials and Supplies and Other Savings (79,007)

Uses on January 26, 2010 \$23,829,172

Difference **\$236,124**

Sources on January 26, 2010 **\$22,362,734**

Uses on January 26, 2010 **\$23,829,172**

Surplus/(Deficit) **(\$1,466,438)**

Draft Budget Proposal

The proposed revenue budget is as follows:

<u>Sources</u>	FY 2010 Adopted	FY 2011 Proposed	Increase/ (Decrease)	Percent Changed
Planning Department Fees	16,163,911	17,462,474	1,298,563	8.0%
Developer Impact Fees	104,532	-	(104,532)	-100.0%
Grants and Gifts	891,913	576,100	(315,813)	-35.4%
General Fund Support	2,507,806	1,542,332	(965,474)	-38.5%
Integrated Permit Tracking	855,000	-	(855,000)	-100.0%
General Advertising Program	281,000	704,608	423,608	150.8%
Code Enforcement Funds	104,000	104,000	-	0.0%
Expenditure Recovery	2,983,029	1,123,220	(1,859,809)	-62.3%
Use of Prior Year Savings	250,000	850,000	600,000	240.0%
Total	\$ 24,141,191	\$ 22,362,734	\$ (1,778,457)	-7.4%

As shown in the table above, the largest increase in the revenue budget is for Department fees due to the reasons discussed above - (1) slightly better actuals in the current year

compared to budget, (2) an assumed improvement in the volume of applications filed next year at 2.5 percent, and (3) the proposed fee increase at 4.65 percent. The use of prior year savings from appropriations for long-range planning efforts increases from \$250K to \$800K. The Citywide Planning program will use contract and other savings from prior year planning efforts to support staff costs next year for the plan implementation function and other activities. The General Advertising program revenue increases substantially which is due to anticipated penalty and settlement revenues, most of which will be the result of legal action.

The largest decrease is in Expenditure Recovery, which is funding from other departments for planning and environmental review work. Other decreases include General Fund support, which we have discussed in detail, grants and gifts, and Development Impact fees, which assumes that pursuant to the Mayor’s proposed legislation developers will have the option to defer fee payments in FY2011 and that 100 percent will choose to defer fees.

The proposed expense budget is as follows:

	FY 2010 Proposed	FY 2011 Proposed	Increase/ (Decrease)	Percent Changed
Salaries	13,429,428	13,411,290	(18,138)	-0.1%
Mandatory Fringe Benefits	4,823,538	5,527,986	704,448	14.6%
Overhead	-	379,614	379,614	100.0%
Non Personal Services	810,448	708,941	(101,507)	-12.5%
Materials and Supplies	179,660	148,128	(31,532)	-17.6%
Equipment	13,248	22,280	9,032	68.2%
Services of Other Departments	3,621,369	3,630,933	9,564	0.3%
Grant passthrough to DPW	408,500	-	(408,500)	-100.0%
Integrated Permit Tracking	855,000	-	(855,000)	-100.0%
Total	\$ 24,141,191	\$ 23,829,172	\$ (312,019)	-1.3%

The details of the above shown changes are in Attachment B – FY2011 Expenditure Summary. The most significant changes on the expenditure side are in Fringe Benefits, Overhead, and the Integrated Permit Tracking System project. Despite decreases in salary costs, fringe benefit costs continue to grow, led by a substantial increase in retirement costs. Overhead costs are anticipated at \$380k in FY2011, after a one-time credit to account for being overcharged for this item in prior years. The Integrated Permit Tracking System project shows both a reduction in funding and in expenditures, as the Department plans to use current year savings to cover FY2011 costs.

Administration Staffing

Commissioner comments included a concern that there is not sufficient administrative support to the Commissions, especially with respect to answering public questions and formal public information requests, and that the staff reductions in prior years impacted administrative staff proportionally more than it did planner classifications.

With regard to answering public information requests, the Department believes it needs to make significant improvements in this area. Lack of funding and staff resources has resulted in a decentralized and inefficient system both for the public and for staff, without clear procedures and technology to support these procedures and ensure compliance. The Department proposes shifting this responsibility from the Commission Secretary and her staff so that they can focus on serving the Commissions, to the Operations function. The proposal includes substituting a vacant Planner III position to a Planner IV position, 0.50 FTE of which is to provide direct support to the Director of Neighborhood Planning, and the other 0.50 FTE of which will be reassigned from Neighborhood Planning to Operations, which is under the Administration Division. The proposed duties of the 0.50 FTE Planner IV positions are as follows:

- Coordinate timely and complete responses to public information requests,
- Develop policies and procedures for compliance with the Sunshine Ordinance and for open and free information exchange,
- Train staff on these procedures,
- Represent the Department before the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, and
- Manage efforts to make information available electronically.

The number of reductions to Administration and support staff last fiscal year was proportionately high compared to Planning staff. The reason for this was a decision to shift the TAC team functions to the quadrant team administrative support staff, to share executive administrative support across Department managers, and to eliminate the Contracts Manager and IT Business Manager positions. At the same time, however, the Department has taken steps to shore up its support functions. First, the Department reassigned administrative staff last fiscal year to HPC support, away from support to completed long-range planning projects. Second, Department management has worked closely with the Department's support staff to develop and propose a new paraprofessional position called a Planner Technician. This effort is part of the Action Plan, and provides for both increased efficiency in how the Department performs its work and a "career ladder" for support staff working in the Planning Department. In developing this proposed new position, Department management and support staff also worked together to determine how to staff the Department's current functions more efficiently, and we are making ongoing efforts to achieve those allocations. As it stands today, the Department's proposed FY2011 budget funds the filling of one of those

support positions. Finally, the Planning Department has been able to take advantage this fiscal year of the federal "Jobs NOW" program, which allows the Department to hire support staff who are paid through federal stimulus funds. The Department in turn provides training and supervision to employees in this program. We have found this program to be very successful to date, and are following efforts to extend the program past its current planned expiration in September 2010.

Proposed Changes to Historic Preservation Survey Staffing.

The proposed reduction for historic preservation survey staff is 1.80 (from 3.37 to 1.57 FTEs). The reasons for this reduction are (1) the Department is nearing the completion of survey work for several Area Plans and there are no new area plans upcoming that require survey work, and (2) the need to reallocate staff to areas where there is greater demand.

The 1.80 FTEs reduction would be reallocated to the following areas:

- 1.00 FTE to Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER) work to address the backlog in the environmental review process of evaluating historic resources,
- 0.50 FTE to the Public Information Counter (PIC) in response to the Department's two-year Action Plan, which called for increased preservation staffing at the PIC, and
- 0.30 FTE to support the HPC (including initiation of landmark designations) because of the need to provide support to this newly-created independent Commission.

The proposal does provide 1.57 FTEs for the following survey-related activities in FY2011:

- 0.25 FTE for Administrative support to maintain the preservation library, history files, and computer database system,
- 0.22 FTE to complete the Modern Age Context Statement, filling our contractual Agreement with the State Office of Historic Preservation (Grant expires in November 2010),
- 0.30 FTE for integration of survey findings into the Planning Department's Information Database System,
- 0.50 FTE for completion of current survey work underway, including adoption of survey findings by the HPC, and
- 0.30 FTE for ongoing staff review of community-based surveys (e.g., West Slope of Russian Hill, North Beach, etc).

The Department does not currently have the resources to complete district initiations. However, once survey results are adopted, the Department has very useful information for the purposes of planning, CEQA, and project review. The Department considers designation to be a formal recognition of a resource which also allows the property owner

financial incentives for rehabilitation and maintenance. However, the Department's standards of review do not materially change under CEQA if a property or district is not designated. Given the importance of this work to the HPC, we are applying for a *Preserve America* grant to fund both individual and district designations from the Market and Octavia Survey findings. The application deadline is February 12, 2010 and the grant requires a 1 to 1 match which the Department hopes to provide if we receive the award. As referred in the above paragraphs, the Department does have in the proposed work program a .30 FTE to support HPC activities, including landmark designations.

Code Enforcement and General Advertising Sign Program Staffing and Funding.

Code Enforcement.

The proposed staffing for Code Enforcement and the General Advertising Sign program has not changed from the current year. The reduction of 0.75 FTE in the Code Enforcement program is a result of moving the management of the program and the General Advertising Sign program to item 8 (0.25 FTE), and recognizing a current year reassignment to staffing Procedures (0.50 FTE). There is no actual reduction in Code Enforcement proposed, which is staffed with 6 employees - four Planner III positions, one Planner IV position and one 1450 Executive Secretary position. The total cost of the program including the City Attorney's costs is approximately \$862k.

While Code Enforcement has been a General Fund Program, staff has developed cost recovery and penalty programs in the past four years to generate non-General Fund sources for this program and to compel compliance. These programs have not been successful from a revenue standpoint (although they are successful at encouraging compliance). The reason cost recovery has not worked to date is that while the Code allows for the collection of time and materials associated with Code violation abatement efforts, the majority of bills sent out to violators have not been paid. Further, the responsible party for the Code violation is often disputed, for example when the violation is allegedly the result of a tenant or leaseholder's action. For this reason, staff recommended changes to the Code last year which took effect in August of 2009. These changes established a \$1,080 inspection fee for abatement of violations that require building permits, and a \$1,080 inspection fee for monitoring conditions of approval. Enforcement staff developed procedures for the implementation of the first fee and started using it last month. This work is not complaint-driven; importantly, it provides funding for staff to be proactive in addressing land uses such as entertainment that are typically problematic.

The reason the Department is not generating revenue from the Administrative Penalty program is because the program is a successful tool to compel compliance. Most property owners abate violations before penalties accrue, and therefore penalties are not charged. It is also important to note that a large portion of enforcement planners' time is spent responding to questions and complaints. Many of these complaints do not result in notices of violations (which can then lead to penalties), but nevertheless require investigation. Further, while it is the Department's policy goal that Code Enforcement judgments support the legal cost of pursuing code violators, to date, legal action has been a cost to the Department. Based on the first quarter of this year, Code Enforcement and the GA Sign program will cost approximately \$400K in City Attorney fees which is 31 percent of our entire City Attorney work-order. While the GA Sign program may accrue some judgments and settlements, if the current year is like prior years, the Department will not receive revenue as a result of these recent actions.

General Advertising Sign Program.

Staff previously reported that the General Advertising Sign Program should have sufficient funds accumulated to support the program next year. This assumption is uncertain as City Attorney costs remain high and the promise of judgments that reimburse the Department for these costs have not materialized. At this point, the General Advertising Sign Program is projected to end the year without a fund balance, and therefore will need to rely on penalty revenues and/or legal judgments to support approximately \$470K of the Program's costs next year.

The Department proposes to work closely with the City Attorney's Office and develop a strategy for recovery of legal costs associated with pursuing code violators. This is particularly important given the Academy of Art and other more serious violations where administrative penalties are not a sufficient incentive to compel compliance. In anticipation of a successful conclusion to this collaboration, the budget proposal assumes that the Code Enforcement program will recover \$104,000 from inspection fees and penalties which is the City Attorney budget for next year designated for Code Enforcement, and that the GA Sign program will recover \$470K in judgments and/or penalties which is required to keep the program funded in FY2011.

Revenues Projections and Fee Proposal

Department staff recommends shifting the Code Enforcement and Preservation Survey Programs away from General Fund support and onto fee and penalty support, and fee and grant support respectively. This decision reflects that the General Fund allocation does not allow for continued support for these programs and allows for greater future flexibility.

Commissioner comments focused on small to mid-sized projects as being the project types that a fee increase will most impact. As in prior fee changes, the detailed fee proposal will consider the total fee as a percent of project cost, and not increase fees for the additional surcharge where the fee proposal exceeds a reasonable percentage of project costs. At no point will the fee increase exceed 5 percent per application type, unless required to recover the direct cost of service. Further, staff will consider the fixed cost surcharges (DR, appeals to the Board of Supervisors, and Board of Appeals) and will restructure the application of these surcharges to reduce costs to smaller projects if possible while still achieving cost recovery for appeals for the Board of Appeals and the Board of Supervisors.

For budget projection purposes, Department staff is assuming an overall fee revenue increase of 7.15 percent which will be made up of volume increases from an improved economy in FY2011 (assumed at 2.5 percent), and a fee increase to recover more from fees for the long-range planning program and the Code Enforcement program (assumed at 4.65 percent). This proposal limits the cost to any one application to less than a 5 percent increase, while allowing for the continuation of vital long-range planning efforts and the Code Enforcement program.

Strategies for Solving the Remaining Budget Imbalance

As shown in Attachment A – FY2011 Proposed Budget Summary, the Department's proposed expenditures of \$23.83M are currently \$1.47M more than our sources of \$22.36M. As a recap, this projected deficit assumes the use of the following budget balancing solutions:

- An assumption of a 2.5 percent increase in the volume of applications Planning will receive next fiscal year (i.e., a slight economic recovery),
- A 4.65 percent across-the-board fee increase, subject to the restrictions described above,
- An assumption of Code Enforcement inspection fees and GA Sign penalty revenue,
- Successful securing of \$470K in new grants for next fiscal year, and
- The use of \$850K in prior year savings to fund the long-range planning program.

To solve for the remaining \$1.47M deficit, we may either increase revenues or decrease expenditures. On the revenue side, it is possible that the Department may be able to secure additional grants. The Department may also be able to increase the amount of funding it receives from other departments to perform work on their behalf. Right now, our proposed FY2011 budget assumes that we will perform approximately 8 FTE worth of work for other departments, whereas in the current fiscal year we have 22 FTE worth of work for other departments. However, both of these sources are uncertain and we are

only able to budget them if we can enter into agreements with the relevant funding partners. That said, we are actively seeking both of these forms of funding, and any agreements we secure will be put towards reducing the deficit.

We might also be able to achieve additional General Fund support through the Mayor's Office. However, this looks like a very unlikely source of revenue next fiscal year. The Mayor recently announced that the City's deficit for FY2011 has grown to \$525M, and that figure assumes only a \$40M hit to the City from the State's budget, an amount which could be significantly higher. Therefore, we believe that securing additional General Fund support above the base amount the Mayor's Office has provided is not likely. Moreover, we must assume that the Mayor's Office will require the full 30 percent reduction they have requested, and not just the 20 percent (i.e., the 20 percent plus the 10 percent contingency).

Another revenue option is to consider a higher fee increase than the 4.65 percent currently proposed. Each additional percentage point fee increase generates approximately \$163,000.

On the expenditure side, we are left with few options other than to consider reducing labor costs. Last fiscal year – and continuing in FY2011 – we reduced our non-salary budget to the essential items we need in order to function, such as paper and supplies, or contracts which are well underway. While we may be able to find small cost reductions by finding new ways to control certain costs like those of the City Attorney, these are unlikely to be of any significant magnitude. Therefore, we must consider labor costs.

As the Commissions may be aware, the Department has been working for a number of months with the unions which represent employees in the Planning Department to develop and implement a Joint Labor Management Committee. The Committee is up-and-running, and is comprised of staff from the Department as well as representatives from each of the relevant labor unions – specifically, the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21 (Local 21), the Service Employees International Union, Local 1021 (Local 1021), and the Municipal Executives Association (MEA). The Committee is currently meeting weekly to consider creative options to resolving the Department's remaining budget deficit. The Committee is considering a broad range of potential ways to save money on labor and other costs, and is making every effort to review and discuss those options with staff Department-wide so that any recommendations are fully informed by broader staff sentiment, concerns, and priorities. Once the Committee has recommendations to share with the Commissions, those will be provided. It is very important to note that any such idea pertaining to labor costs will almost certainly be subject to collective bargaining, and any recommendations the Committee generates will need to be vetted by the unions as well as by the City's Department of Human Resources.

The JLMC is reviewing the possible budget balancing options shown in the table below. Staff is also seeking the Commissions' input on these options. Moreover, if the

Commissions determine that they do not want to pursue a fee increase of 4.65 percent, for example, staff would like to know from the Commissions which of the below options they prefer to pursue. Again we must note, however, that the implementation of many of these ideas would require collective bargaining and cannot be assumed as a fait accompli. Nevertheless, in the interest of understanding which options to pursue, staff seeks the Commissions' direction.

Possible Budget Balancing Options

Option	Incremental Amount	Percent or Number Needed to Balance the Budget Using Only this Solution
1% Fee Increase	\$163,000	9% (<i>above 4.65% already proposed</i>)
1% Wage Decrease	\$135,000	10.9%
1 day unpaid Dept closure	\$41,000	34 days
Work schedule reduced by one hour per week (i.e., 39 hours total)	\$336,000	4.4 hours per week
1 layoff (average value)	\$129,000	11.4 FTE

In addition to providing input on the above, staff asks the Commissions for their recommendations on potential reductions to the Department's work program. Many of the above options would result in a reduction of FTE, whether through fewer worked hours or through fewer staff overall. Therefore, we are looking for input from the Commissions on to which programs or projects they would allocate fewer resources were that to become necessary.

Next Steps

Staff, in coordination with the Mayor's Office, will develop a solution to the \$1.47M shortfall. On February 11, 2010, staff will present a balanced budget to the Commission for final review and approval. Once the Commission has reviewed and approved the proposed FY2011 budget, staff will provide the Department's official budget submittal to the Mayor. Over the next few months, staff will work with both the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors to refine and adjust the budget as necessary. Significant changes to the budget will be brought back to the Commission for review. Final budget adoption by the Board of Supervisors will occur no later than August 1, 2010.

Attachment A - Planning Department
 FY2010/2011 Budget Summary

<u>Sources</u>	FY 2010 Adopted	FY 2011 Proposed	Increase/ (Decrease)	Percent Changed
<i>Operating</i>				
Planning Department Fees	\$ 16,163,911	\$ 17,462,474	\$ 1,298,563	8.0%
Developer Impact Fees	104,532	-	\$ (104,532)	-100.0%
Grants and Gifts	891,913	576,100	\$ (315,813)	-35.4%
General Fund Support	2,507,806	1,542,332	\$ (965,474)	-38.5%
Integrated Permit Tracking System	855,000	-	\$ (855,000)	-100.0%
Subtotal	\$ 20,523,162	\$ 19,580,906	\$ (942,256)	-4.6%
<i>Special Funds</i>				
General Advertising Program	281,000	704,608	423,608	150.8%
Code Enforcement Funds	104,000	104,000	-	0.0%
Subtotal	\$ 385,000	\$ 808,608	\$ 423,608	110.0%
Expenditure Recovery	2,983,029	1,123,220	(1,859,809)	-62.3%
Use of Prior Year Savings	250,000	850,000	600,000	240.0%
Subtotal	\$ 3,233,029	\$ 1,973,220	(1,259,809)	-39.0%
Total	\$ 24,141,191	\$ 22,362,734	\$ (1,778,457)	-7.4%
<u>Uses</u>				
	FY 2010 Proposed	FY 2010 Proposed	Increase/ (Decrease)	Percent Changed
Salaries	13,429,428	13,411,290	\$ (18,138)	-0.1%
Mandatory Fringe Benefits	4,823,538	5,527,986	\$ 704,448	14.6%
Overhead	-	379,614	\$ 379,614	100.0%
Non Personal Services	810,448	708,941	\$ (101,507)	-12.5%
Materials and Supplies	179,660	148,128	\$ (31,532)	-17.6%
Equipment	13,248	22,280	\$ 9,032	68.2%
Services of Other Departments	3,621,369	3,630,933	\$ 9,564	0.3%
Grant passthrough to DPW	408,500	-	\$ (408,500)	-100.0%
Integrated Permit Tracking System	855,000	-	\$ (855,000)	-100.0%
Total	\$ 24,141,191	\$ 23,829,172	\$ (312,019)	-1.3%
<i>Surplus/(Deficit)</i>	\$ -	\$ (1,466,438)		

Planning Department
Proposed Expenditure Summary - FY2010/2011

Category	Original FY2010 Budget	Proposed FY2011 Budget	Increase/Decrease		Explanation of Request
			Amount	Percent	
Salaries	13,429,428	13,411,290	(18,138)	-0.14%	Slight decrease in salaries due to reduction in temporary salaries and premium pay and increase in attrition savings, offset by converting off-budget positions to regular positions (GIS and GA Sign), the cost of the new grant writer position, and other salary adjustments.
Retirement	1,308,222	1,809,576	501,354	38.32%	Includes increases in health and dental and other fringe benefit costs in accordance with the Controller's estimates. Retirement costs will increase approximately 11.98 percent, and the retirement pick-up is assumed as the City's responsibility, which is subject to labor negotiations, for a total increase of 38.32 percent.
Health	2,419,693	2,555,353	135,660	5.61%	
Fringe benefits	1,095,623	1,163,058	67,435	6.15%	
Subtotal of Sal. & Fringes	18,252,966	18,939,277	686,311	3.76%	
Indirect Cost Reimb (COWCAP)	-	379,614	379,614	100.00%	Funds Planning's portion of citywide overhead costs. In the current year, the Department has a one-time credit for being overcharged in prior years.
Professional and Specialized Services	304,259	205,668	(98,591)	-32.40%	In Administration, funds garbage services (\$36,000); In Citywide, funds strategic plan implementation (\$156,883), and Misc. contract supported by FOCP (\$10,000).
Other Current Expenses	506,189	503,273	(2,916)	-0.58%	Funds a variety of office expenses: in Administration, includes software licensing (\$122,432), advertising (\$91,254), office machine rental and other expenses (\$57,050), postage (\$65,013), records storage (\$24,803), training (\$8,702), translation services (\$11,040), travel (\$3,000), and other miscellaneous expenses (\$21,350). In Neighborhood Planning, funds software licensing for Historic Preservation (\$2,785). In Citywide, funds printing (\$46,900), travel supported by FOCP (\$42,800), and subscriptions (\$6,144).
Subtotal of Non-Personal Services	810,448	708,941	(101,507)	-12.52%	
Materials and Supplies	179,660	148,128	(31,532)	-17.55%	Funds materials and supplies costs for the department (\$148,128). Includes savings from <i>Think Before You Print</i> program and efficiencies from full service lease agreement for the photocopier machines.
Equipment	13,248	22,280	9,032	68.18%	Funds department-wide IT hardware costs (\$22,280).
Integrated Permit Tracking	855,000	-	(855,000)	-100.00%	Savings in the project in FY2010 allow the Department to continue the project in FY2011 without requesting additional funding.

Planning Department
Proposed Expenditure Summary - FY2010/2011

Category	Original FY2010 Budget	Proposed FY2011 Budget	Increase/Decrease		Explanation of Request
			Amount	Percent	
Services of Other Departments	4,029,869	3,630,932	(398,937)	-9.90%	Funds services performed by other City departments for the Planning Department. In Administration, significant expenses include Real Estate (\$1,097,204), City Attorney (\$916,000), DTIS (\$445,817), Human Resources (\$381,634), Reproduction (\$140,398), Mail Services (\$93,936), and DBI (\$50,000). In MEA, significant expenses include Real Estate (\$69,530). In Neighborhood Planning, budget is for funding Sign Program-City Attorney Services (\$280,000), Code Enforcement-City Attorney Services (\$104,000) and Sign Program reproduction expenditures (\$1,000). Decrease is because DPW's grant passthrough workorder is for this year only (\$408,500), offset by an increase in the DBI workorder.
Total	24,141,191	23,829,172	(312,019)	-1.29%	

PLANNING DEPARTMENT WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011				
<i>Activity</i>		<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
I. NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING		62.38	62.38	0
1 Application Review and Processing		19.43	18.52	(0.91)
	A. Building Permit Applications	6.44	6.42	(0.02)
	B. Discretionary Review Applications: <i>decrease depends on Board of Supervisors' approval of DR Reform, including administrative review provision</i>	1.75	0.62	(1.13)
	C. Variance Applications	1.60	1.40	(0.20)
	D. Conditional Use and other case applications (309, 321, 329, Prop K, Costal Zone)	4.35	4.00	(0.35)
	E. Zoning Adminstrator Letters of Determinations	0.40	0.40	
	F. CEQA Class 1 & 3 Categorical Exemptions	1.50	1.50	
	G. Misc. Permit Referrals: including Health, Fire, ABC, Police and Entertainment	0.80	0.70	(0.10)
	H. DPW Permit Referrals: Condos/Subdivisions/Telecommunications	0.51	0.50	(0.01)
	I. Residential Design Team: <i>reflects increased process due to front-loaded DR Reform work, plus time for policy resolution with the public and Commission.</i>	0.25	0.88	0.63
	J. Project Review	0.83	0.60	(0.23)
	K. Preliminary Project Assesment (PPA): <i>to be implemented in March, 2010.</i>	0	0.50	0.50
	L. Project Management incl. shadow analysis, architectural design, RDT etc.	1.00	1.00	

Activity			2009-10 FTEs	Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs	Change
2. Historic Preservation (Total # of Preservation Planners would be maintained at 11)			8.52	7.82	(0.70)
	A.	Preservation Survey Programs: <i>(reflects shift in staff to HPC, PIC and HRE work.)</i>	3.37	1.57	(1.80)
	B.	Historic Resource Evaluation Requests/Reports: <i>increased to address backlog</i>	1.80	2.80	1.00
	C.	Certificates of Appropriateness, Permits to Alter, Mills Act, Section 106, and other Preservation Applications	1.90	1.90	
	D.	Review of building permits by preservation technical specialist: <i>embedded in permit review item 1.A above</i>	0	0	
	E.	Historic Preservation Commission action items including landmark designations	0	0.30	0.30
	F.	Landmarks and Historic District Initiations (privately initiated)	0.05	0.05	
	G.	Articles 10 & 11 re-write	0.20	0.20	
	H.	Preservation staff training and Professional Development	0.20	0	(0.20)
	I.	Preservation project review meetings (internal) + bi-weekly staff mtgs	1.00	1.00	
3. Provide Public Information			7.38	8.44	1.06
	A.	Planning Information Counter staffing <i>(4 core staff plus rotations): staffing increased to reduce wait times and increase preservation expertise</i>	4.94	6.00	1.06
	B.	PIC Internet and Intranet Pages	0.25	0.25	
	C.	Zoning Verification Letters	0.08	0.08	
	D.	Foreign Delegation Requests	0.01	0.01	
	F.	General Public Information <i>(not at PIC and including public information requests)</i>	2.10	2.10	

<i>Activity</i>			<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
4. Code Enforcement			7.25	6.50	(0.75)
	A.	General Code Enforcement	4.00	3.50	(0.50)
	B.	General Advertising Sign Program	3.25	3.00	(0.25)
5. Inter-Department/Agency Activities			2.10	2.10	
	A.	Inter-Department Coordination (DBI, DPW, MOH, SFRA, etc.)	0	0.50	0.50
	B.	Board of Appeals	0.50	0.50	
	C.	Redevelopment Agency Coordination	0.60	0.10	(0.50)
	D.	Preservation work for the Port of San Francisco	1.00	1.00	
6. Process Maintenance & Improvements, Citywide Support, Staff Training, Performance Review, etc.			2.45	4.50	2.05
	A.	Planning Code and Area Plan Implementation, Legislative Review, etc.	0.25	0.30	0.05
	B.	Action Plan: <i>reflects completion of most of the Action Plan by June 2010</i>	1.00	0.10	(0.90)
	C.	Citywide Planning support: <i>growth dialogue, Central Subway Corridor, etc.</i>	0.25	0.75	0.50
	D.	Performance Plan & Appraisal Reporting	0.10	0.20	0.10
	E.	Staff Training and Professional Development	0.50	0.90	0.40
	F.	Ombudsman support for the Director	0.10	0.10	
	G.	Procedures including implementation of Action Plan	0	0.50	0.50
	H.	Support for Director of NP for process improvement and case management	0	0.50	0.50
	I.	Neighborhood Commercial Design Standards (NCDS)	0.25	0.25	
	J.	Support for the ZA	0	0.90	0.90

<i>Activity</i>				<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
7. Support Staff				8.00	6.50	(1.50)
	A.	Clerical support for Code Enforcement, Quadrants, TAC, GASP, PIC and Director of NP		8.00	6.50	(1.50)
8 Management				7.25	8.00	0.75
	A.	Director of NP, Four Quadrant Managers, Preservation Coordinator, Enforcement Manager, .75 PIC Manager, .25 GASP Manager		7.25	8.00	0.75

Activity			2009-10 FTEs	Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs	Change
II. CITYWIDE PLANNING			35.19	35.19	0
1. General Plan Elements			3.60	2.00	(1.60)
	A.	Housing Element: <i>Completed in FY2009-10</i>	0.75	0	(0.75)
	B.	Community Safety Element: <i>Support for environmental review</i>	0	0.10	0.10
	C.	Recreation and Open Space Element: <i>Develop financing strategies & priorities for improvements and support the environmental analysis</i>	0.50	0.15	(0.35)
	D.	General Plan Applications, including General Plan Referrals	0.65	0.50	(0.15)
	E.	Continued maintenance: Update and maintain the General Plan	0.50	0.50	
	F.	Sustainability Updates. Collaborate with Department of Environment on a series of updates to the General Plan to incorporate amendments on environmental protection, climate change and sustainable development to address mandates of SB375.	0.60	0.30	(0.30)
	G.	Area Plan Follow-up	0.25	0.25	
	H.	Community Plan Exemptions	0.35	0.20	(0.15)
2. Sustainable Development Strategy			0.92	3.60	2.68
3. Area Plans, Sub-Area Plans			10.79	8.89	(1.90)
	A.	Southeast Planning Projects			
	(I)	Bayview/Hunters Point Area Plan	1.00	1.49	0.49
	(II)	India Basin Shoreline Area Plan	0.25	0.30	0.05
	(III)	Executive Park Sub-Area Plan	0.08	0.08	
	(IV)	Candlestick / Hunters Point Shoreline (Redevelopment/Stadium)	1.00	0.30	(0.70)
	(V)	Hope SF Projects	0.65	0.87	0.22
	(VII)	Green Bayshore	0.10	0.33	0.23
	B.	Transit Center District Plan (Transbay)	1.00	0.62	(0.38)
	C.	Fourth and King Railyards Study	0.50	0.75	0.25
	D.	Central Subway Corridor Planning	2.00	1.50	(0.50)

Activity			2009-10 FTEs	Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs	Change
	E.	Japantown Planning Effort	0.50	0.50	
	F.	Glen Park Station Neighborhood Area Plan	0.50	0.37	(0.13)
	G.	Western SoMa Planning Support	1.00	0.62	(0.38)
	H.	Treasure Island Development Plan	0.10	0.31	0.21
	I.	Parkmerced	0.10	0.10	
	J.	Port Planning Coordination - Northeast Waterfront Strategic Updates and Fisherman's Wharf: <i>Fisherman's Wharf Environmental Review support in FY2011</i>	2.01	0.75	(1.26)
4. Area Plan Implementation, Monitoring, Funding and Community Improvements.			1.50	1.86	0.36
5. City Design Group. Urban design, street and public realm design, citywide and district planning, and design review. Ongoing			5.68	5.35	(0.33)
	A.	Street and Public Realm Design.	1.00	0.75	(0.25)
	B.	Urban Design	0.70	0.75	0.05
	C.	Mission Public Realm Plan	0.80	0	(0.80)
	D.	Fisherman's Wharf Public Realm Plan	0.15	0	(0.15)
	E.	Cesar Chavez Phase I and Phase II: <i>Potrero Avenue and West; Freeway Undercrossing and East</i>	0.27	0.25	(0.02)
	F.	Embarcadero Open Space Study.	0.25	0.25	0.50
	G.	Pavement to Parks Program	0.31	0.60	0.50
	H.	Market Street Redesign	0.50	1.00	0.50
	I.	Newcomb Street Design	0.10		(0.10)
	K.	Urban Design Support. Urban Design services to Citywide Section's Other Plans and Programs	0.25	0.25	
	L.	Design Review/UDAT/DWG. Urban design services to Department project review function	0.25	0.25	
	M.	Urban Design Support to MTA	0.50	0.75	0.50

<i>Activity</i>			<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
	N.	Urban Design Support to Redevelopment Agency	0.60	0.50	(0.10)
6.	Data Information and Analysis. Develop, analyze and maintain Citywide data, including development projects pipeline, housing production trends, socio-economic data, land use and growth forecasts, and report on findings; perform data and analysis support for area plan projects and general plan updates; respond to inter-agency and public requests for demographic and land use information; prepare policy analysis reports on planning issues. <i>Ongoing.</i>		4.00	3.70	(0.30)
	A.	Area Plan/Project-specific data analysis	0.50	0.25	(0.25)
	B.	Housing Element: Data and Needs Analysis / 2004 HE Evaluation	0.50	0.35	(0.15)
	C.	Quarterly Pipeline Report	0.50	0.25	(0.25)
	D.	Annual Housing Inventory Report	0.30	0.25	(0.05)
	E.	Annual Commerce & Industry Inventory Report	0.30	0.25	(0.05)
	F.	Annual Downtown Monitoring Report	0.40	0.65	0.25
	G.	Land Use Database and Growth Forecast Modeling	0.15	0.20	0.05
	H.	GIS Cartography and Spatial Analysis	1.00	1.00	
	I.	Census 2010	0.35	0.50	0.15
7.	Development and Implementation of the Action Plan		0.50	0.20	(0.30)
	A.	Project management and other efforts	0.15	0	(0.15)
	B.	Support on other Action Plan efforts	0.35	0.20	(0.15)
8.	Other. Management, Support, Training and Development		8.20	9.59	1.39
	A.	Graphics Program	1.00	1.00	
	B.	PIC Coverage: 0.75 FTE @ 11 Shifts/Week	0.35	0.54	0.19
	C.	Preliminary Project Assessment	0	0.40	0.40
	D.	Policy, General Plan, City Design and Data support for Board of Supervisors, Mayor's Office and other City agencies	0.50	1.30	0.80
	E.	Performance Evaluations for all Citywide Staff, reflecting staff not manager time	0.10	0.10	

<i>Activity</i>				<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
	F.	Staff Training and Professional Development		0.25	0.25	
	G.	Project and staff management		5.00	5.00	
	H.	Clerical support		1.00	1.00	

<i>Activity</i>		<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
III. MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS		27.13	27.13	0
1. Training and support.		0.85	0.85	
	A. Training for environmental staff regarding legislative and procedural changes, consultant supervision, general quality assurance, project and caseload management, and records retention. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.10	0.10	
	B. Training for transportation staff regarding professional practices, general quality assurance, consultant supervision, project and caseload management, and records retention. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.30	0.30	
	C. Training and support for environmental review activities performed by other Department staff; provide materials relevant to public information activities; and provide staff support (4 shifts) at the Public Information Counter (PIC). <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.35	0.35	
	D. Coordinate with other City agencies contemplating plans and development projects that will necessitate environmental review under CEQA. Ensure that CEQA compliance is acknowledged in project schedules, and that project managers are cognizant of requirements and procedures. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.10	0.10	
2. Prepare complex environmental documents.		22.22	22.73	0.51
	A. Privately Funded Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) for projects other than Planning Dept and Board of Supervisors projects. Projects which are the subject of ongoing EIRs or for which EIRs will be in progress and/or completed in FY 2010-2011 include: Treasure Island, Transit Center District Plan, Port Projects, TEP, Mexican Museum, MOMA, India Basin, Park Merced, the Palace Hotel, Academy of Art, and CPMC.	11.11	9.81	(1.30)
	B. Publically Funded EIRs for Planning Dept and Board of Supervisors projects. Planning Department and Board-initiated projects anticipated this year include: Transit Center District Plan, Western SoMa, the Preservation Element, and support for the Central Subway Corridor initiative. This does not reflect the additional funding that will be required for outside consultant support, whenever such support is required to complete environmental review.	1.50	2.31	0.81

<i>Activity</i>		<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
	C. Appeal Hearings. CEQA Documents can be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. Staff time is required to respond to appeals in writing and at Board of Supervisors hearings. Staff time is also required to revise documents that are overturned by the Board on appeal.	2.00	2.00	
	D. Privately Funded Negative Declarations. Complex Negative Declarations are those: for which background technical studies are required; which concern controversial subjects and are the likely focus of an appeal; and for which special expertise in environmental issues are required. A majority of complex negative declarations are fee-supported and concern private development proposals. From time-to-time, public projects and/or proposed legislation also require review.	3.00	3.00	
	E. Publically Funded Negative Declarations for City-sponsored projects. Planning and Board initiated projects (including legislation) which will rely upon ad valorem funding for staff time involved in preparation of Negative Declarations. This includes the Fisherman's Wharf review, the Recreation and Open Space Element, and Community Safety Element. <i>Note: This line item reflects Planning Department staff time only. It does not reflect the additional funding that will be required for outside consultant support, whenever such support is required to complete environmental review.</i>	1.01	2.01	1.00
	F. Other Transportation Studies. Planning staff participates in studies by undertaken by other Departments and agencies (e.g. Level of Service Strategic Analysis Report being prepared by SFCTA). <i>Specific projects and schedules to be determined.</i>	0.95	0.95	
	G. Transportation Impact Studies. Transportation Impact Studies are required for projects with potential impacts on circulation, congestion, and other transportation issues, as determined by senior transportation staff. Studies are performed by consultants under the supervision and direction of expert staff. <i>Ongoing.</i>	2.65	2.65	
3. Update internal procedures for citywide CEQA compliance.		0.40	0.40	
	A. Continue effort to adopt significance standards as suggested in revised CEQA Guidelines. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.10	0.10	
	B. Continue efforts to refine the guidelines for transportation studies as necessary to reflect the most current available data and professional practices. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.10	0.10	
	C. Continue efforts to update EIR consultant instructions and guidelines, reviewer's instructions, standard language, and other procedural and reference materials related to environmental review. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.10	0.10	

<i>Activity</i>			<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
	D.	Continue efforts to establish consistent guidance and procedures for mitigation monitoring and reporting. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.10	0.10	
4.	Development and Implementation of the Action Plan 2008-2010 (New Section)		1.11	0.20	(0.91)
	A.	Action Plan Implementation: Case closure policies; forms, applications and handouts; and website work.	1.11	0.20	(0.91)
5	Other environmental applications, performance evaluations, public information, support to Citywide and procedures.		2.55	2.95	0.40
	A.	Categorical Exemptions: Class 1 and 3 Categorical Exemptions and HRER reports shifted to Neighborhood Planning.	1.90	1.50	(0.40)
	B.	Other environmental documents (e.g. Addenda). <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.20	0.20	
	C.	Performance Evaluations for all MEA staff. Reflects staff not management effort. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.10	0.10	
	D.	Public Information Counter Staffing	0.35	0.35	
	E.	Support to Citywide for Growth Dialogue	0	0.30	0.30
	F.	Procedures	0	0.50	0.50

<i>Activity</i>			<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
IV. ADMINISTRATION			29.90	29.90	0
1. Director's Office			3.50	3.50	
	A.	Department Head functions and Executive Assistant. <i>Ongoing.</i>	2.00	2.00	
	B.	Assistant Director: staff management, process improvement management, area plan implementation, personnel and training, and special projects. <i>Ongoing.</i>	1.50	1.50	
2. Zoning Administrator			4.00	4.00	
	A.	Zoning Administrator functions, Project Coordination, Design Review, Legislation Management, Major Projects, Public Information and Executive Assistant. <i>Ongoing.</i>	2.00	2.00	
	B.	Management and development of Legislation. <i>Ongoing.</i>	2.00	2.00	
3. Administrative Services			9.65	9.65	
	A.	Chief Administrative Officer function: Provide oversight and direction to the Finance, Information Technology, and Operations functions.	1.00	1.00	
	B.	Under Assistant Director - Human Resources: Provide recruitment, employee relations, personnel processing, EEOC mandates, workers comp administration, and payroll processing services; develop labor policies and procedures; implement performance-based labor contract provisions; monitor and ensure completion of performance evaluations for all staff. <i>Ongoing.</i>	1.50	1.50	
	C.	Under Assistant Director - Training: Provide effective training programs to promote staff development, strengthen the Department's technical and management capacity, and ensure compliance with relevant policies and regulations; oversee and coordinate the Department's Employee Recognition Program; provide professional development opportunities through coordination of noontime lecture series and brown bag lunch series; administer the intern program. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.50	0.50	

Activity			2009-10 FTEs	Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs	Change
	D.	Finance: Provide effective resource management and budget development in support of the Department's goals and programs through providing direction and oversight to the Department's Finance functions. Coordinate development and delivery of management reports, identify and manage fiscal-related legislative concerns and participate in general legislative review.	1.50	1.50	
	E.	Accounting, Budget: Handles accounting, audits, and invoice payments; perform financial analysis and financial reporting; prepare annual budget and monitor throughout the year; ensure compliance with City and other fiscal rules and regulations; prepare fiscal policies and procedures. <i>Ongoing.</i>	1.75	1.75	
	F.	Contract Administration: Administer requests for proposals and requests for quotes; ensure compliance with and seek approval of contracts through City Attorney, Human Rights Commission, Civil Service Commission, Human Resources and employee unions.	0.90	0.40	(0.50)
	G.	Revenue/Collections: Seek methods for cost recovery, track applicant fees to capture payment; analyze revenues to set fee schedule; audit billing to capture outstanding fees; reconcile revenues to Controller's deposits; and track collections. <i>Ongoing.</i>	2.50	2.00	(0.50)
	H.	Grants: Seek grant opportunities and coordinate grant applications: <i>Grant funded position in the current year</i>	1.00*	1.00	1.00
4. Information Technology			5.00	5.00	
4.1 Strengthen the Department's Information Technology function.			1.00	1.00	
	A.	Integrated Permit Tracking System: <i>Project funded</i>	1.00	1.00	
4.2 Provide effective Information Technology resource management			4.00	4.00	
	A.	Network Maintenance and Enhancement. <i>Ongoing.</i>	1.00	1.00	
	B.	Information Systems Development and Maintenance	0.75	0.75	
	C.	Continue staff computer training program. <i>Ongoing.</i>	0.25	0.25	
	D.	Help Desk support.	1.00	1.00	
	E.	Develop GIS infrastructure and build GIS capacity in-house.	1.00	1.00	

<i>Activity</i>				<i>2009-10 FTEs</i>	<i>Proposed FY2010-11 FTEs</i>	<i>Change</i>
5. Operations				4.75	4.75	
		(1)	Maintain coverage for reception desk for Planning Department <i>Ongoing</i>			
		(2)	Maintain records center with support for all record requests . <i>Ongoing.</i>			
		(3)	Maintain inventory of all office supplies and coordinate distribution. <i>Ongoing.</i>			
		(4)	Maintain delivery of all in/out mail services, commission packets and material.			
		(5)	Maintain support of all phone systems, staff moves, property management and Repro services . <i>Ongoing.</i>			
6. Commissions				3.00	3.00	
	A.	Commission Secretary for Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Commission, and all staff directly serving these Commissions. <i>Ongoing.</i>		3.00	3.00	
DEPARTMENT TOTALS -- ALL DIVISIONS				154.60	154.60	0