

# Department of Planning and Development



## Report to the Program Analysis Committee

AUGUST 1998

**City of Ithaca Planning & Development Department  
Department Program Analysis Report**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- 1) Report Overview
- 2) Current Program Description
  - a) Overview of Department duties
  - b) Comparison with other planning departments
- 3) Process Improvement
  - a) Revenue Generation Opportunities
    - i) Increase City Revenues Through Sales & Property Tax
    - ii) Grants Development
    - iii) Increasing and Adding Fees
    - iv) Qualitative – Increase Quality of Life...Comprehensive Plan...
  - b) Cost Reduction
  - c) Reorganization/Combination of Programs
  - d) Exploration of New Technologies or Expanded Use of Computers
- 4) Descriptive Forms
  - a) Department Programs
  - b) Department Projects
- 5) Personnel Information
  - a) Organizational Chart
  - b) Job Descriptions
  - c) Employee Roster
- 6) Supplementary Material
  - a) Appendix A – Survey Results from Similar Cities
  - b) Appendix B – Various Reports
    - i) 1997 Time Worked by Program & Staff (with FTE)
    - ii) 1998 Time Worked by Program – Including CD
    - iii) 1998 Department Hours Worked on Projects
  - c) Appendix C – Work Program Database design

---

**List of Tables:**

- Table A1 – Program Hours worked by Year – General Fund Only  
Table A2 – Program Personnel Costs by Year – General Fund Only  
Table B – Southwest Area Development – Direct Revenues  
Table C – Direct Revenues from Grants and Fees  
Table D – Expenses for Regular Mailings

# Report Overview

The department used its work program to develop this year's programmatic budget. The work program is a database application that has tracked every hour of professional staff time on each project since 1993. The 17 budget programs in this report were derived from project categories that the department has used over the years (with a few minor changes). As a whole the transfer from our project records application into a program-based budgeting tool has been highly successful.

It is unusual for a department to track its hours to the level that our department has. The wealth of information in the work program has allowed us to analyze our work over a period of several years. It is tempting to get lost in the dozens of ways to view which projects our department works on, what types of projects they are, and how much time and money we devote to them. We have learned the hard way, however, the traps involved with analyzing our activities in this way. In the first place reality never conforms to a neatly organized category system, making it dangerous to draw conclusions from the data. This danger is exacerbated by the department's "soft" and multi-disciplinary nature. We are not an enforcement agency, nor do we have "hard" and timeless activities such as building roads and bridges. Our department responds to the priorities of the policy makers in office, which has varied significantly over the years. Each staff person has a variety of skills and manages a large number of projects (an average of 25) that vary significantly. In the course of a day each staff person will work on five or more projects and be interrupted a dozen or more times. The department's investment is in the skills of its employees, not capital equipment. These characteristics make it challenging to use a programmatic approach to budgeting.

This analysis is further complicated by the existence of two funding sources within the department. Although the mission and goals of the entire department are the same as those in this report, funding for the Community Development office comes from federal Block Grant money. The work of the Community Development office is overseen by the Ithaca Urban Renewal Agency (IURA).

Most of the budget and staff time data in this report do not include the contribution of the Community Development office. Some programs may as a result be under-represented in this report, such as "Housing" or "Grants Development and Administration." In some program descriptions and reports, the work of the Community Development office is included. We apologize for this confusion, but this was done because of how tightly integrated the two groups work together.

The program "forms" were generated as reports from our work program. We attempted to match the common format as much as possible. We have provided a few useful reports from the work program, but there are many more. If you are interested in specific types of reports, please ask.

## Current Program Description

### ***Overview of Department Duties***

This report to the Program Analysis Committee brings into focus two essential standards for comparing the Planning & Development Department's performance: the breadth of services we offer and the quality of our services. The breadth of service is represented by the department's 17 programs (see tables A1 and A2). This may be a lot of programs for such a small budget, but the programs would lose their meaning if they were combined into fewer categories. The department oversees a huge number of projects. In 1998 alone, staff members have worked on about 180 projects (see Appendix B).

The question is not only how much the Department does, but even more importantly, the quality of the work produced by the Department. From program to program, Department staff strive for the highest levels of professionalism and responsiveness to the community. Year after year our success in grantsmanship has been envied by other upstate New York cities. Our economic development programs have, and continue to be, an essential part of preserving and strengthening downtown, Collegetown, and now the west end, Inlet Island and the southwest area. Our work in the areas of neighborhood preservation, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), site plan review, and historic preservation are well known throughout the state. It is not surprising that the recent proposal before the New York State legislature for property tax abatement for historic rehabilitation was called "Ithaca Bill". Repeatedly the City of Ithaca is at the forefront in finding ways to improve the quality of life in neighborhoods, strengthen the local economy and provide grants for various programs and projects.

Even though the department does relatively little enforcement, much of the time is tied up with mandatory or ongoing projects. Examples of mandatory functions include site plan review, subdivision reviews, and board/committee staffing. 55% of staff hours are devoted to mandatory and ongoing tasks. In such a small department, that leaves little room for flexibility.

The following section, which is on process improvement, will explain the financial benefits the department brings to the City. It is important to note department activities with a less direct fiscal impact on the City, but are nevertheless a great value. For example, the staff time spent improving the quality of life for city residents, including neighborhood improvements and planning for broader citywide amenities, is a sound investment. This type of activity includes services to neighborhood organizations, traffic calming in residential neighborhoods, design of recreational trails and other park improvements and improvements to the waterfront. Historic preservation protects significant community resources and gives Ithaca a unique visual identity. Site plan reviews improve the appearance and functional performance of new development. All these activities make the city a more desirable place to live, in turn raising property values and increasing its fiscal strength.

The Department of Planning and Development is at the leading edge of the city's effort to automate its data systems. The Department developed the city's Geographic Information System (GIS) and continues to work with other city departments to establish an integrated, intelligent data system, which will lead to increasing economies and improvements in staff productivity. One example this year is the extensive work by the Department of Planning and Development to assist the Building Department in designing and implementing their new automated management system. Another example is the GIS Web project, giving anybody with a browser interactive access to the City's GIS data.

### ***Department Comparison***

The Committee suggested that we gather comparative information from planning departments of other cities. Selecting several cities of similar size and demographics, such as college towns, interns conducted telephone interviews to see how we compare in terms of the types of services and number of employees. The data show that the per capita cost of the City of Ithaca's Department of Planning and Development is somewhere in the middle of the sample we investigated. Depending on whether the Community Development staff is included or not, the city has a ratio of roughly 3,700, if CD is included, to 4,900 of population per professional planner. The ratio in other cities ranged from a high of 14,000 people per planner in Madison, Wisconsin, to a low of 625 people per planner in Taos, New Mexico. Burlington, Vermont, often referred to as Ithaca's sister city, has a population of 39,127 and a ratio of about 1,950 people per planner. This calculation from Burlington includes both their community and economic development division, and their planning division. These two divisions in Burlington's government provide roughly the same services as does the City of Ithaca's Department of Planning and Development. Analysis of these data, however, is extremely tricky. There is no indication of what kinds of services are provided within each category or the number of hours that the departments put into them.

Among the many program areas about which we inquired, the only area that this department does not cover is code enforcement. We do, however, provide virtually all the other planning services that were listed in any of the other cities. This study shows the great range of work done by this department. In many cases, several of our programs would be done by other departments. For example, there is often a separate Economic Development office, or all environmental work will be done in Engineering, or GIS work will be done in an Information Services department. Since there is so much cross-over in planning programs, it makes it nearly impossible to compare departmental size with other communities.

## Process Improvement Analysis

The Program Analysis Committee has requested that we investigate a number of ways that may improve City services and decrease costs. These include suggestions for generating new revenues, the most effective and most economical use of resources, a recommendation regarding department organization, and an explanation of our progress with new technologies.

Our background work leads us to the following conclusions and recommendations:

### ***Revenue Generation Opportunities***

#### Sales and Property Tax

In the area of revenue generation, the Department will be directly responsible for bringing new development into the city, which will have a very substantial impact on the city's budget in the coming years. Many of the department's programs strengthen the city's revenue base. For example, at present many areas in the city are under consideration for development or redevelopment. These range from 120 acres in the southwest, at this time undeveloped, to smaller parcels along the Route 13 corridor, such as the Franklin Street DPW site. If these areas are developed, they will add millions of new revenue dollars per year to the city's budget. Even relatively modest scale development, in the range of 500,000 square feet, would result in sales and property taxes in excess of \$2,000,000.00 and possibly as high as \$5,000,000.00. Table B demonstrates a revenue analysis with modest build-out assumptions for the Southwest Area.

Economic development is one of the department's primary areas of concentration. The Department is confident that economic development goals will be achieved if staffing remains at the current level, and City policy makers continue their commitment to economic growth.

#### Grants Development

The department has been extremely successful in grant writing. In 1997, for every dollar of taxpayer's money invested in the Department, the City received \$10 of financial benefit (see Table C). This number includes the federal Block Grant money in Community Development. Even excluding Community Development, the department brought in over \$600,000 in revenues in 1997, almost twice its budget. Between 1994 and 1998, the department received just under \$9,000,000.00 in grants. During the same period, general fund expenditures for the Department were in the neighborhood of \$350,000.00 per year. This is a five year average of a 5 to 1 ratio between grants and direct city expenditures.

In addition, the Department has intensified its efforts to bring new dollars into the community through grantsmanship. A substantial portion of the city's grants are dedicated to housing and neighborhood improvements. Conservatively estimated, each dollar invested in housing is multiplied three times in the local economy; therefore, grants for these purposes have not only a direct impact on the programs themselves, but also, to the community's benefit, a strong multiplier effect. These efforts are staff intensive, making any reduction in staff at this time a counter-productive action.

### Increasing & Adding Fees

On the other hand, the Department does not raise large amounts of revenue through fees, permits, etc. While site plan review fees can be substantial, we do not recommend raising fees on routine activities like Certificates of Appropriateness in historic districts. The city has an interest in seeing that buildings in these districts are maintained and improved. Raising the fees for these activities might, in the long run, be counter-productive, by providing limited revenue at the long term cost of discouraging investment. The most significant thing the City can do is promote economic development generally. Site plan review revenues can pay for the Landscape Planner's position. During the Walmart review in 1996, the Department brought in over \$35,000 from fees.

### **Cost Reduction**

The department does not have any major capital equipment, only computer and office hardware. The tiny operating budget that it does have is needed to keep the staff as efficient as it is. The department has looked hard at ways to streamline its current operations. One area to find savings is in our mailings. The department staffs 17 standing boards and committees, 7 of which receive regular mailings from us. There are always several significant ad hoc committees also staffed by the department. At this point in time, the department is sending regular mailings to 11 groups. The table on the following page demonstrates the significant costs of these mailings, estimated to total each year at about \$3,100 in office expenses and \$4,700 in secretarial staff time just for the mailing process.

We are recommending that in the coming year, an attempt be made to automate and computerize most or all of the distribution of agendas and minutes of the various committees and boards served by the Department. This would not only represent labor saving in departmental time, but would also save money, postage and materials. We hope to have this automated system in place before the end of the year.

### **Reorganization/Combination of Programs**

We have been asked to examine changes in departmental organization or consolidating programs that might be redundant. Over the past two years, a great deal of time has been put into reorganizing the personnel structure in the Department of Planning and Development. As a result there is increased specialization for virtually all professional members of the department staff. We feel that this has resulted in our ability to hire a strong professionally qualified staff, in addition to focusing the expertise and experience of employees who have been here for a longer period of time. Having made these changes, I do not believe that much further can be done in the area of departmental reorganization that would bring benefits to the city.

As a response to staffs' increased specialization, the department has put together multi-disciplinary teams to take on a variety of projects. The department has found the use of teams well suited for large, complex projects. Southwest Development and this program analysis are good examples. Virtually the entire staff has been involved in both tasks at some level.

### **New Technologies**

All department employees are heavy computer users. Computers are used for such routine activities as scheduling meetings and circulating memos to highly sophisticated Geographic Information System usage. The department has done much with technology in order to increase production and quality. It has set up databases and automated work flow with purchased or self-developed applications. In many cases, the department is not only looking at its own work flow but finding ways to cooperate with other departments in order to save money and share staff expertise. Successful examples include the work program, the map file index program (used by Engineering and Building), capital projects request application, etc. More detail on this work can be found in the Information Management Program and Goals description.

The GIS developed by the Department on a minimal budget (through a creative partnership with other agencies) has proven to be very useful to many city departments. Some, like the Building Department, are using it in their extensive automation system. Others, like Engineering, use it as the basis for a variety of different recordkeeping and analytical functions. It is our expectation that the GIS will be an increasingly important tool for most city departments in the coming years.

We also continue to build the Department's Web page. Established in early August, we intend to use it for publication of department reports, such as the Southwest Area Land Use Plan, its GEIS Scoping Document, the Inlet Island and West End Plans. Future goals include the creation of direct form applications for site plan review and historic preservation, and for a "What's New" area to post items such as neighborhood updates and current department activities.

---

## **Notes on Program Forms**

The reader should be aware that the descriptions in this section are taken for the most part from the Department's existing computerized work program. There may be some inconsistencies in these write-ups because of the variety of users and definitional differences in some key terms used in both the work program and the program analysis report.

The program "forms" were reports generated from the work program. We tried to imitate the format of the Program Analysis Committee's forms as much as possible.

The FTE and budget numbers were created through a somewhat complicated method. To generate the budget estimates, the 1998 relative cost of each program was generated by summing hours worked this year by each employee (accounting for their salary). 1999 estimated personnel costs were then generated by using the same cost percentage but for the 1999 personnel budget request (salaries are well-known). Operating costs were generated by subtracting the personnel costs from the total costs of each program.

On the form there are two FTE estimates: 1998 and estimated 1999. 1998 FTE estimates were created by using the percentage of time worked by professional staff on each program and adding administrative support staff time in an even proportion. Total FTE estimates were then created by adding the percentage difference if the department were fully staffed, which in 1998, it was not. This final number is what is used for in the line called "Past/Current Full Time Equivalent staffing."

Estimated 1999 FTE numbers were then modified given what we think will be the priorities for next year. These numbers are simply using our judgment to predict dedication of staff time to each program. This number is represented in the line called "Estimated 1999 Full Time Equivalent staffing".

This is confusing, but remember that the estimated budget numbers reflect 1998 time worked on each program, not estimated shifts in priority for next year.

---

## **Notes on Project Forms**

The reader should be aware that the descriptions in this section are taken from the Department's existing computerized work program. There may be some inconsistencies in these write-ups because of the variety of users. The department oversees a large number of projects and it is difficult to keep consistent records on all of them.

At the beginning of the section is a list of the projects in the same order as they appear in the report. Unfortunately, there was no easy way to put page numbers on the list, so it could act as a table of contents. We apologize for this inconvenience.

# PD Program Hours Worked By Year -- General Fund

SECTION	1995			1996			1997			1998			Total Hours		avg fte
	hrs	avg	fte	hrs	avg	fte	hrs	avg	fte	hrs	avg	fte	Total Hours	%	avg fte
BOARDS & COMMITTEES	1301	15.1	0.8	1176	13.4	0.7	865	11.8	0.5	729	9.4	0.5	4162	12.6%	0.7
COMMUNITY CONTACTS	448	5.2%	0.3	456	5.2	0.3	406	5.6%	0.3	366	4.7	0.2	1702	5.1%	0.3
DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION	1102	12.8	0.7	1603	18.3	1.0	1342	18.4	0.8	1484	19.2	0.9	5679	17.2%	0.9
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	829	9.6%	0.5	858	9.8	0.5	687	9.4%	0.4	1022	13.2	0.6	3478	10.5%	0.5
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	50	0.6%	0.0	102	1.2	0.1	254	3.5%	0.2	83	1.1	0.1	495	1.5%	0.1
GRANTS DEVELOPMENT & ADMINISTRATION	21	0.2%	0.0	169	1.9	0.1	23	0.3%	0.0	44	0.6	0.0	264	0.8%	0.0
HISTORIC PRESERVATION	177	2.1%	0.1	262	3.0	0.2	271	3.7%	0.2	80	1.0	0.0	789	2.4%	0.1
HOUSING	200	2.3%	0.1	110	1.2	0.1	97	1.3%	0.1	157	2.0	0.1	572	1.7%	0.1
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	948	11.0	0.6	924	10.5	0.6	1019	14.0	0.6	837	10.8	0.5	3819	11.5%	0.6
INFRASTRUCTURE/CAPITAL PROGRAMMING	101	1.2%	0.1	61	0.7	0.0	140	1.9%	0.1	155	2.0	0.1	474	1.4%	0.1
LAND USE LAWS & REGULATIONS	341	4.0%	0.2	143	1.6	0.1	17	0.2%	0.0	51	0.7	0.0	555	1.7%	0.1
LONG-RANGE PLANNING	33	0.4%	0.0	264	3.0	0.2	226	3.1%	0.1	1021	13.2	0.6	1616	4.9%	0.3
NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING	94	1.1%	0.1	310	3.5	0.2	232	3.2%	0.1	441	5.7	0.3	1106	3.3%	0.2
PERMITS & APPEALS	1320	15.3	0.8	561	6.4	0.4	303	4.1%	0.2	95	1.2	0.1	2285	6.9%	0.4
RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	324	3.8%	0.2	288	3.3	0.2	217	3.0%	0.1	137	1.8	0.1	981	3.0%	0.2
SHORT TERM AND MISCELLANEOUS	833	9.7%	0.5	688	7.8	0.4	726	9.9%	0.5	670	8.7	0.4	2944	8.9%	0.5
TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING	499	5.8%	0.3	808	9.2	0.5	478	6.5%	0.3	347	4.5	0.2	2161	6.5%	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>8618</b>			<b>8782</b>			<b>7301</b>			<b>7714</b>			<b>33080</b>		

Friday, February 12, 1999

**Note: This report is based from number of hours worked by each professional staff, based on their 1998 salary. Administrative support time is not included**



# P&D Program Personnel Costs By Year -- General Fund

SECTION	1995		1996		1997		1998		Total	
BOARDS & COMMITTEES	\$56,426	15.6%	\$53,824	13.6%	\$38,509	11.8%	\$29,939	10.2%	\$182,571	13.0%
COMMUNITY CONTACTS	\$18,596	5.1%	\$20,288	5.1%	\$18,162	5.6%	\$12,783	4.3%	\$70,899	5.0%
DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION	\$59,754	16.5%	\$86,660	21.8%	\$75,022	23.0%	\$77,213	26.2%	\$306,905	21.8%
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	\$37,926	10.5%	\$43,476	11.0%	\$33,187	10.2%	\$35,115	11.9%	\$153,622	10.9%
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	\$1,505	0.4%	\$4,866	1.2%	\$11,122	3.4%	\$3,008	1.0%	\$20,732	1.5%
GRANTS DEVELOPMENT & ADMINISTRATION	\$435	0.1%	\$8,377	2.1%	\$1,114	0.3%	\$2,381	0.8%	\$12,823	0.9%
HISTORIC PRESERVATION	\$6,583	1.8%	\$9,770	2.5%	\$10,091	3.1%	\$2,986	1.0%	\$29,430	2.1%
HOUSING	\$10,885	3.0%	\$5,968	1.5%	\$5,073	1.6%	\$5,743	1.9%	\$28,148	2.0%
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	\$29,844	8.3%	\$29,330	7.4%	\$32,393	9.9%	\$26,131	8.9%	\$120,705	8.6%
INFRASTRUCTURE/CAPITAL PROGRAMMING	\$4,828	1.3%	\$2,802	0.7%	\$6,333	1.9%	\$5,914	2.0%	\$20,711	1.5%
LAND USE LAWS & REGULATIONS	\$9,419	2.6%	\$4,283	1.1%	\$791	0.2%	\$2,254	0.8%	\$16,888	1.2%
LONG-RANGE PLANNING	\$2,027	0.6%	\$13,814	3.5%	\$9,326	2.9%	\$36,781	12.5%	\$64,935	4.6%
NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING	\$2,460	0.7%	\$11,925	3.0%	\$8,773	2.7%	\$15,655	5.3%	\$39,874	2.8%
PERMITS & APPEALS	\$53,211	14.7%	\$25,229	6.4%	\$13,607	4.2%	\$2,967	1.0%	\$95,226	6.8%
RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	\$10,748	3.0%	\$9,997	2.5%	\$8,113	2.5%	\$4,304	1.5%	\$33,663	2.4%
SHORT TERM AND MISCELLANEOUS	\$34,044	9.4%	\$27,368	6.9%	\$32,511	9.9%	\$19,257	6.5%	\$114,020	8.1%
TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING	\$22,503	6.2%	\$38,987	9.8%	\$22,734	7.0%	\$12,236	4.2%	\$97,603	6.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$361,194</b>		<b>\$396,963</b>		<b>\$326,863</b>		<b>\$294,667</b>		<b>\$1,408,758</b>	

Friday, February 12, 1999

**Note: This report is based from number of hours worked by each professional staff, based on their 1998 salary.**

**Administrative support time is not included**

# Southwest Area Development

## Direct Revenues

	Land Size (Acres)	Land Value (\$/Sq. Ft.)	TOTAL NET REVENUE	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
<b>Southwest Area Development -- Southwest Area Land Use Plan</b>								
PLANNING/PREP								
GEIS				\$ (305,000)				
LAND SALE/PURCHASE								
Southwest Park *	60	\$ 2.00	\$ 5,227,200		\$ 5,227,200			
Substitute Properties								
Purchase SW 6,7,8	23	\$ 0.05			\$ (55,304)			
Purchase of SW-2	4	\$ 1.50			\$ (331,979)			
Sale of SW-2 Comm.	1	\$ 3.00				\$ 119,703		
Purchase of SW-3	14	\$ 1.50			\$ (1,133,623)			
Sale of SW-3 Comm.	6	\$ 3.00				\$ 793,228		
Sale of non-park SW-4	3.3	\$ 2.00				\$ 287,496		
SALES TAX (Sales/yr(\$200/sq ft))								
Large Parcel	Sq. Feet	Total Sales						
	600,000	\$ 120,000,000				\$ 1,200,000	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 2,400,000
South of Levee	100,000	\$ 20,000,000				\$ 200,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000
PROPERTY TAX (\$9.12656/\$1,000)								
SWP future value	\$ 0.01	\$ 5.88	\$ 352,073		\$ 23,853	\$ 47,706	\$ 140,257	\$ 140,257
Increased Dump value	56	\$ 2.40			\$ 26,572	\$ 53,145	\$ 130,205	\$ 130,205
		\$ 3.48						
<b>TOTALS</b>			\$ 15,364,382	\$ (305,000)	\$ 3,756,720	\$ 2,701,278	\$ 3,070,462	\$ 3,070,462

\* Revenues from SWP sale must be put into capital projects for park development

8/18/98

# Grants and Fees

## Direct Revenues

	1998	1997	1996	1995	1994	1993	Earlier
CDBG							
Block Grant	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 1,900,000	\$1,200,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 2,355,800
Canal Corridor Initiative		\$ 759,000					
Revolving loan fund revenues							
Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC)							\$ 150,000
Multimodal							
Traffic calming		\$ 250,000					
Pedestrian bridge		\$ 250,000					
Brownfields							
Inlet Island	\$ 96,000						
Ithaca Falls*	\$ 113,226						
Certified Local Government (CLG)		\$ 7,150		\$ 12,200	\$ 1,842		\$ 2,793
EQBA							
Boathouse			\$ 49,812		\$ 49,660		
Site Plan Review	\$ 3,042	\$ 11,891	\$ 35,622	\$ 13,229	\$ 3,740		
Subdivision Review	\$ 171	\$ 87	\$ 69	\$ 257	\$ 490		
<b>Grants &amp; Fees Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 2,112,439</b>	<b>\$ 3,178,128</b>	<b>\$1,285,503</b>	<b>\$ 925,686</b>	<b>\$ 955,632</b>	<b>\$ 900,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,508,593</b>
<b>Department Budget</b>	<b>\$ 409,980</b>	<b>\$ 313,842</b>	<b>\$ 372,610</b>	<b>\$ 351,385</b>	<b>\$ 350,220</b>	<b>\$ 331,794</b>	
<b>Surplus</b>	<b>\$ 1,702,459</b>	<b>\$ 2,864,286</b>	<b>\$ 912,893</b>	<b>\$ 574,301</b>	<b>\$ 605,412</b>	<b>\$ 568,206</b>	<b>\$ 2,508,593</b>
<b>Total Revenues</b>							
<b>\$</b>	<b>11,865,981</b>						

Committee/Board	# of Recipients for Agenda Only	# Recipients for Entire Packet	Average # of Pages per Packet	# Mailings per Year	Hours Copying & Stuffing per Mailing	Type of Envelope Used*	Postage Expense per Packet	Avg. Cost per packet	# Page Per Year	Annual Copying Cost (@5cents/page)	Annual Postage of Package Mailing	Annual Postage of Agenda Mailings	Staff cost (@\$20/hour)	Total Annual Cost
Planning & Economic Development Committee	50	10	50	12	4	agenda #10 packets 10"x13"	0.32	\$3.00	6,600	\$ 330	\$ 360	\$ 192	\$ 960	<b>\$ 1,842</b>
Planning & Development Board	60	7	60	12	4	agenda #10 packets 10"x13"	0.32	\$3.00	5,760	\$ 288	\$ 252	\$ 230	\$ 960	<b>\$ 1,730</b>
Codes Committee	0	3	60	12	2	10"x13"		\$3.00	2,160	\$ 108	\$ 108	\$ -	\$ 480	<b>\$ 696</b>
Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission	20	7	20	12	2	agenda #10 Packets 9"x12"	0.32	\$0.75	1,920	\$ 96	\$ 63	\$ 77	\$ 480	<b>\$ 716</b>
Conservation Advisory Council	0	6	15	12	2	9"x12"		\$0.50	1,080	\$ 54	\$ 36	\$ -	\$ 480	<b>\$ 570</b>
Parks Commission	0	8	1	12	0.5	#10	0.32	\$0.32	96	\$ 5	\$ 31	\$ -	\$ 120	<b>\$ 156</b>
Collegetown Neighborhood Association	20	78	3	12	1.5	#10	0.32	\$0.32	3,048	\$ 152	\$ 300	\$ 77	\$ 360	<b>\$ 889</b>
Economic Development Advisory Council	0	13	5	12	1	#10		\$0.32	780	\$ 39	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ 240	<b>\$ 329</b>
Residential Parking Permit System Committee	0	21	3	12	1	#10	0.32	\$0.32	756	\$ 38	\$ 81	\$ -	\$ 240	<b>\$ 358</b>

Inlet Island Guidelines Committee	0	10	1	12	0.50	#10	0.32	\$0.32	120	\$ 6	\$ 38	\$ -	\$ 120	\$ 164
Cable Refranchising Committee	0	12	3	12	1	#10	0.32	\$0.32	432	\$ 22	\$ 46	\$ -	\$ 240	\$ 308
* Does not include cost of envelopes									22,752	\$ 1,138	\$ 1,364	\$ 576	\$4,680	\$ 7,758

# Planning & Development Department

August 1998

