

## Planning and Management Department

Richard A. Smith, Director

[www.tampagov.net/dept\\_Planning/](http://www.tampagov.net/dept_Planning/)

### Key Public Service Areas

Planning & Management provides services in the areas of Comprehensive Planning, Neighborhood Information, eGovernment marketing, Strategic Planning, Grants Administration, Demographic and Economic Research and Special Projects.

### Critical Issues and Areas of Concern

- Comprehensive Plan - Update
- Citywide Management Systems
- Project Tracking Systems
- GIS Information Services
- Revisiting the Neighborhood Planning Process
- Neighborhood Planning Support
- Determining the Role of Neighborhood Plans
- Creating a Neighborhood Plan Implementation Structure
- Funding Neighborhood Planning Activities
- MacDill Encroachment Coordination
- MacDill AFB FDA Grant Agreement

### Scope of Department Operations

Planning & Management provides a wide variety of planning and management services. With a staff of 14 and a budget of \$1.2 million, the Department manages the organization of information on numerous City projects and programs; coordinates with departments to publish quarterly and annual reports on City grant activities, the Mayor's Strategic Initiative, Tampa's Technology Initiative and *TampaGov* marketing efforts; and undertakes innovative approaches to providing information to the public, including the use of the department's webpage to report on City development activity in "The Major Development Report" and update citizens on the status of their neighborhoods in the "Neighborhood Information Page."

### Current Initiatives

- Monitoring the Implementation of the City's Comprehensive Plan
- Overseeing City-wide Strategic Planning and Management Program, including the Mayor's Strategic Initiatives and Annual Management Reports
- Conducting City Grants Research and Management Program
- Developing the Neighborhood Information Page (Internet Application)
- Coordinating Tampa Technology Initiative
- Managing *TampaGov* marketing efforts
- Administering City/MacDill AFB Partnership Program, including Memoranda of Understanding.

### Status Report

**Comprehensive Plan - Update.** The City's Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) for the Comprehensive Plan is due on August 1, 2006. The EAR will update the more than 1,100 policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan and typically requires 12-18 months time to complete. Thus, the City of Tampa will need to begin the EAR process at or around January 1, 2005. By that date, City Departments will need to designate appropriate staff resources to evaluate and update the various comprehensive plan elements. These resources will need to be identified and included in the City's Budget (no later than the FY04 Budget).

**Citywide Management Systems.** The Department has been historically charged with developing various citywide management systems- beginning with the Service Level Analysis in the 80's, the Mission and Management Analysis in the 90's and the current Mayor's Strategic Initiatives. These management systems have provided a comprehensive framework for understanding the myriad of services provided by City Departments. Building upon the success of these systems, a comprehensive performance measurement system-fully integrated with the City's resource allocation program-should be considered to help citizens better understand what government programs are achieving. Such a system would enable the identification of needs, inform decision-making with respect to resource allocations, and provide for better governmental planning. In short, it would provide a more efficient and effective delivery of City services.

**Project Tracking Systems.** City Departments are responsible for making many decisions that affect the delivery services for Tampa's residents. Many decisions affect or are dependent on actions of other Departments or external agencies. Until recently, it was difficult,

## **Planning and Management Department**

### **Status Report (continued)**

if not impossible, to track the progress of projects and programs throughout the City. However, new software and information management systems now make it possible to track decisions and projects throughout an organization as large as the City of Tampa, thus, allowing the Mayor and Department Heads to immediately access the status on major initiatives. Such tools can enhance decision making and the delivery of services. A feasibility study should be completed to determine the best approach and system to use in the City of Tampa. A pilot project to demonstrate the capabilities of such a system should be considered, including a city-wide INet Status Reporting System to measure progress on accomplishing Mayoral priorities.

**GIS Information Services.** The Department receives several requests from City Departments for GIS services; however, in several instances the data required to provide the service is not available. The Planning and Management Department has had to request data from the department that originally requested the GIS service request. In some cases, the Department has not been able to respond to the service request. Several City Departments create GIS data, but its either not available or known to other City departments or not in the proper format to be used when requests are made. An effort to standardize GIS data and establish a Citywide GIS system is critical. In this regard, data relationships and information sources must be documented and managed in a centralized repository. Standard naming, format and content conventions must be developed to ensure information can be passed easily from one system to another. A mayoral mandate is needed to get this effort underway. [[CR-33](#)]

**Revisiting the Neighborhood Planning Process.** In 1997, the City of Tampa developed and approved a neighborhood planning process to guide Tampa's residents in creating neighborhood plans. Since then, several neighborhoods have attempted to develop the plans according to the procedures outlined in the guide. The City's neighborhood planning process has been effective in stimulating interest in neighborhood plans, However, experience gained thus far indicates a need to revisit the process and establish new procedures for streamlining and simplifying the process of developing neighborhood plans.

**Neighborhood Planning Support.** The City's neighborhood planning process did not provide funding for city staff to assist neighborhoods in developing their plans. Since the inception of the process, the Planning Commission has been tapped to provide this function. Generally, it takes approximately three years to develop a neighborhood plan. According to the Planning Commission FY03 Work Program, approximately 3,500 staff hours (1.68 FTE) will be devoted to neighborhood planning. As more neighborhoods embark on developing neighborhood plans, demands for additional technical assistance is likely to increase. Some cities (e.g. Seattle) have large staffs dedicated to neighborhood planning and support services. Other cities (St. Petersburg and Nashville) have smaller staffs, but coordinate extensively with other departments in planning and implementing plans. The City of Atlanta integrates its neighborhood planning activities into its comprehensive planning process, producing an annual update of its Comprehensive Development Plan. The City of San Francisco is embarking on a new neighborhood planning effort, dedicating a portion of its planning staff to developing 3 demonstration plans. In these cities, the planning process varies between 6 months to 2 years for each plan. The City needs to evaluate the staff requirements for neighborhood planning and establish the proper funding or agency agreements to meet the desired level of service. [[CR-24](#)]

---

## **Planning and Management Department**

### **Status Report (continued)**

**Determining the Role of Neighborhood Plans.** The Neighborhood Planning Guide only touches on the role and weight of Neighborhood Plans. There is no consensus on the role neighborhood plans should play in the delivery of City services or how the plans are to be integrated into or related to the comprehensive planning, capital improvements and budget processes. In other Cities, the role of neighborhood plans varies. In Seattle, the neighborhood plans are an extension of the City's growth management mandates. In St. Petersburg, the emphasis is solving neighborhood issues and concerns quickly, not so much on the "plan". In Atlanta, the process is intended to integrate neighborhood concerns into the City's Comprehensive Plan. In all cases, the role of the plan is clearly articulated and a process is established. The role of Tampa's neighborhood plans should be similarly defined.

**Creating a Neighborhood Plan Implementation Structure.** Under the City's current structure, once neighborhood plans are approved by City Council, the neighborhood is responsible for implementing its plans. (Note: Currently, neighborhood plans are adopted by City Council resolution; the plans are solely advisory in nature). If City support is needed, neighborhoods contact appropriate departments, City Council or City Administration directly in regard to a specific issue. Beyond that, there is no specific process to follow. There is also no mechanism to track and monitor the implementation of plans. As more neighborhood plans are approved, requests to City departments for assistance may also increase. An implementation structure needs to be put in place to adequately administer the implementation of neighborhood plans. Implementation structures instituted in other cities vary considerably. The City of Seattle has a separate department consisting of 95 staff, charged with a full-range of neighborhood services in addition to implementing neighborhood plans. The City of Nashville employs a collaborative approach in implementing plans, which mirrors their metropolitan style of government. In St. Petersburg, a team of planners coordinates with City Departments in targeting city services to address concerns. In Atlanta, the implementation is handled under their Comprehensive Plan. While the organizational and responsibilities may vary, there are certain similarities between the approaches. In all cases, a specific department is charged (and funded) with administering the implementation of neighborhood plans and developing practices to ensure proper tracking and management of plan recommendations.

**Funding Neighborhood Planning Activities.** The Neighborhood Planning Process stresses a self-help, capacity-based approach that relies on developing partnerships. However, many of the strategies in the neighborhood plans require a direct capital or operating outlay (even the process of notifying residents of neighborhood plans and public hearings/meetings incurs mailing costs, which must be considered). As more neighborhood plans are developed, the need for funding will grow, elevating the need for a process that will prioritize the implementation of specific actions; otherwise, the City's budget may become strained. Funding for neighborhood implementation activities varies widely in other Cities. The City of Seattle provides \$3.7 million annually in neighborhood matching grants, specifically to implement neighborhood plan recommendations. The City of St. Petersburg provides \$200,000 annually for matching grants and \$100,000 in capital improvements. Nashville provides \$100,000 for matching grants. Atlanta, on the other hand, does not have a specific fund, as activities are funded through their annual capital improvements program. A policy decision by the administration concerning the potential funding of a neighborhood grants program is needed. [[CR-23](#) & [CR-24](#)]

## **Planning and Management Department**

### **Status Report (continued)**

**MacDill Encroachment Coordination.** In June 2001, MacDill AFB surfaced the need to conduct an encroachment study of the area adjacent to the Base and attempted to obtain a grant to undertake the study from the State of Florida (requiring a match from the City). The City determined it could undertake the study independently without state funding and the grant was returned. The City completed a preliminary land use analysis and provided its findings to the Base in November 2002. The findings of that study indicate that development within the area has occurred at a lower density than allowed within the approved land use classifications. Agreement was reached to include MacDill AFB on the list of notifications for rezonings, plan amendments or cell tower requests within the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) to address potential encroachment issues. Proposed legislation for the 2003 session includes the Florida Military Base/Land Use Protection Bill. The provisions of this bill would require local jurisdictions and land use authorities to consider the impact of new growth on military activities, when those jurisdictions and authorities propose zoning ordinances or when they assign land use designations to land in close proximity to military bases or installations. The Bill suggests that local jurisdictions and authorities plan land use activities in areas adjacent to military installations, operating areas and ranges that encourage open space and compatible land uses. It also requires that land use within a jurisdiction surrounding a military airfield be consistent with the safety and noise standards contained in the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ). The City's position is that such legislation is unnecessary – and opposes it. The City will need to monitor the proposed legislation in 2002, lobby its position with the Legislature and the Governor's Office, and continue to coordinate with MacDill AFB on potential encroachment issues. [[CR-11](#)]

**MacDill AFB FDA Grant Agreement.** Under an FDA 2002 Infrastructure Grant, MacDill AFB will undertake the design, engineering and construction of the improvements on city property to mediate respective impacts resulting from its \$7 million (military construction funds) Security Gate Enhancement projects. The City of Tampa is acting as the "pass-through" entity for MacDill AFB, which will be responsible for project and all associated liabilities. In order for the project to move forward, certain modifications must be made to the award documents and agreements to ensure the City is not held responsible for aspects of the project that it does not control. The City has requested modifications to the State's "boilerplate agreement" and is waiting for a response from the granting agency. If the state is unable to amend the "boilerplate agreement," the City should return the grant and fund the improvements (up to the \$144,000 grant amount). Continued monitoring and coordination with MacDill and the granting agency will be required to ensure the project is implemented for the benefit of all parties. [[CR-29](#)]

## Planning and Management Department Organization Chart

The Department of Planning and Management is organized in two divisions: Strategic Planning and Urban Planning.

**Urban Planning** is responsible for comprehensive planning, neighborhood planning information, GIS information services, sustainable communities, and eGovernment marketing.

**Strategic Planning** provides the research and technical analyses related to major policy issues affecting the City. Priority programs include: Mayor's Strategic Initiatives, MacDill Partnership Initiatives, and the Major Development Report.

