
Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Community Development works to facilitate development and a multi-modal transportation system in accordance with municipal codes, protecting safety, public health and environmental resources, while also working to promote a healthy economy, strong businesses and neighborhoods, and recreational opportunities. We respond to our customers seeking code enforcement information, zoning or platting applications, building permits or inspections with open, friendly, cost efficient and effective service.

Core Services

- Enable property development through building permitting and creative and practical zoning regulations and plans that meet community expectations for our winter city community;
- Ensure new construction meets municipal standards for protecting safety, public health, and environmental quality;
- Enforce municipal codes to protect public assets such as rights-of-way and to promote clean and attractive neighborhoods;
- Support continued development of the community by planning for the community's long-term multi-modal transportation needs; and
- Work to achieve land use goals established through Assembly-adopted comprehensive plans for Eklutna/Eagle River/Chugiak, Anchorage Bowl, Girdwood and Turnagain Arm areas.

Accomplishment Goals

- Improve citizens' and businesses' understanding about the Municipality's new (rewritten) Title 21 Land Use Code and about how the new code differs from the old one;
- Assess community sentiment about municipal progress in using land use planning to: strengthen the area's economy, businesses, downtown core, and neighborhoods; augment Anchorage's standing as a premier winter city; and improve recreational opportunities; and
- Create a survey system to assess customers' opinions about services provided by Community Development's staff.

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving accomplishment goals will be measured by:

Measure #1: Community sentiment about land use planning progress.
--

Community Development mailed surveys to all 38 community councils to assess community sentiments about municipal progress in using land use planning to:

- Strengthen the area's economy;
- Strengthen the area's businesses;
- Strengthen the area's downtown core;
- Strengthen the area's neighborhoods;
- Augment Anchorage's standing as a premier winter city; and
- Improve recreational opportunities.

Survey results for 2012 are not yet available. For 2011, eleven of thirty-eight councils have returned surveys. [Click here for a link to the 2011 survey results.](#)

Measure #2: Percent complete – Users’ Guide for new Title 21 Land Use Code

This performance measure will report on staff’s progress drafting chapters and illustrations for the new guidebook to facilitate implementation of the new code.

The users’ guide is intended to inform citizens and businesses about the municipality’s new (rewritten) Title 21 Land Use Code following adoption. Work on the guide will begin once the Anchorage Assembly has adopted the new Title 21 Code.

Measure #3: Percentage of customers completing service surveys that rank accuracy and clarity of information provided by the department’s staff as good or excellent.

Staff at the department’s public counters asks every tenth customer to complete a customer service survey. Results by quarter are as follow:

Q1 2011 Responses about Staff’s Services at the Public Counters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Marked as N/A
Staff were readily available to assist me	68%	28%	0%	4%	0%
Staff were a valuable resource	74%	22%	0%	4%	0%
Staff were helpful, courteous & professional	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%
Staff provided clear, concise & correct info.	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%

Q1 2011 Response about Staff’s Services at Public Counters	Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
Rating of overall level of satisfaction with services provided	76%	12%	4%	8%

Q1: In regards to handwritten comments on the surveys, two commented on how long it took for service. Twelve complimented staff. One asked for better instructions on the department’s website. Another expressed disappointment that the old permitting system was discontinued before all issues in the new Hansen system were worked out.

Q2 2011 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Marked as N/A
Staff were readily available to assist me	67.9%	19.6%	5.4%	5.4%	1.8%
Staff were a valuable resource	67.9%	23.2%	5.4%	0.0%	3.6%
Staff were helpful, courteous & professional	69.6%	19.6%	7.1%	0.0%	3.6%
Staff provided clear, concise & correct info.	67.9%	19.6%	5.4%	0.0%	7.1%

Q2 2011 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters	Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
Rating of overall level of satisfaction with services provided	62.5%	21.4%	7.1%	8.9%

Q2: In regards to handwritten comments, several were complimentary of staff, others expressed dissatisfaction with new Hansen system, and some commented on wait times and need for more staff. One suggested an express drop-off service for design professionals familiar with how to complete the paperwork. Another suggested an online application process for re-roofing permits.

Q3 2011 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Marked as N/A
Staff were readily available to assist me	62.5%	9.4%	6.3%	12.5%	9.4%
Staff were a valuable resource	75.9%	20.7%	0%	3.4%	0%
Staff were helpful, courteous & professional	82.8%	17.2%	0%	0%	0%
Staff provided clear, concise & correct info.	79.3%	17.2%	3.4%	0.0%	0%

Q3 2011 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters	Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
Rating of overall level of satisfaction with services provided	58.6%	13.8%	13.8%	13.8%

Q3: In regards to 29 handwritten comments, some complimented staff (11), while others complained about inadequate staffing and waits up to 45 minutes (17). One comment addressed problems in faxing in a retro plumbing permit.

Q4 2011 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Marked as N/A
Staff were readily available to assist me	86.7%	0%	0%	13.3%	0%
Staff were a valuable resource	85.7%	7.1%	0%	7.1%	0%
Staff were helpful, courteous & professional	80%	6.7%	13.3%	0%	0%
Staff provided clear, concise & correct info.	80%	13.3%	0.0%	6.7%	0%

Q4 2011 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters	Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
Rating of overall level of satisfaction with services provided	81.3%	0%	12.5%	6.3%

Q4: In regards to 12 comments received, two-thirds were complimentary of staff. Other comments complained about waits, poor service, and in one case about incorrect information.

Q1 2012 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Marked as N/A
Staff were readily available to assist me	50%	0%	25%	25%	0%
Staff were a valuable resource	50%	25%	0%	25%	0%
Staff were helpful, courteous & professional	50%	25%	0%	25%	0%
Staff provided clear, concise & correct info.	50%	25%	25%	0%	0%

Q1 2012 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters	Completely Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
Rating of overall level of satisfaction with services provided	60%	0%	20%	20%

Q1: In regards to comments received, one person asks that phone list and organizational chart for staff be posted on website. Others commented on exceptionally long wait times and that only a couple of the counter work-stations were actually staffed. Some complimented or criticized service provided by staff.

Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Building Safety Section accepts applications for building, land use, and private development permits; performs plan reviews for compliance with code, municipal design criteria, and municipal construction standards; issues permits; performs inspections to assure safe development; and protects public health and environmental quality through regulation of on-site water and wastewater systems.

Direct Services

- Process permit applications, provide cashier services, and issue permits;
- Verify that plans meet minimum code requirements through plan review;
- Inspect construction for compliance with plans and adopted building codes;
- Administer subdivision, improvement to public place, and development agreements in accordance with code;
- Process applications and issue permits for water and wastewater systems serving single family homes in accordance with Anchorage Municipal Code 15.55 (Water) and 15.65 (Wastewater); and
- Process certificates of on-site systems approval (COSA) for existing single family water and wastewater systems.

Accomplishment Goals

- Continue to provide excellent customer service by providing prompt and efficient permit processing, timely plan reviews, and same-day as requested construction inspection services;
- Manage the private development process effectively and efficiently;
- Ensure development-related infrastructure is designed and constructed according to municipal design criteria, standards, codes, and practices; and
- Provide on-site water and wastewater permitting, certification, training and enforcement consistent with goals of protecting public health and environmental quality.

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

Measure #4: Average number of minutes for first customer contact (*Permitting Management Unit*)

Average Number of Minutes for 1 st Customer Contact			
			Q4 2010
			3.81 minutes
			2,284 customers
			4 employees*
Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
9.15 minutes	18.10 minutes	27.8 minutes **	13.85 minutes
2,351 customers	4,954 customers	4,681 customers	2,902
4 employees*	4 employees	4 employees	4 employees
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
16.29 minutes			
2,305 customers			
3 employees* – see note below			

*Staffing in this unit has varied. For all of the first quarter of 2012, one of four counter staff has been out on extended leave for the quarter. During 2011, all four counter employees had to take family medical leave time with some being out for several weeks. There was also an employee who quit without notice during the first quarter of 2011, and replacing that employee with a new person required months of training to bring the replacement fully up to speed.

Another factor for wait times has been the launch of the new Hansen software in 2011. The new software takes longer processing times for re-submittals, change orders, certificate of occupancies, etc.

Measure #5: Percent of first-time residential plan reviews completed within 4 business days (*Plan Review Unit*)

Percent of 1 st -Time Residential Reviews Completed within 4 Business Days			
During 2009, 77% of the reviews were completed within 4 business days. (Code provides for 10 days to complete)			
For 2010 the quarterly percentages are as follows:			
Q1 2010	Q2 2010	Q3 2010	Q4 2010
93% in 4 days	69% in 4 days	70% in 4 days	68% in 4 days
100% in 10 days	97% in 10 days	97% in 10 days	100% in 10 days
89 reviews	376 reviews	384 reviews	165 reviews
For 2011 the quarterly percentages are as follows:			

Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
70% in 4 days	70% in 4 days	67% in 4 days	With change in year to 2012, not able to extract report for Q4 2011 from Hansen system. IT staff is aware and working on the issue.
97% in 10 days	90% in 10 days	89% in 10 days	
180 reviews	444 reviews	419 reviews	
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
71% in 4 days			
97% in 10 days			
130 reviews			

Building Safety has one residential plan reviewer who is assisted by two commercial plan reviewers during the busiest times of the year.

Measure #6: Percent of Plan Review Unit's comments submitted to Current Planning Section on or prior to comment due date for pending platting and zoning cases. (*Plan Review Unit*)

Percent of Plan Review Comments on Zoning & Platting Cases
Submitted on or Prior to Due Date

2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date	Plan Review will begin reporting these statistics for Q3 of 2011						100%	21%*	100%	100%	100%	100%
# of Cases Reviewed							26	14	18	14	17	18
# of Staff							1	1	1	1	1	1
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date	100%	100%	100%									
# of Cases Reviewed	14	17	24									
# of Staff	1	1	1									

*The missed deadlines in 2011 were from cases distributed while reviewer was on vacation.

**Measure #7: Percent of construction inspections completed same day as requested
(Building Inspection Unit)**

Percent of Construction Inspections Completed Same Day as Requested			
During 2009, 97.9% of all inspections were completed the same day as requested.			
For 2010 the quarterly percentages are as follows:			
Q1 2010	Q2 2010	Q3 2010	Q4 2010
99.75%	99.85%	99.22%	98.71%
For 2011 the quarterly percentages are as follows:			
Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
95.8%	96%	97.9%	99.5%
4353 inspections	5767 inspections	6771 inspections	5872 inspections
15 full +3 shared use inspectors	15 full +3 shared use inspectors	15 full, 1 temp + 3 shared use inspectors	15 full time, 3 shared use and 1 temporary (terminated mid-December)
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
99.4%			
4195 inspections			
15 + 3 shared used inspectors			

Please note that one structural inspector was out during all of Q3 2011.

Measure #8: Percent of Life Safety Building Code Complaints Investigated within One Business Day and Percent of All Code Abatement Service Requests Initially Investigated Same Week as Received. (Code Abatement Unit)

Number of Building Code Abatement Service Requests Investigated			
2007	425 investigated <i>(also performed 3 building inspection*)</i>		
2008	379 investigated <i>(also performed 1 building inspection*)</i>		
2009	552 investigated <i>(also performed 134 building inspections*)</i>		
2010	455 investigated <i>(also performed 330 building inspections*)</i>		
Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
60 received, <i>also did 27 bldg insp*</i>	154 received, <i>also did 169 bldg insp*</i>	152 received, <i>also did 583 bldg insp*</i>	134 requests also did 160 bldg insp.**
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
Life Safety Service Requests			
38 Received 33 Responded Same Day 86.8% same day			
Other (Non-Life Safety) Service Requests			
90 Received 77 Responded within 7 days 85.6% w/ 7 days Also performed 13 building construction inspections			

The Hansen Information System has been programmed to generate, beginning with Q1 of 2012, the quarterly statistics about the percentage of life safety code complaints investigated same day and all other requests investigated with the same week as received.

**The three code abatement inspectors have building code abatement as their primary responsibility. However, the abatement inspectors are used for regular building permit inspections when necessary, but each time that they are pulled to do regular building permits, work on abatement complaints is delayed.*

Measure #9: Percent of draft agreements initiated within ten business days of receiving applications, requisite supporting documents and deposits (<i>Private Development Unit</i>)
--

For the first quarter of 2011, no new subdivision agreements or improvements to public place agreements were received. However, several existing private development projects that had been suspended by the developers were re-activated. We received three updated applications for projects that had been on hold that require changes to existing draft agreements or amendments to signed agreements. Work on the agreements for these re-activated projects continues as the developers gather and provide supporting document(s).

For the second quarter of 2011, this measure was achieved 100%.

Q2 applications included the following:

1. Subd. Agreement for Eagle Crossing Phase I (Ref File 11-001; rec'd 4/11/11, Agreement signed 6/21/11)
2. Improvement of Public Place Agreement for Electron Way and W. Dowling Road (Ref File 11-002; rec'd 4/22/11)

For the third quarter of 2011, this measure was achieved 100%.

Q3 applications included the following:

3. Sonoma Glen at WestPark (Ref File 11-003; rec'd 7/6/11)
4. Checkpoint 2011 (Ref File 11-004; rec'd 7/12/2011)

Q4 applications included the following:

5. Dimond Sands (Ref File 11-005; rec'd 12/2/2011) – application incomplete – awaiting additional information/authorization from applicant and/or engineer.

Data for 2012

(Complete) Subdivision Agreement Applications Received	Q1 2012			Q2 2012			Q3 2012			Q4 2012		
	Received this quarter	Drafts initiated within 10 days	Percent in 10 days	Received this quarter	Drafts initiated within 10 days	Percent in 10 days	Received this quarter	Drafts initiated within 10 days	Percent in 10 days	Received this quarter	Drafts initiated within 10 days	Percent in 10 days
Dimond Sands	1	Y	100									
Powder Ridge Phase 7	2	Y	100									
Powder Ridge Phase 4B	3	Y	100									
The Terraces Phase 5	4	Y	100									
Arlberg Avenue Extension	5	Y	100									
Amendments	0	0	0									

Measure #10: Percent of follow-up letters issued within ten (10) business days of project milestone events to include: signed subdivision agreements; design plan approvals; notices to proceed to construction; pre-final, final, and warranty inspections; and notices of completion or rescission. *(Private Development Unit)*

Percent of Follow-Up Letters Issued within 10 Days of Milestone Events

Subdivision Agreement Milestone Event	Q2 2011			Q3 2011			Q4 2011		
	Total #	# within 10 days	Percent in 10 days	Total #	# within 10 days	Percent in 10 days	Total #	# within 10 days	Percent in 10 days
Signed Subdivision Agreements	2*	2		3	3	100	2*	2*	100
Design Plan Approvals	6**	6		2	2	100	6	6	100
Notices to Proceed to Construction	10	10		3	3	100	0	0	N/A
Pre-Final Inspections	1	1		9	9	100	6	6	100
Final Inspections	1	1		6	2	33	4	4	100
Warranty Inspections	2	2		8	2	25	2	2	100
Notices of Completion	1	1		2	2	100	11	11	100
Notices of Rescission	1	1		0	0	N/A	2	2	100

*Includes an amendment to an agreement.

**Two projects with conditional approvals.

Data for 2012

Subdivision Agreement Milestone Event	Q1 2012			Q2 2012			Q3 2012			Q4 2012		
	Total #	# within 10 days	Percent in 10 days	Total #	# within 10 days	Percent in 10 days	Total #	# within 10 days	Percent in 10 days	Total #	# within 10 days	Percent in 10 days
Signed Subdivision Agmts	0	0	0									
Design Plan Approvals	1	1	100									
Notices to Proceed to Const	0	N/A	N/A									
Pre-Final Inspections	0	N/A	N/A									
Final Inspections	0	N/A	N/A									
Warranty Inspections	0	N/A	N/A									
Notices of Completion	1	0	0									
Notices of Rescission	0	N/A	N/A									

*projects in winter shutdown

Measure #11: Percent of Private Development comments submitted to Current Planning Section on or prior to comment due date for pending zoning and platting cases. (*Private Development Section*)

Percent of Private Development Comments on Pending Zoning & Platting Cases
Submitted on or Prior to Due Date (new measure – reporting begins April 2011)

2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date				68%	93%	90%	91%	100%	88%	100%	100%	100%
# of Cases Reviewed				19	28	21	11	13	17	17	19	16
# of Staff				4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date	100%	100%	100%									
# of Cases Reviewed	11	17	25									
# of Staff	4	4	4									

Measure #12: Percent of review responses provided to a development team within 15 business days of a developer's submittal (*Private Development Unit*)

Percent of Review Responses Provided Within Fifteen Business Days			
Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
64%	43%	100%	100%
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
80%			

Private Development's plan review engineer position was vacant the entire 1st quarter of 2011. A new engineer filled the position beginning on April 4, 2011.

Measure #13: Percent of Certificate of On-Site Approval applications reviewed within 3 business days (*On-Site Water & Wastewater Unit*)

Percent of Certificate of On-Site Acceptance Applications Reviewed w/ 3 Business Days			
During 2009, 77% of all reviews were completed the same day as requested.			
For 2010 the quarterly percentages are as follows:			
Q1 2010	Q2 2010	Q3 2010	Q4 2010
97%	Not available	Not available	63%
Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
86%	81%	80%	78%
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
94 applications	135 applications	137 applications	125 applications
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
89%			
3 staff			
92 applications			

Measure #14: Percent of bottom-of-hole construction inspections performed prior to system installations (On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit)

Municipal code requires the Municipality of Anchorage or a licensed engineer to inspect and approve the excavation prior to installation of a septic system. Code provides for a two hour notification to the Municipality before any inspections occur, so the Municipality may send its own staff to observe even if a private engineer is hired to do an inspection. The following performance measure tracks how often municipal staff inspects the bottom-of-the-hole excavation prior to system installation.

Percent of Bottom-of-Hole Inspections Performed Prior to System Installation
Data not available

Staff anticipated using an automated report from the Hansen database to provide the data for this table. However, IT staff report that such a report cannot be generated without significant changes to the Hansen database.

Measure #15: Percent of inspection report reviews completed within 3 business days (On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit)

Percent of Inspection Report Reviews Completed within 3 Business Days			
During 2009, 54% of inspection report reviews were completed within 3 business days.			
Q1 2010	Q2 2010	Q3 2010	Q4 2010
49% in 3 days	<i>Data not available for subsequent quarters due to change from PAS to Hansen systems.</i>		
Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
Not available	30% in 3 days	24% in 3 days	11% in 3 days
Not available	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
Not available	10 reviews	17 reviews	46 reviews
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
38% in 3 days			
3 staff			
13 reviews			

Measure #16: Percent of on-site permit application reviews completed within 3 business days (*On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit*)

Percent of On-Site Permit Application Reviews Completed within 3 Business Days			
			Q4 2010
			47% in 3 days
Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
88% in 3 days	78% in 3 days	46% in 3 days	85% in 3 days
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
26 permits	83 permits	101 permits	59 permits
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
96% in 3 days			
3 staff			
28 permits			

Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Protect the travelling public and improve the quality, useful life, and safety of the public rights-of-way within the Municipality of Anchorage.

Improve quality of life and ensure compatible land uses through effective zoning review and enforcement of Title 21, Land Use Regulations.

Provide assistance to general public and development community through review of facility licenses, administrative land use permits, and business development proposals and assign and maintain unique addressing and street names to ensure conformance with Anchorage's land use regulations.

Direct Services

- Inspect construction projects within municipal rights-of-way;
- Review plans and issue right-of-way permits on a timely basis;
- Investigate and resolve complaints regarding illegal usage of rights-of-way.
- Enforce Title 21, the Land Use Code;
- Perform final zoning inspections of completed construction projects;
- Conduct land use reviews (at request of property owner, developer, mortgage lender, etc.) to determine a parcel's zoning status, conformity with other land use regulations, and/or eligibility for grandfather rights;
- Issue administrative land use permits for bed and breakfast establishments, antenna towers and attachments, snow disposal sites, adult entertainment establishments, and premises where minors are not allowed;
- Review and inspect day care centers, animal facilities (such as kennels), and businesses selling alcoholic beverages for compliance with municipal land use regulations when those businesses seek new licenses or renewals; and
- Assign addresses to new construction and work to eliminate duplicate street names.

Accomplishment Goals

- Protect the travelling public and the municipal rights of way, the largest single asset of the Municipality of Anchorage at +\$10 billion;
- Respond to land use code complaints within established timeframes;
- Complete final zoning inspections same day as requested;
- Provide timely and accurate services for:
 - Land use reviews/determinations;
 - Administrative land use permits;
 - Business facility reviews and inspections;
 - Assignment of new addresses; and
 - Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses; and
- Continue to make progress eliminating duplicate street names to ensure the uniqueness of each address, thereby improving E911 response times.

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

Measure #17: Percent of inspections of permitted construction completed the same day to ensure installation compliance with MOA standards and specifications. (Right-of-Way Enforcement Section)

Measure used to track percent completed within 2 working days. Started tracking percent completed same day beginning with Q2 2011.

Old Measure: Percent of Inspections Completed within 2 Working Days in 2011			
	Requested	Accomplished	Percent
Jan	5	5	100%
Feb	7	7	100%
Mar	13	13	100%

New Measure: Percent of Inspections Completed Same Days as Requested in 2011				
	# of ROW Officers	Requested	Accomplished	Percent
Apr	7	22	*22/73	100%
May	7	94	*94/324	100%
Jun	7	161	*161/430	100%
Jul	7	147	147/495	100%
Aug	7	161	161/697	100%
Sep	7	104	104/412	100%
Oct	7	105	105/382	100%
Nov	7	231	231/281	100%
Dec	7	10	10/95	100%
Percent of Inspections Completed Same Days as Requested in 2012				
	# of ROW Officers	Requested	Accomplished	Percent
Jan	7	14	14/164	100%
Feb	7	6	6/28	100%
Mar	7	22	22/243	100%
Apr				
May				
Jun				
Jul				
Aug				
Sep				
Oct				
Nov				
Dec				

* In the "Accomplished" column inspections are reported in two categories, separated by a "/." The first number represents the number of inspections accomplished same day as requested and is used to compute the percent result. The second number is the total number of inspections performed for the month. The larger number for total inspections reflects on how a single job may require numerous inspections. Examples of inspection types are: initial, progress (there could be 4-6 or more progress inspections), final, and warranty.

Measure #18: Percent of all complaints of illegal uses within the right-of-ways inspected within one working day of receipt. (*Right-of-Way Enforcement Section*)

Measure used to track percent completed within 2 working days. Started tracking percent completed same day beginning with Q2 2011.

Old Measure: Percent of Illegal ROW Usage Complaints Investigated within 48 Hours

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Jan	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Feb	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%
Mar	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Apr	100%	100%	100%	100%	See new measure below for remaining months of 2011
May	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Jun	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Jul	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Aug	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Sep	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Oct	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Nov	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Dec	100%	100%	100%	100%	

New Measure: Percent of Illegal ROW Usage Complaints Investigated within One Working Day

Measure #18, 2011 Data							
Month	# of ROW Officers	Number of Complaints	Number Investigated within 1 Working Day	Percent Investigated within 1 Working Day	# Found to be no Violation	Cases w Violations Closed this Quarter <i>(new cases)</i>	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr <i>(pre-existing cases)</i>
Apr	7	77	67	87%	21	116	43
May	7	76	70	92%	8		
Jun	7	100	88	88%	14		
Jul	7	63	62	99%	8	144	55
Aug	7	63	62	99%	4		
Sep	7	79	79	100%	5		
Oct	7	93	93	100%	9	1165	63
Nov	7	549	549	100%	39		
Dec	7	423	423	100%	26		
Measure #18, 2012 Data							
Month	# of ROW Officers	Number of Complaints	Number Investigated within 1 Working Day	Percent Investigated within 1 Working Day	# Found to be no Violation	Cases w Violations Closed this Quarter <i>(new cases)</i>	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr <i>(pre-existing cases)</i>
Jan	7	472	472	100%	47	1369	43
Feb	7	531	515	97%	39		
Mar	7	365	365	100%	46		
Apr							
May							

Jun							
Jul							
Aug							
Sep							
Oct							
Nov							
Dec							

Measure #19: Percent of Right-of-Way comments submitted to Private Development Section on or prior to comment due date for draft subdivision plans review. (*Right-of-Way Enforcement Section*)

2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date				0%	100%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
# of Cases Reviewed				1	1	1	3	0	0	5	0	0
# of Staff				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date	0%	0%	0%									
# of Cases Reviewed	0	0	2									
# of Staff	1	1	1									

Percent of Right-of-Way Comments on Draft Subdivision Agreements
Submitted on or Prior to Due Date (new measure – reporting begins April 2011)

Measure #20: Percent of land use enforcement complaints that are inspected within one working day of receipt. (*Land Use Enforcement Section*)

Old Measure: Percent of Code Enforcement Complaints Responded to Within Established Timeframes

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2007	73%	88%	88%	87%	96%	97%	95%	97%	97%	100%	100%	100%
2008	100%	98%	95%	100%	85%	91%	98%	96%	94%	100%	100%	100%
2009	100%	100%	100%	84%	93%	95%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2010	100%	100%	100%	96%	99%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2011	100%	96%	94%	See remaining months of 2011 in the next table								

New Measure: Percent of Code Enforcement Complaints Inspected within One Working Day of Receipt

Measure #20: 2011 Percent of land use enforcement complaints that are inspected within one working day of receipt. (Land Use Enforcement Section)							
Month	Number of Officers	Number of Complaints	Number Investigated within 1 Working Days	Number Found w/ Violation	Number Found w/ no violation	Cases w Violations Closed this Quarter (new cases)	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr (pre-existing cases)
Apr	*7	152	87/ 57%	135	17	247	357
May	*8/6	156	121/ 78%	115	41		
Jun	*8/6	163	125/ 77%	138	25		
Jul	6/5	137	123/ 90%	103	34	327	30
Aug	6/5	118	113/ 96%	98	20		
Sep	6/5	102	96/ 94%	73	29		
Oct	*5/4	127	127/100%	120	7	366	125
Nov	*5/4	110	110/100%	106	4		
Dec	*5/4	129	129/100%	124	5		
Measure #20: 2012 Percent of land use enforcement complaints that are inspected within one working day of receipt. (Land Use Enforcement Section)							
Month	# of LUE Officers	Number of Complaints	Number Investigated within 1 Working Day	Percent Investigated within 1 Working Day	# Found to be no Violation	Cases w Violations Closed this Quarter (new cases)	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr (pre-existing cases)
Jan	6	86	79	92%	12	281	98
Feb	6	81	81	100%	7		
Mar	6	114	109	96%	10		
Apr							
May							
Jun							
Jul							
Aug							
Sep							
Oct							
Nov							
Dec							

*Shows number of officers but note one of the officer positions is actually the lead enforcement officer who covers for other staff when they are out in addition to performing his regular lead duties.

**Measure #21: Percent of final zoning inspections completed same day as requested
(Land Use Enforcement Section)**

**Percent of Final Zoning Inspections
Completed Same Day as Requested**

	2008	2009	2010	2011
Jan	100.0%	92.3%	100.0%	100.0%
Feb	100.0%	90.0%	100.0%	88.9%
Mar	100.0%	85.1%	100.0%	100.0%
Apr	100.0%	70.1%	100.0%	See data for remaining months of 2011 in next table
May	92.6%	97.9%	97.1%	
June	80.6%	90.3%	95.1%	
Jul	95.2%	100.0%	96.3%	
Aug	97.2%	98.8%	94.9%	
Sep	98.8%	98.5%	100.0%	
Oct	100.0%	96.2%	100.0%	
Nov	90.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Dec	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Percent of Final Zoning Inspections
Completed Same Day as Requested with Additional Data**

2011				Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Average # of Days to Complete				15	20	12	7	16	19	8	20	8	
Total # Completed				22	12	11	9	13	14	10	14	10	
# of Staff				3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	
2012		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days to Complete		4	1	3									
Total # Completed		3	2	4									
# of Staff		2	2	2									

**8 officers assigned to the unit for Q2 of 2011, but one has been covering for a vacancy in the zoning plan review section, and another has been out on extended leave. Lead enforcement officer helps cover when other staff is out in addition to performing his lead duties.

Measure #22: Average number of business days to complete initial reviews of land use determinations (*Land Use Review & Addressing Section*)

Old Measure: Average Number of Days to Complete a Land Use Determination

2010	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days to Complete	24	11	18	14	17	21	26	23	16	14	26	8
2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days to Complete	29	35	11	See next table for data for remaining 2011 months								

New measure tracks average number of business days to complete the initial review of a land use determination.

New Measure: Average Number of Business Days to Complete Initial Reviews of Land Use Determinations

2011				Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days to Complete				15	20	12	7	16	19	8	20	8
Total # Completed				22	12	11	9	13	14	10	14	10
# of Staff				3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days to Complete	4	1	3									
Total # Completed	3	2	4									
# of Staff	2	2	2									

Measure #23: Average number of days to complete initial reviews of administrative land use permits. (Land Use Review & Addressing Section)

Average Number of Days to Complete Initial Reviews of Administrative Land Use Permits

2010	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days	9	15	15	18	92	13	53	0	19	10	9	3
2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days	8	22	13	8	18	18	4	10	1	9	4	18
Total # Completed	3	2	2	8	8	6	3	13	6	43	7	40
# of Staff	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days	9	19	17									
Total # Completed	4	11	4									
# of Staff	1	1	1									

This section experienced staff shortages due to vacations and a vacant supervisor position during this quarter. One of the three staff members was acting in the capacity of the supervisor and took on additional duties.

Measure #24: Average number of days between request and completion of initial field inspections for kennel, child care, and liquor license reviews. (Land Use Review & Addressing Section)

Average Number of Days to Complete Initial Inspections for Facility License Reviews

2010	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days	24	15	21	19	33	25	40	6	5	15	12	14
2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days	6	29	26	24	31	21	23	6	8	1	21	26
Total # Completed	5	12	22	77	14	31	14	13	21	11	26	26
# of Staff	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # Days	13	20	9									
Total # Completed	37	28	13									
# of Staff	2	2	2									

During the 2Q of 2011 there were numerous staff absences due to leave or FMLA. The supervisor position has been vacant since February. One staff member has been acting manager until the position is filled.

Measure #25: Percent of new construction addresses assigned within 3 business days of application. (Land Use Review & Addressing Section)

Percent of New Construction Addresses
Assigned within 3 Business Days

2010	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% within 3 days						70%	70%	70%	88%	89%	100%	100%
2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% within 3 days	42%	48%	74%	84%	59%	55%	86%	79%	68%	89%	100%	100%
# of Addresses this Month	47	37	67	56	52	107	100	55	66	49	21	17
# of Staff*	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% within 3 days	68%	68%	77%									
# of Addresses this Month	25	181	20									
# of Staff*	1	1	2									

Note: *Addressing staff was reduced in 2009 from 3 to 2 positions. This unit had only one person from November of 2010 into early 2012 due to the other position being vacant. In March of 2012, the Addressing unit became staffed again with 2 employees. Assigning addresses to new construction is important, but it is a lower priority than keeping GIS layers updated so that police and fire emergency responders have up-to-date addressing information.

Measure #26: Percent of address and street GIS layer updates completed weekly or within one business day if requested by Police or Fire departments. (Land Use Review & Addressing Section)

Percent of Address and Street GIS Layers Updated On-Time

2010	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of address & street layers updated weekly						100%	100%	77%	100%	100%	100%	100%
2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of address & street layers updated weekly	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% of updates completed in 1 business day if Police/Fire request	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of address & street layers updated weekly	100%	100%	100%									
% of updates completed in 1 business day if Police/Fire request	100%	100%	100%									
# of Staff	1	1	2									

Measure #27: Number of duplicate or otherwise problematic street name cases prepared for consideration and action by Mayor and Assembly (*Land Use Review & Addressing Section*)

2010	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Cases Prepared	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
# of Staff	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1
2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Cases Prepared	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Cases Prepared	0	0	0									
# of Staff	1	1	2									

Note: Some duplicate street name cases may be more time-intensive than others due to level of controversy or number of residents involved (long streets.)

Measure #28: Percent of Land Use Review comments submitted to Current Planning Section on or prior to comment due date for pending zoning and platting cases. (*Land Use Review & Addressing Section*)

Percent of Land Use Review Comments on Pending Zoning & Platting Cases
Submitted on or Prior to Due Date (new measure – reporting begins April 2011)

2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date				60%	63%	30%	76%	71%	66%	50%	54%	41%
# of Cases Reviewed				10	22	10	13	7	15	12	11	12
# of Staff				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date	60%	54%	53%									
# of Cases Reviewed	5	11	13									
# of Staff	1	1	1									

Measure #29: Percent of Land Use Review comments submitted to Private Development Section on or prior to comment due date for draft subdivision agreements. (*Land Use Review & Addressing Section*)

Percent of Land Use Review Comments on Draft Subdivision Agreements
Submitted on or Prior to Due Date (new measure – reporting begins April 2011)

2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of Cases Reviewed				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of Staff				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date	0	0	0									
# of Cases Reviewed	0	0	0									
# of Staff	1	1	1									

Long-Range Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Provide professional and technical expertise that sets forth goals, policies and objectives governing growth and future development within the Municipality of Anchorage.

Direct Services

- Prepare land use and development plans for municipal adoption that: accommodate and foster growth and high quality of life; emphasize “northern city” design; coordinate public and private resources to ensure efficient development and delivery of public services; assess infrastructure needs; and ensure the protection of natural resources.
- Implement adopted land use plans by writing ordinances that amend land use code and coordinating planning programs with other government agencies and the private sector.

Accomplishment Goals

- Create a tracking system to monitor improvement in the implementation of existing plans.
- Strive to keep the preparation of new plans and studies within targeted timelines.

Performance Measure

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

Measure #30: Percent complete of an inventory of implementation actions and an implementation tracking system for adopted plans.

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Create a tracking system to monitor improvement in the implementation of existing plans that have been adopted by the Assembly.

Measure Reporting

Status of implementation steps for the following six recent major plans are being tracked annually.

Plan	Comments
Anchorage 2020: Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan	Completed for 2011; 2012 check-in in progress. See Anchorage 2020 Update Status Report to read each implementation action for this plan and its status as being completed, in progress or not started. Find this report at: http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical/Pages/PerfMeasImpl.aspx
Anchorage Downtown Comprehensive Plan	Complete for 2011; 2012 check-in in progress. See Anchorage Downtown Comprehensive Plan Update Status Report to read each implementation action for this plan and its status as being completed, in progress or not started. Find this report at: http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical/Pages/PerfMeasImpl.aspx
Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update	Complete for 2011; 2012 check-in not started yet. See Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update to read each implementation action for this plan and its status as being completed, in progress or not started. Find this report at: http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical/Pages/PerfMeasImpl.aspx
Girdwood Area Plan	Complete for 2011; 2012 check-in not started yet. See Girdwood Area Plan Status Report to read each implementation action for this plan and its status as being completed, in progress or not started. Find this report at: http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical/Pages/PerfMeasImpl.aspx
Hillside District Plan	Complete for 2011; 2012 check-in not started yet. See Hillside District Plan Status Report to read each implementation action for this plan and its status as being completed, in progress or not started. Find this report at: http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical/Pages/PerfMeasImpl.aspx
Turnagain Arm Comprehensive Plan	Complete for 2011; 2012 check-in not started yet. See Turnagain Arm Comprehensive Plan Status Report to read each implementation action for this plan and its status as being completed, in progress or not started. Find this report at: http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical/Pages/PerfMeasImpl.aspx

Measure #31: Improve Project Management by Tracking Number of Days Elapsed between Target and Actual Completion Dates for Long Range Planning Studies

The division will track and compare actual progress completing long range plans and studies in 2011 to scheduled completion dates on a monthly basis to highlight which projects are ahead of schedule, on schedule, or behind schedule – and why.

The plans and studies to be tracked in 2011 are the following:

- Government Hill Plan
- Historic Preservation Plan for Downtown, South Addition, Fairview, and Government Hill Community Council Areas
- Title 21 Rewrite
- Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map
- Commercial Lands Study
- West Anchorage District Plan
- Wetlands Management Plan Update
- Anchorage Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2011 Update

Major milestone tasks and projected completion dates are tracked in following table:

Task	Target Date	Actual Date	Days Early	On-Time	Days Late
East Anchorage District Plan					
Public Visioning Workshop	5-22-12				
Initial Review Draft Released	Nov 2012				
Public Hearing Draft Released	February 2013				
Planning & Zoning Commission Review	April 2013				
Anchorage Assembly Review	May 2013				
Comments: The East District planning process is in the early stages so the later dates are simply targets at this time.					
Government Hill Plan					
1st Public Meeting about Project	11-30-11	12/3/11			4
Public Review Draft Released	5-31-12				
Public Meeting regarding Public Review Draft	6-30-12				
Public Hearing Draft Released	9-30-12				
Planning & Zoning Commission Review	10-31-12				
Anchorage Assembly Begins Review of Plan	12-15-12				
Comments: The first round of public workshops and focus group meetings was very successful with a good turnout by area residents. An official summary of this public outreach effort was posted January 15 th . A second public workshop series was completed in February (16 th -17 th) and included a successful public workshop, a 2 nd advisory council meeting and a meeting with KABATA to discuss alignment issues and the GHNP summary from the first round of public workshops. From this 2 nd round of public meetings, a revised set of diagrams was produced by the consultant team. These diagrams were presented to members of JBER on March 30 th to facilitate discussion of various redevelopment opportunities that may involve JBER properties. An open house is scheduled for May 31 st that will involve public participation and refinement of design development scenarios. The release Public Review Draft is scheduled for early June, to give the contractor an opportunity to implement the comments from the May 31 st Open House. The KABATA Annual Section 106 Meeting will be held on May 1 st at which time the Programmatic Agreement					

Task	Target Date	Actual Date	Days Early	On-Time	Days Late
and Memorandum of Understanding pertaining to the Government Hill Neighborhood Plan will be reviewed to make sure that these documents are being adhered to as the KABATA project and associated planning projects progress.					
Historic Preservation Plan for Downtown, South Addition, Fairview, & Government Hill					
1 st Public Meeting about Project	Oct 2011	10-24-11		X	
Public Review Draft Released	July 2012				
2 nd Public Meeting	Aug 2012				
Public Hearing Draft Released	Oct 2012				
Planning & Zoning Commission Review	Oct 2012				
Anchorage Assembly Review	Nov 2012				
Comments: The project has completed 2 rounds of public comment, initial products include draft goals, policies, and implementation strategies. The initial public review draft will be available May 31 st at a public open house. Project is on time.					
South Addition Historic Inventory & Govt. Hill Oral History of Older Residents					
<i>South Addition Historic Inventory</i>					
Survey Methodology & List of Data Fields	Jul 2011	Aug 2011		X	
Reconnaissance Survey & Typology and Community meeting	Aug – Sep 2011	Sep 2011		X	
Draft Historical Context for South Addition	Oct 2011	Oct 2011		X	
Draft 1 Inventory Report	Oct 2011	Oct 2011		X	
Draft 2 Inventory Report	Nov 2011	Oct 2011		X	
Excel database created w all data fields and summary sheet for each property to be recorded	Nov 2011	Nov 2011		X	
Final Inventory Plan	Dec 2011	Not complete			
<i>Government Hill Oral History</i>					
Initial Scoping Project Mtg /interviews w identified stakeholders	Aug-Oct 2011	Aug – Oct 2011		X	
Draft Historical Context for Govt Hill Oral History	Oct 2011	Oct 2011		X	
Complete 30-40 Oral Interviews	Sep- Oct 2011	Nov 2011			10
Draft 1 of written report	Oct 2011	Oct 2011		X	
Draft 2 of written report	Nov 2011	Jan 2012			60
Comments: Context Statement drafted and submitted on time. Interviews with Government Hill residents and stakeholders completed, however, we found additional persons to interview and they have not been available to interview until after the holidays. Inventory completed and submitted to SHPO on time. Printing of final reports will transpire in March after SHPO has completed their review and comment. SHPO project manager is out on FMLA until March, 2012. A contract extension has been completed with the Contractor for three additional months to cover these additional interviews and coordination with SHPO manager.					
Title 21 Rewrite Project					
Chugiak-Eagle River Chapter – public release	6-16-11	6-16-11		X	
Implementation Strategy – public information	7-31-11	TBD			
Economic Impact Analysis – draft update release	9-23-11	TBD			
Staff report for Chugiak-Eagle River released	9-30-11	TBD			

Task	Target Date	Actual Date	Days Early	On-Time	Days Late
Title 21 Clean-up Amendments – released for public hearing date (PZC and/or Assembly)	10-31-11	11-23-11; 12-31-11			30 to 60
Title 21 Users' Guide Completed	3-31-12	TBD			
Comments: Title 21 Rewrite was provisionally adopted by the Assembly in 2010. Staff was redirected from the above tasks from July through October, in order to support Administration's review of Coffey proposed changes. Department has been redirected away from Chugiak-Eagle River Chapter until completion of the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) review of the Mayor's proposed changes, which staff prepared and released by the end of 2011 for PZC review. Further completion of tasks depends on actions by PZC, Assembly, and Municipal Administration.					
<u>Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map</u>					
Research development needs & land capacity	12-30-11	TBD			
Prepare revised public draft land use map	3-31-12				
Public meeting(s) and stakeholder consultations	5-14-12				
Planning & Zoning Commission public hearing	5-14-12				
Introduction at Assembly	8-31-12				
Comments: Project schedule has been and is anticipated to continue to be affected by GIS resources available to complete development needs and land capacity analysis. Further completion of tasks depends on whether staff resources continue to be re-directed to Title 21 Rewrite Project.					
<u>Commercial Lands Study</u>					
1 st Project Advisory Committee Meeting	9-16-10	9-16-10		X	
2 nd Project Advisory Committee Meeting	12-16-10	12-16-10		X	
3 rd Project Advisory Committee Meeting	4-14-11	4-14-11		X	
4 th Project Advisory Committee Meeting	8-15-11	10-25-11			71
Technical Report Release	11-30-11	10-18-11	43	X	
Planning & Zoning Commission & Assembly Joint work session	11-30-11	12-14-11			14
Comments: The fourth project advisory committee meeting was postponed to October primarily due to staff commitments to other project deadlines. The technical report was available for review in October but the PZC work session was held in December since the Commission was fully booked with meetings in November. The contract with for the consultant is completed. Staff is completing final edits per comments received during the final work sessions for the study.					
<u>West Anchorage District Plan</u>					
1 st Public Meeting about Project	5-12-11	5-12-11		X	
Public Review Draft Released	1-25-11	3-25-11			58
Public Hearing Draft Released	6-28-11	7-11-11			13
Planning & Zoning Commission (PZC) Review	Aug 2011	7-25-11, 9-26-11 & 10-3-11		Yes for start, no for approval	74
Anchorage Assembly Review	Dec 2011	TBD			
Comments: Additional public hearing meetings were held by the PZC to hear additional public comment. The public hearing was continued to and closed after the 10-3-11 meeting. PZC approved WADP on November 14, 2011. The Plan is currently in PACE and is waiting for approval to move on to the Assembly for introduction and hearing.					

Task	Target Date	Actual Date	Days Early	On-Time	Days Late
Wetlands Management Plan Update					
Technical Review Draft Release (1)	Oct 2011	10-10-11		X	
Public Meeting (2)	Jul-Sep 2011				
Public Review Draft Released (3)	Jul 2011				
Public Hearing Draft Released	Aug 2011				
Planning & Zoning Commission Review (4)	Sep 2011				
Anchorage Assembly Review	Oct 2011				
Comments: (1) Preparation of a Technical Review Draft was added to allow for scientific review, as well as unanticipated work on Title 21 Rewrite issues and responses have pushed all remaining tasks and dates out. Comments from agencies on the Technical Review Draft were incorporated into a Public Hearing Draft, which will be released for review in April, with public comments due end of May, 2012. (2) Public meeting part is being handled via briefings to the Community Councils. Staff met with the Federation of Community Councils in Feb, 2012; and is fielding invites from other Community Councils to speak on the plan. Notices will be sent to private parcel owners with mapped wetlands encouraging comments during the Public Hearing Draft review period. (3) Public Review Draft will not be produced because Technical Review has taken its place. (4) PZC has asked that the public hearing for the AWMP be scheduled after Title 21 Rewrite has moved out of PZC sometime after June. PZC Public Hearing tentatively scheduled for August, 2012.					
Anchorage Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2011 Update					
Analysis and distribution of survey to agencies	5/30/11			X	
Agency review completed	4/30/11			X	
Analysis of survey results received	5/30/11			X	
Draft report completed	6/10/11	6/06/11	5		
Final report completed and sent to US Department of Commerce for 6/30/11 deadline	6/24/11	6/29/11		See note	5
Comments: This is an annual report. The final 2011 updated ACED report was submitted to federal government on 6/29/11. The report was on-time, as it was due 6/30/11 but was 5 days later than our initial goal date of 6/24/11.					
Anchorage Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2012 Update					
Analysis and distribution of survey to agencies	4/11/12				
Agency review completed	5/11/12				
Analysis of survey results	6/10/12				
Draft report completed	6/15/12				
Final report completed and sent to US Department of Commerce for 6/30/12 deadline	6/30/12				
Comments: Work has begun on the 2012 update with discussion between MOA staff and AEDC staff on coordinating the distribution of the survey to agencies.					

Measure #32: Percent of Long Range Planning comments submitted to Current Planning Section on or prior to comment due date for pending zoning and platting cases.

Percent of Long Range Planning Comments on Pending Zoning & Platting Cases
Submitted on or Prior to Due Date (new measure – reporting began April 2011)

2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date				75%	100%	83%	100%	100%	90%	55%	50%	100%
# of Cases Reviewed				8	3	12	6	8	10	10	14	12
# of Staff				3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date	100%	100%	100%									
# of Cases Reviewed	7	12	15									
# of Staff	3	4	5									

Measure #33: Percent of Long Range Planning comments submitted to Private Development Section on or prior to comment due date for pending subdivision agreements.

Percent of Long Range Planning Comments on Pending Subdivision Agreements
Submitted on or Prior to Due Date (new measure – reporting began April 2011)

2011	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date				0	0	100%	0	100%	100%	0	0	0
# of Cases Reviewed				0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
# of Staff				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2012	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
% of Comments Submitted by Due Date	0	0	0									
# of Cases Reviewed	0	0	0									
# of Staff	1	1	1									

**Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department**

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Facilitate land use development in accordance with Anchorage's zoning and subdivision regulations.

Direct Services

- Respond to public inquiries regarding land use development regulations and how regulations apply to given situations.
- Provide public processes for property owners to seek exceptions to (variances, grandfather rights, rezonings, etc.), or accommodation under (conditional uses, plat notes, etc.) Anchorage's zoning or platting regulations.

Accomplishment Goals

- Provide timely, clear, and accurate information about zoning and platting cases to the general public and to the citizens serving on Anchorage's four land use regulatory boards: Planning and Zoning Commission, Platting Board, Zoning Board of Examiners and Appeals, and Urban Design Commission.
- Examine and track the level of tax subsidy for the processing of zoning and platting cases.

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

Measure #34: Percent of board and commission members that ranks quality and timeliness of zoning and platting case information provided by Planning's staff as good or excellent.

Current Planning Section sent its first annual survey to board and commission members in March of 2011. There are four boards and commissions with a total of 36 seats.

A total of four surveys were returned. For timeliness of information provided, two indicated a rating of good and two as excellent. For clarity of information provided, three indicated a rating of good and one a rating of needs improvement. For accuracy of information, two ranked accuracy as excellent, one as good, and one as needing improvement.

Management contacted other members that did not complete a survey for feedback, and the general response was either that everything seemed fine or that members were too new to their positions to feel like they could accurately respond. There were several vacant positions at the time of the survey as well many relatively new board and commission members.

We also asked members for comments to identify areas and methods in which to improve our service delivery. Comments included the need for: consistent and accurate referral/analysis of all relevant plans per case, citation of all applicable non-Title 21 code

requirements to support technical agencies' responses; and clear responses to conflicting agencies' comments about an issue. Other comments were that staff knows and identifies municipal code and comprehensive plan requirements well but that analyses are open to interpretations and that it is the job of board and commission members to make final decisions.

Survey for 2012 has not been done yet.

Measure #35: Percent of zoning and platting cases this quarter processed free of staff errors (all case types—public hearing, non-public hearing, administrative, etc.)

Percent of Zoning & Platting Cases Processed Free of Staff Errors			
Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
98.1%	100%	100%	98.1%
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
100%			

Staff errors include items such as incorrect or missing information in a legal advertisement, not posting a legal notice on time, or other administrative issue that causes a hearing date or administrative case decision to be delayed.

Measure #36: Average number of days to process zoning and platting public hearing cases.

Average Number of Days to Process a Case*			
Q1 2010	Q2 2010	Q3 2010	Q4 2010
77	61	69	61
Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
55	48	51	54
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
53			

*Averages are based on case durations from application to hearing for all case types except cases to the Urban Design Commission are excluded since cases are heard twice (not once) by the UDC. Cases going to the Assembly for hearing are also excluded since calendaring for the Assembly's agendas is outside of the department's control. Also, cases with durations greater than a year are generally due to petitioner-requested extensions and are excluded as are a small number of cases that appear to have data entry errors.

Measure #37: Average cost, fee revenue, and tax subsidy per case processed.

Year	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Average direct cost per case	5,358	4,852	5,033	5,011	4,118	3,727
Average revenue per case	3,080	2,918	2,243	3,040	2,665	3,043
Tax subsidy	2,278	1,934	2,790	1,971	1,453	684

Annual figures are the most reliable ones. The following breaks down figures by quarter, but direct costs and revenues are cumulative (2nd quarter includes figures for 1st quarter.) Given that revenues and expenditures are not evenly spread over all days of the year, the annual summary figures are more informative than the quarterly figures.)

Cumulative Figures by Quarter for 2010				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Average direct cost per case	4,664	4,572	4,626	4,852
Average revenue per case	3,065	3,105	2,802	2,918
Tax subsidy	1,600	1,467	1,824	1,934

Cumulative Figures by Quarter for 2011				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Average direct cost per case	5,217	4,817	5,417	5,358
Average revenue per case	2,855	2,979	3,054	3,080
Tax subsidy	2,362	1,837	2,363	2,278

Cumulative Figures by Quarter for 2012				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Average direct cost per case	4,714			
Average revenue per case	2,543			
Tax subsidy	2,171			

Transportation Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Develop and implement a multi-modal transportation system.

Direct Services

- Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS) supervision and coordination to direct the use of transportation resources.
- Short and long range transportation plan development for the MOA to facilitate planned growth of transportation systems.
- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) annual funding coordination for the development of a transportation infrastructure.
- Preparation and review of design and land use plans relating to traffic issues.

Accomplishment Goals

- Comment on 80 percent of platting cases within 10 days of receipt
- Maximize the full amount of federal grant funding available in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for task completion

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals shall be measured by:

Measure #38: Percent of Transportation Planning Section's comments submitted to Current Planning Section on or prior to due date for pending platting and zoning cases.
--

Measure	Q4 2010	Q1 2011	Q2 2011	Q3 2011	Q4 2011
# of Cases Received	29	34	43	42	28
# Commented on within 10 days	9	16	30	12	3
% Commented on within 10 days	31%	47%	69%	29%	11%
% Commented on by Deadline	65%	80%	93%	45%	18%
Measure		Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
# of Cases Received		44			
# Commented on within 10 days		21			
% Commented on within 10 days		48%			
% Commented on by Deadline		60%			

Achievement of this goal was complicated in Q4 2011 by two factors. One employee was out on FMLA for much of the quarter, and one employee's work efforts were consumed to a large degree by the Title 21 update, preventing her from commenting on many cases.

Measure #39: Number of Days Elapsed Between Target and Actual Dates for Milestones in Completing the Anchorage Metropolitan Transportation 2035 Plan

Task	Target Date	Actual Date	Days Early	On-Time	Days Late
Public Review Draft Released	8/29/11	9/29/11			30
2 nd Public Meeting about Plan	8/22/11				
Public Hearing Draft Released	10/24/11	12/21/11			57
Planning & Zoning Commission Review	12/12/11	1/9/12			28
Anchorage Assembly Review	2/28/12	4/10/12			30
Review by Federal Highways Administration	4/24/12				
Comments: The release of the public review draft was delayed due to additional effort that was requested for the financial plan. The release of the public hearing draft was affected by that delay as well as the additional public review offered. Planning & Zoning Commission took four meetings to finalize their review of the MTP due to lack of a quorum. Ultimately, the Commission approved the MTP on 4/12/12 but their delay means that the Assembly reviewed is pushed back too.					

Administration Division Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Provide leadership and coordination for overall operation of the Community Development Department.

Direct Services

- Guide the Community Development Department, providing leadership, direction, and oversight for the department's staff and operations.
- Provide full array of administrative services such as: preparing and implementing budgets; tracking revenues; handling grant accounting; managing records and assets; preparing payroll; assisting managers with human resource needs and recruitments; paying invoices; ordering supplies and equipment repairs; preparing journal entries and other accounting records; tracking department's vehicles; coordinating software, hardware, and phone and computer moves; writing requests for proposal, contracts, and amendments; and handling special projects and management initiatives for the director.

Accomplishment Goals

- Provide more training for the department's managers about municipal policies and procedures.

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

Measure #40: Conduct training sessions for department's managers about municipal policies and procedures.

Starting in January of 2011, the division will start preparing and conducting training sessions for the department's managers to improve knowledge about municipal policies and procedures in various areas such as payroll, purchasing and contracting, and budgeting.

For the first quarter of 2011, the division held a training class with planning division managers about contracting (preparing requests for proposals, different types of contracts, monitoring and staying in regular communication with the contractor, etc.) The division also held a training class with development services division managers about leave policies covering a wide array of topics such as leave without pay, jury leave, funeral leave, administrative leave, leave donations, family medical leave, mandatory rest breaks, etc.

For the second quarter of 2011, the division worked with new managers to explain budgeting processes but has not yet held a formal budgeting class for all managers. Division will be fully staffed beginning in August and anticipates holding budgeting, refund, and purchasing classes in Q3.

For third quarter, division was not fully staffed as we had an employee out for three months on leave. We also worked to train a new accountant. As such, trainings on refunds and purchasing methods have been postponed. However, Admin. staff did conduct a training on

proper completion of timecards with Planning Division employees. Other staff worked with managers in the Development Services Division on proper completion of leave slips. Also updated department managers on budget and 2011 year-end projections.

For fourth quarter, conducted training for Development Services' supervisors on using the municipal Intranet effectively to find information.

For first quarter 2012, we did a more extensive review of IGCs and did spend time explaining IGCs to our department director and worked with OMB and other departments on IGC corrections. We also are working with Kronos, and a main role for the Admin. group is to redirect staff to the new forms and processes to be used for Kronos.

Trainings to be Conducted during Remainder of 2011
Q2 2011
Budgets: how to administer, monitor, and plan ahead
Q3 2011
Refunds: municipal requirements for documenting and issuing refunds
Purchasing: different methods/requirements – depending on what you need to acquire
Q4 2011
Using Municipal Intranet Effectively: how to find information/forms

Trainings to be Conducted during 2012
Q1 2012
IGCs: Explain what they are and how they work to department management
Kronos: Anticipate helping supervisors & employees with learning how to use Kronos
Q2 2012
SAP: Anticipate helping supervisors & employees with navigating/learning new SAP
Budget: Explain 2013 budget issues & provide info for decision-making to management
Q3 2012
Continue SAP training into Q3
Q4 2012
Refunds: Reschedule training on refunds for this quarter.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Community Development Department

Measure #1: Community sentiment about land use planning progress

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Assess community sentiment about municipal progress in using land use planning to: strengthen the area's economy, businesses, downtown core, and neighborhoods; augment Anchorage's standing as a premier winter city; and improve recreational opportunities.

Definition

Municipal charter and state law require the Municipality of Anchorage to do comprehensive land use planning. Land use planning is a tool that helps communities to achieve community goals. For example, a few examples of comprehensive planning goals for Anchorage are affordable, quality housing, a transportation system that moves people and goods safely and efficiently, and a network of open spaces throughout the community. This performance measure involves surveying community councils to see if they feel that Anchorage is making progress towards achieving its land use goals.

Data Collection Method

The Community Development Department will distribute surveys to Anchorage's 38 community councils.

Frequency

Community Development Department will distribute the surveys annually, at the beginning of February and ask each council to return its survey by the end of March.

Measured By

Department's administrative staff will collect the completed surveys, analyze, and tabulate the results.

Reporting

Community Development will present and release survey results by May 1st of each year and post results on the department's website.

Used By

The Community Development Director and the Municipal Manager will use survey results to assess community sentiment as to whether the Municipality is using land use planning tools effectively (*zoning, platting, land use code, comprehensive plans, etc.*) to achieve the community's land use goals.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Community Development Department

Measure #2: Percent complete – Users' Guide for New Title 21 Land Use Code

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Improve citizens' and businesses' understanding about the Municipality of Anchorage's new (rewritten) Title 21 Land Use Code and about how the new code differs from the old one.

Definition

The Anchorage Assembly is expected to adopt the rewritten land use code during 2011. The Community Development Department will need to inform citizens, businesses, and other municipal departments about how to use the new code. Critical to that effort will be the development of a users' guidebook for the new code. Development of the guide is a key project for the department in 2011/2012, and this measure will track completion of the guide with 0% as the beginning and 100% as full completion.

Data Collection Method

The Long Range Planning Division has identified a list of topics to be covered in the new guidebook. The supervisor for Long Range Planning will track staff's progress drafting chapters and illustrations for the new guidebook to cover and address all identified topics.

Frequency

Long Range Planning Section Manager will assess the completion level of the new guidebook at the end of each month.

Measured By

Long Range Planning Section Manager will track topics to be included in an Excel spreadsheet and note the date that work on each topic is completed.

Reporting

Long Range Planning Section Manager will send the department's administrative staff the completion percentage for the users' guide at the end of each month for inclusion in the department's regular performance measure reports.

Used By

The department director will use the information to monitor progress on the new users' guide and will also report the information to the Municipal Manager.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Community Development Department

Measure #3: Percent of customers completing service surveys that rank accuracy and clarity of information provided by the department's staff as good or excellent.

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Strive to provide timely and accurate information and services for the department's customers.

Definition

Community Development works with customers at a number of public counters (planning, building permits, right-of-way permits, on-site water and wastewater, and zoning plan review.) This performance measure will require staff at the cashiering station to provide a customer service survey to every tenth customer (to make the sample more random and less self-selected.)

Data Collection Method

There will be a locked box for customers to place completed surveys. The department's administrative staff will collect and compile the survey results.

Frequency

Monthly

Measured By

Department's administrative staff will collect the completed surveys, analyze, and tabulate the results.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate survey results into its regular performance measures reports.

Used By

The Community Development Director and Municipal Manager will use survey results to assess customer service satisfaction and to work with staff on any changes that may be needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #4: Average number of minutes for first customer contact. (<i>Permitting Management Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Continue to provide excellent customer service by providing prompt and efficient permit processing, timely plan reviews, and same-day as requested construction inspections.

Definition

Measures the efficiency of the permit management process by focusing on prompt, efficient customer service.

Data Collection Method

Data is collected by logging in the time each customer enters the processing area and stopping it with the first customer contact by a permit technician.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The permit technicians will maintain a continuous log of customers served using the measurement criteria. They will compile customer service information at the end of each day and week and store the data in an Excel spreadsheet. The permit management supervisor will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The permit management supervisor will create and maintain a weekly and monthly report in Excel from the data received from the permit technicians. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The permit management supervisor and engineering services manager will use the information to gain a clear understanding if customer service standards are effective. The report will be presented to the deputy director and director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #5: Percent of first-time residential plan reviews completed within four business days. (<i>Plan Review Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Continue to provide excellent customer service by providing prompt and efficient permit processing, timely plan reviews, and same-day as requested construction inspections.

Definition

Measures the efficiency of the permit management process by focusing on fluctuations in the time of completing initial residential plan review.

Data Collection Method

Data is collected automatically by the permit processing software by logging in the time each construction plan is routed for review and stopping it when the review is completed.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The permit technicians and plan reviewers will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to maintain and compile data of when the plans were routed and reviewed using measurement criteria. The engineering services manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The engineering services manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The permit management supervisor and engineering services manager will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director and director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #6: Percent of Plan Review Unit's comments submitted to Current Planning Section on or prior to comment due date for pending platting and zoning cases. (*Plan Review Unit*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Ensure that Current Planning Section receives timely case comments so that zoning and platting case reports are prepared on-time.

Definition

This measure tracks the percent of review comments for pending zoning and platting cases that are prepared by Plan Review Unit on or prior to the comment due deadline set by the Current Planning Section.

Data Collection Method

The Plan Review Engineering Manager will keep a log of cases received for comment in an Excel spreadsheet, logging date received, comment due date, and date that comments are submitted to Current Planning Section.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Plan Review Engineering Manager

Reporting

The Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Plan Review Engineering Manager, Community Development Director, and Current Planning Section Manager will monitor this performance measure to assess how timely case comments are being provided to planners working on zoning and platting case reports.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #7: Percent of construction inspections completed same day as requested. (<i>Building Inspection Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Continue to provide excellent customer service by providing prompt and efficient permit processing, timely plan reviews, and same-day as requested construction inspections.

Definition

Measures the efficiency of service delivery of inspections by analyzing the ratio of inspections performed the same day as requested.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing number of inspections performed the same day as requested by the number of requested inspections and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Initial data is collected automatically by proprietary software and downloaded via a paper system into an inspection report. Each inspector manually enters the inspection request prior to leaving for the day's work and then enters the inspection results upon return. The data will be evaluated by comparing the number of inspections performed by the number of inspections requested for that time period, expressed in a percentile. *Note: Upon implementation of Hansen software in fall 2010 this will be an automated, "real time," process saving thousands of dollars via employee time saved.

Reporting

The chief of inspections will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The chief of inspections and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #8: Percent of Life Safety Building Code Complaints Investigated within One Business Day and Percent of All Code Abatement Service Requests Initially Investigated Same Week as Received. (<i>Code Abatement Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Protect the public by enforcing the building code by investigating code abatement service requests about structures that are unsafe or otherwise non-compliant with the building code and construction occurring without proper permits.

Definition

Tracks the number of code abatement service requests received each quarter.

Data Collection Method

Each code abatement service request is entered into the Hansen code compliance module and resolution of each request is recorded.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously.

Measured By

Running a report in the Hansen database to calculate the number of code abatement requests processed each quarter.

Reporting

The Chief of Inspections will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly.

Used By

The Chief of Inspections and Deputy Director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Private Development Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #9: Percent of draft agreements initiated within 10 business days of receiving applications, requisite supporting documents, and deposits. (*Private Development Section*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Manage the private development process effectively and efficiently.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the private development process by focusing on fluctuations in the time to receive all required information, supporting documentation, and deposits to draft a development agreement.

Data Collection Method

Data is collected manually and entered into an Excel spreadsheet by logging in the date a complete agreement and application deposit and the time by which a draft agreement is initiated.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The reviewers will enter accurate data into the Excel spreadsheet and will maintain and compile data of when each agreement (to include requisite supporting documents and deposits) are received. The private development manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The private development manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The private development manager and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director and director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Private Development Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #10: Percent of follow-up letters issued within ten (10) business days of project milestone events to include: signed subdivision agreements; design plan approvals; notices to proceed to construction; pre-final, final, and warranty inspections; and notices of completion or rescission. (*Private Development Section*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Manage the private development process effectively and efficiently.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the private development process by providing event and inspection results to developers operating under private development agreements.

Data Collection Method

Data is collected manually and entered into an Excel spreadsheet by logging in the date of each event or inspection and the date that results are conveyed to the developer.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Private development staff will enter accurate data into the Excel spreadsheet and will maintain and compile data of when events and inspections are conducted and results forwarded using the measurement criteria. The private development manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The private development manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The private development manager and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director and director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Private Development Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #11: Percent of Private Development Section's comments submitted to Current Planning Section on or prior to comment due date for pending zoning and platting cases. (<i>Private Development Section</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Ensure that Current Planning Section receives timely case comments so that zoning and platting case reports are prepared on-time.

Definition

This measure tracks the percent of review comments for pending zoning and platting cases that are prepared by the Private Development Section on or prior to the comment due deadline set by the Current Planning Section.

Data Collection Method

The Private Development Manager keeps a log of cases received for comment in an Excel spreadsheet, logging date received, comment due date, and date that comments are submitted to Current Planning Section.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Private Development Manager

Reporting

The Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Private Development Manager, Community Development Director, and Current Planning Manager will monitor this performance measure to assess how timely case comments are being provided to planners working on zoning and platting case reports.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Private Development Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #12: Percent of review responses provided to a development team within 15 business days of a developer's submittal. (<i>Private Development Section</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Manage the private development process effectively and efficiently.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the private development process by focusing on fluctuations in the time plan submittal comments are reviewed and compiled.

Data Collection Method

Data is collected manually and entered into an Excel spreadsheet by logging in the date a complete plan set and a deposit are received and the time review responses for the submittal are sent to a development team.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Private development staff will enter accurate data into the Excel spreadsheet and will maintain and compile data of when submittals (plans and deposits were routed) and when submittal comments are sent to a development team using the measurement criteria. The private development manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The private development manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The private development manager and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director and director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #13: Percent of Certificate of On-Site Approval applications reviewed within 3 business days. (<i>On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide on-site water and wastewater permitting, certification, training, and enforcement consistent with goals of protecting public health and environmental quality.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the on-site process by focusing on fluctuations in the time of completing certificate of on-site approval (COSA) reviews.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of COSA applications received within a designated time frame and completed within 3 business days, by the number of applications received within the same designated time frame, and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The plan reviewers will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to and will maintain and compile data of when the plans were routed and reviewed using the measurement criteria. The engineering services manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The engineering services manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The engineering services manager and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #14: Percent of bottom-of-hole construction inspections performed prior to system installations. (<i>On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide on-site water and wastewater permitting, certification, training, and enforcement consistent with goals of protecting public health and environmental quality.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the on-site process by focusing on fluctuations in the frequency of inspecting bottom-of-the-hole (excavations) prior to septic system installation.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of bottom-of-hole inspections completed prior to system installation divided by the total number of bottom-of-hole inspection requested received, and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

On-site staff will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to and will maintain and compile data of bottom-of-hole inspections that were completed prior to system installation. The engineering services manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The engineering services manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The engineering services manager and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #15: Percent of on-site inspection report reviews completed within 3 business days. (<i>On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide on-site water and wastewater permitting, certification, training, and enforcement consistent with goals of protecting public health and environmental quality.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the on-site process by focusing on fluctuations in the time of completing inspection report reviews.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of inspection reports received and completed within a designated time frame by the number of requests received within the same designated time frame, and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The reviewer will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to and will maintain and compile data of when the inspection was requested and the initial inspection performed. The engineering services manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The engineering services manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The engineering services manager and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #16: Percent of On-Site Permit Application Reviews Completed within 3 Business Days (<i>On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide on-site water and wastewater permitting, certification, training, and enforcement consistent with goals of protecting public health and environmental quality.

Definition

Measures efficiency of the on-site process by tracking the number of permit application reviews within three business days.

Data Collection Method

The calculation by comparing dates for receipt of new applications to dates when permit reviews were completed.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously and updated quarterly.

Measured By

The reviewer will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to and will maintain and compile data of when permit application was received and when the review was completed.

Reporting

Community Development will include results in its regular performance measure reports.

Used By

The Engineering Services Manager and Deputy Director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the Director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #17: Percent of permitted construction inspections completed the same day requested to ensure installation compliance with MOA standards and specifications. (*Right-of-Way Unit*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Protect traveling public and municipal rights-of-way as Anchorage's largest single asset valued at more than \$10 billion.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the Right-of-Way Unit by focusing on fluctuations in the frequency of performing construction inspection in the rights-of-way.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing number of inspection requests received and completed within a designated time frame by the number of requests received within the same designated time frame, and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The right-of-way inspector will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to and will maintain and compile data of when the inspection was requested and the initial inspection performed. The lead right of way enforcement officer will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The lead right-of-way enforcement officer will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically.

Used By

The lead right-of-way enforcement officer and chief of code enforcement will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #18: Percent of all complaints of illegal uses within the rights-of-way inspected within one working day of receipt. (<i>Right-of-Way Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Protect traveling public and municipal rights-of-way as Anchorage's largest single asset valued at more than \$10 billion.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery of inspections by analyzing the ratio of inspections performed compared to the established time lines based on life/safety or impact on the community.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of code enforcement inspections performed within the established timelines by the number of required code enforcement inspections and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Data is collected automatically by Hansen software and can be extracted by Crystal Report.

Reporting

The lead right-of-way enforcement officer will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically.

Used By

The lead right-of-way enforcement officer and chief of code enforcement will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #19: Percent of Right-of-Way Unit's comments submitted to Private Development Section on or prior to comment due date for pending subdivision agreements. (<i>Right-of-Way Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Ensure that Private Development Section receives timely comments on draft subdivision agreements so that execution of new agreements is not unduly delayed.

Definition

This measure tracks the percent of review comments for pending draft subdivision agreements that are submitted on or prior to the comment due deadline set by the Private Development Section.

Data Collection Method

The Lead Right-of-Way Enforcement Officer will keep a log of draft subdivision agreements received for comment in an Excel spreadsheet, logging date received, comment due date, and date that comments are submitted to Private Development Section.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Lead Right-of-Way Enforcement Officer

Reporting

The Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Lead Right-of-Way Enforcement Officer, Chief of Code Enforcement, Community Development Director, and Private Development Section Manager will monitor this performance measure to assess how timely review comments are being provided to engineers working on draft subdivision agreements.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #20: Percent of code enforcement complaints that are inspected within one working day of receipt. (<i>Land Use Enforcement Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Respond to land use code complaints within established timeframes.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness of service delivery of inspections by analyzing the ratio of inspections performed compared to the established timelines based on life/safety or impact on the community.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of code enforcement inspections performed within the established timelines by the number of required code inspections and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Data is collected automatically by Hansen software and can be extracted using Crystal Reports.

Reporting

The lead land use enforcement officer will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically.

Used By

The lead land use enforcement officer and chief of code enforcement will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #21: Percent of final zoning inspections completed same day as requested. (<i>Land Use Enforcement Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Perform final zoning inspections of completed construction projects.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness of service delivery of inspections by analyzing the ratio of inspections performed compared to the established timelines based on life/safety or impact on the community.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of final zoning inspections performed the same day as requested by the number of requested inspections and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Initial data is collected automatically by proprietary software and downloaded via a paper system into an inspection report. Each inspector manually enters the inspection request prior to leaving for day's work and enters inspection results upon return. The data will be evaluated by comparing number of inspections performed by number of inspections requested for that time period, expressed as a percentile.

Reporting

The lead land use enforcement officer will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically.

Used By

The lead land use enforcement officer and chief of code enforcement will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #22: Average number of days to complete initial reviews of land use determinations. (<i>Land Use Review and Addressing Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- Land use reviews/determinations;
- Administrative land use permits;
- Business facility reviews and inspections;
- Assignment of new addresses; and
- Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses.

Definition

This measure calculates the average number of calendar days elapsing between receipt and completion of land use determination requests. A property owner, realtor, or financier, etc., may request a land use determination for a particular property parcel. Land use review staff will identify the zoning, allowable land uses, parking and landscaping requirements for the property and provide a written determination as to whether the property is in compliance with municipal land use regulations.

Data Collection Method

Each determination will be logged when received and logged out upon completion in an Excel spreadsheet. The log will provide data needed to compute average number of days to complete land use determinations.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The land use review manager will calculate and display results quarterly.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The land use review manager, director, and municipal administration will use results to monitor average wait times, to allocate staff resources appropriately, and to identify problems with processes, research methods, or staff training needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #23: Average number of days to complete initial reviews of administrative land use permits (<i>Land Use Review & Addressing Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- Land use reviews/determinations;
- Administrative land use permits;
- Business facility reviews and inspections;
- Assignment of new addresses; and
- Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses.

Definition

This measure tracks the number of calendar days elapsing between receipt of administrative land use permit applications and initial review of permits. Land Use Review processes administrative land use permits for bed & breakfasts, rooming houses, commercial kennels, antenna tower sites, adult entertainment facilities, and premises where minors are not allowed.

Data Collection Method

Each permit application will be logged upon receipt and again upon completion of initial review in an Excel spreadsheet. The log will provide data needed to computer average number of days to complete permits.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The land use review manager will calculate and display results quarterly.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The land use review manager, director, and municipal administration will use results to monitor average wait times, to allocate staff resources appropriately, and to identify problems with processes, research methods, or staff training needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Enforcement & Permitting Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #24: Average number of days between request and completion of initial field inspections for kennel, child care, and liquor license reviews. (*Land Use Review & Addressing Unit*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- Land use reviews/determinations;
- Administrative land use permits;
- Business facility reviews and inspections;
- Assignment of new addresses; and
- Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses.

Definition

This measure calculates average number of calendar days elapsing between receipt of requests for inspection and initial field inspection. When licenses for kennels, child care facilities, and businesses selling liquor, wine and/or beer are newly requested or due for renewal, Health & Human Services (for kennels and child care) and Municipal Clerk's Office (for liquor/wine/beer establishments) request that land use staff make site visits to ensure license applicants are complying with land use regulations.

Data Collection Method

Each facility license review request will be logged when received and upon completion in an Excel spreadsheet. The log will provide data needed to compute average number of days to complete permits.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The land use review manager will calculate and display results quarterly.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The land use review manager, director, and municipal administration will use results to monitor average wait times, to allocate staff resources appropriately, and to identify problems with processes, research methods, or staff training needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Enforcement & Permitting Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #25: Percent of new construction addresses assigned within 3 business days of application. (<i>Land Use Review & Addressing Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- Land use reviews/determinations;
- Administrative land use permits;
- Business facility reviews and inspections;
- Assignment of new addresses; and
- Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses.

Definition

This measure tracks the number of business days elapsing between receipt of a building permit application that will need to have an address assigned and actual assignment.

Data Collection Method

The Building Safety Permit Automation System records the permit application date and the date when an address assignment is completed. The municipal addressor will extract data to compute the average number of business days needed to issue a new address.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The municipal addressor will calculate and display results quarterly.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The land use review manager, municipal addressor, director, and municipal administration will use results to monitor average wait times, to allocate staff resources appropriately, and to identify problems with processes, research methods, or staff training needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #26: Percent of address and street GIS layer updates completed weekly or within one business day if requested by police or fire departments. (*Land Use Review & Addressing Unit*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- Land use reviews/determinations;
- Administrative land use permits;
- Business facility reviews and inspections;
- Assignment of new addresses; and
- Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses.

Definition

This measure tabulates the number of times that corrections or other updates to address and street GIS layers for the Municipality of Anchorage were not processed within seven calendar days or within one business day if requested by police or fire departments.

Data Collection Method

Staff will keep an Excel spreadsheet logging all requests for address or street layer GIS corrections or updates and will use Excel functions to identify any requests that were not completed within seven calendar days. Similarly, staff will keep an Excel spreadsheet logging all requests from police or fire departments for address corrections or other changes and will use Excel functions to identify any requests not completed within one business day.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The municipal addressor will calculate and display results quarterly.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The land use review manager, municipal addressor, director, and municipal administration will use results to monitor average update times, to allocate staff resources appropriately, and to identify problems with processes or staff training needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #27: Number of duplicate or otherwise problematic street name cases prepared for consideration and action by Mayor and Assembly. (*Land Use Review & Addressing Unit*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Continue to make progress in eliminating duplicate street names to ensure the uniqueness of each address, thereby improving E911 response times.

Definition

This measure tracks the number of duplicate or otherwise problematic street cases that are prepared by Addressing staff for consideration and action by the Mayor and Assembly. (Street name changes have to be approved by the Mayor and Assembly.)

Data Collection Method

Police and Fire Departments maintain a prioritized list of duplicate or otherwise problematic street names. Addressing staff will track the number of street names from that list that are processed and prepared for consideration and action by the Mayor and Assembly each quarter. (Many steps are involved in resolving problem street names: residents need to be notified and surveyed for suggestions; coordination needs to occur with the postal system, etc.)

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The municipal addressor will report the number of cases prepared quarterly.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The land use review manager, municipal addressor, police & fire departments, director, and municipal administration will use results to track progress in resolving duplicate or otherwise problematic street names.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #28: Percent of Land Use Review comments submitted to Current Planning Section on or prior to comment due date for pending zoning and platting cases. (*Land Use Review & Addressing Unit*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- Agency review comments for platting and zoning cases;
- Agency review comments for administrative site plan reviews;
- Business facility reviews and inspections;
- Assignment of new addresses; and
- Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses.

Definition

This measure calculates the percent of agency review comments that are submitted to the Current Planning Section prior to comment due date to ensure timely responses for case preparation.

Data Collection Method

Staff will keep a log of cases received for comments in an Excel spreadsheet. The cases will be logged in per date received, comment due date, and date comments were completed and submitted to the planning division.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Land Use Review Manager will calculate and display results quarterly.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Land Use Review Manager, Community Development Director, and municipal administration will use results to monitor average wait times, to allocate staff resources appropriately, and to identify problems with processes, research methods, or staff training needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #29: Percent of Land Use Review & Addressing Unit's comments submitted to Private Development Section on or prior to comment due date for pending subdivision agreements. (*Land Use Review & Addressing Unit*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Ensure that Private Development Section receives timely comments on draft subdivision agreements so that execution of new agreements is not unduly delayed.

Definition

This measure tracks the percent of review comments for pending draft subdivision agreements that are submitted on or prior to the comment due deadline set by the Private Development Section.

Data Collection Method

The Land Use Review Manager will keep a log of draft subdivision agreements received for comment in an Excel spreadsheet, logging date received, comment due date, and date that comments are submitted to Private Development Section.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Land Use Review Manager

Reporting

The Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Land Use Review Manager, Chief of Code Enforcement, Community Development Director, and Private Development Section Manager will monitor this performance measure to assess how timely review comments are being provided to engineers working on draft subdivision agreements.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Long-Range Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #30: Percent complete of an inventory of implementation actions and an implementation tracking system for adopted plans.

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Create a tracking system to monitor improvement in the implementation of existing plans.

Definition

This measure tracks progress in creating a better tracking system for essential implementation actions identified in adopted community plans. Implementation actions are necessary to fulfill plan recommendations and are the responsibility of multiple departments and stakeholders. The measure involves creating an inventory of implementation actions for existing plans and developing an implementation tracking system in 2010; in 2011 implementation actions will be tracked for each recent major plan that has been adopted.

Data Collection Method

The Long Range Planning Section Manager will work with administrative staff to create an implementation tracking system. The Long Range Planning Manager will begin using the system in 2011 to track implementation actions in each major plan, according to the plan timelines identified for the implementation actions for each major plan that has been adopted by the Assembly.

Frequency

Long Range Planning Section Manager will use the tracking system to tabulate how well implementation actions are staying in alignment with plan timelines annually. In addition to providing a statistical summary, manager will also provide an updated narrative commenting on changes in the last year.

Measured By

The Long Range Planning Section Manager

Reporting

Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports and post results on the department's website.

Used By

The Long Range Planning Section Manager, Community Development Director, directors of other departments, and municipal administration will use reported information to gauge how well the Municipality implements its adopted plans. This information will be shared with the public via the department's website. The

information will also be helpful in setting priorities for annual work programs of multiple departments to achieve adopted plans' land use goals and to tailor goals/implementation schedules for future plans to more realistically match available resources.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Long-Range Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #31: Implement Project Management System to Improve Completion of Plans and Studies On-Schedule
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Implement project management tracking system to improve the completion of plans and studies within expected timeframes.

Definition

Long Range Planning staff work on several land use plans and special studies and will identify milestone tasks for each plan or study underway and target completion dates for each. Staff will then track whether targeted dates are met early, on-time, or late and provide explanatory comments if a project schedule is adjusted.

Data Collection Method

Long Range Planning Manager will track target and actual completion dates for the various milestone tasks for new plans and studies in progress.

Frequency

Long Range Planning Manager will update information monthly.

Measured By

Long Range Planning Manager

Reporting

Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Long Range Planning Manager, Community Development Director and the Municipal Manager will use the information to monitor and improve the completion of plans and studies on schedule.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Long-Range Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #32: Percent of long-range planning section comments submitted to current planning section on or prior to comment due date for pending platting and zoning cases.
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Ensure that Current Planning Section receives timely case comments so that zoning and platting case reports are prepared on-time.

Definition

This measure tracks the percent of review comments for pending zoning and platting cases that are prepared by Long-Range Planning Section on or prior to the comment due deadline set by the Current Planning Section.

Data Collection Method

The Long Range Planning Section Manager will keep a log of cases received for comments in an Excel spreadsheet, logging date received, comment due date, and date that comments are submitted to Current Planning Section.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Long Range Planning Section Manager

Reporting

Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Long Range Planning Section Manager, Community Development Director, and Current Planning Section Manager will monitor this performance measure to assess how timely case comments are being provided to planners working on zoning and platting case reports.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #33: Percent of Long Range Planning Section's comments submitted to Private Development Section on or prior to comment due date for pending subdivision agreements. (*Long Range Planning Section*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Ensure that Private Development Section receives timely comments on draft subdivision agreements so that execution of new agreements is not unduly delayed.

Definition

This measure tracks the percent of review comments for pending draft subdivision agreements that are submitted on or prior to the comment due deadline set by the Private Development Section.

Data Collection Method

The Long Range Planning Manager will keep a log of draft subdivision agreements received for comment in an Excel spreadsheet, logging date received, comment due date, and date that comments are submitted to Private Development Section.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Long Range Planning Manager

Reporting

The Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Long Range Planning Manager, Community Development Director, and Private Development Section Manager will monitor this performance measure to assess how timely review comments are being provided to engineers working on draft subdivision agreements.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #34: Percent of Board and Commission members ranking quality/timeliness of zoning and platting case information provided by Current Planning's staff as good or excellent

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely, clear, and accurate information about zoning and platting cases to the general public and to the citizens serving on Anchorage's four land use regulatory boards: Planning and Zoning Commission; Platting Board; Zoning Board of Examiners and Appeals; and Urban Design Commission.

Definition

This measure assesses whether members of the Current Planning Section's four regulatory boards and commissions find staff reports about zoning and platting cases to be clearly written, accurate, informative, and timely. Staff reports provide information about facts of a given case and explain how municipal land use codes may apply.

Data Collection Method

Annual surveys will be distributed to members of the Planning & Zoning Commission, Platting Board, Urban Design Commission, and Zoning Board of Examiners and Appeals. Surveys will ask members to rate how well the staff reports serve to inform and prepare them for their decision making roles in the cases being heard.

Frequency

The surveys will be provided to and collected from each board member at the end of each calendar year.

Measured By

The Current Planning Section Manager will distribute and collect the surveys and then will compile and summarize results using graphs and narrative.

Reporting

The department's administrative staff will incorporate the results information into the department's performance measure reports.

Used By

The Community Development Director and municipal administration will use results to monitor whether staff is keeping board members accurately informed, explaining complex materials in understandable ways, and will use members' feedback to improve training of staff.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #35: Percent of zoning and platting cases processed free of staff errors (all case types: public hearing; non-public hearing; administrative; etc.)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely, clear, and accurate information about zoning and platting cases to the general public and to the citizens serving on Anchorage's four land use regulatory boards: Planning and Zoning Commission; Platting Board; Zoning Board of Examiners and Appeals; and Urban Design Commission.

Definition

This measures tracks whether a zoning or platting case has to be postponed or rejected because of error by Current Planning's staff. Often postponement or rejection occurs because of an applicant's error or desire to postpone. Sometimes, however, staff mistakenly accepts an incomplete application, failing to catch and inform the applicant about a missing piece of required information.

Data Collection Method

The data will be collected by adding a field in the zoning and platting case management system (CityView) to track the reason for postponement or rejection of an initially accepted application

Frequency

The number of postponements and rejections occurring due to staff error will be calculated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Current Planning Section Manager will extract the data from the zoning and platting case management system (CityView), compile and display results using graphs and narrative.

Reporting

Community Development Department will incorporate results for this performance measure into its quarterly performance measure reports.

Used By

The Community Development Director and municipal administration will use results to monitor the quality and accuracy of staff's initial review of applications at time of intake and will use results to provide staff training as needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #36: Average number of days to process zoning and platting public hearing cases
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely, clear, and accurate information about zoning and platting cases to the general public and to the citizens serving on Anchorage's four land use regulatory boards: Planning and Zoning Commission; Platting Board; Zoning Board of Examiners and Appeals; and Urban Design Commission.

Definition

This measure tracks business days elapsing between the date of acceptance for a zoning or platting application and its public hearing date.

Data Collection Method

Calendaring functions in the zoning and platting case management system (CityView) will provide the data to calculate the average number of business days.

Frequency

This performance measure will be updated each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Current Planning Section Manager will extract the needed data, perform calculations and display results using graphs and narrative.

Reporting

Community Development Department will incorporate results for this performance measure into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Community Development Director and municipal administration will use the results to monitor whether public hearing land use application levels (wait times until public hearing) are holding steady, increasing or decreasing and keep policy makers informed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #37: Average cost, fee revenue, and tax subsidy per case processed

Type

Efficiency

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Examine and track the level of tax subsidy for the processing of zoning and platting cases.

Definition

The Current Planning Section processes zoning and platting cases. Dividing total direct costs for the section by the number of cases yields average cost per case. Dividing total revenues for the section by the number of cases yields average revenue per case. The average tax subsidy per case processed equals the difference of average cost minus average revenue divided by the number of cases. Fees paid by zoning and platting applicants do not fully cover the direct operating costs of this division; this performance measure tracks the level of tax subsidy provided.

Data Collection Method

Data extracted from the Municipality's financial management system and zoning and platting case management system will be used to calculate costs, revenues, number of cases, and average cost, revenue, and tax subsidy per case processed.

Frequency

Average cost, revenue, and subsidy per case processed will be calculated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

Department's administrative staff will work with the Current Planning Section Manager to extract needed data, perform calculations, and display results using graphs and narrative.

Reporting

Community Development Department will incorporate results for this performance measure into its quarterly performance measure reports.

Used By

The Community Development Director and municipal administration will use the results to monitor whether tax subsidy levels are holding steady, increasing or decreasing and keep policy makers informed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Transportation Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #38: Percent of Transportation Planning Section's comments submitted to Current Planning Section on or prior to due date for pending platting and zoning cases.

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Ensure that Current Planning Section receives timely case comments so that zoning and platting cases are prepared on-time.

Definition

This measure tracks the percent of review comments for pending zoning and platting cases that are prepared by Plan Review Unit on or prior to the comment due deadline set by the Current Planning Section.

Data Collection Method

The Transportation Planning Manager keeps a log of cases received for comment in an Excel spreadsheet, logging date received, comment due date, and date that comments are submitted to Current Planning Section.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The Transportation Planning Manager

Reporting

The Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Transportation Planning Manager, Community Development Director, and Current Planning Manager will monitor this performance measure to assess how timely case comments are being provided to planners working on zoning and platting case reports.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Transportation Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #39: Number of days elapsed between target and actual dates for milestones in completing the Anchorage Metropolitan Transportation 2035 Plan.
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Implement project management tracking system to help keep development of the Anchorage Metropolitan Transportation 2035 Plan on track with target deadlines.

Definition

One of the primary tasks of the Transportation Planning Section is to work with the Anchorage Transportation Metropolitan Solutions Committee to update the long range transportation plan for the area. Work on the 2035 plan is underway, and this performance measure identifies original targeted dates for completing milestone tasks and compares to actual completion dates to identify if targeted dates are met early, on-time, or late. If target dates change substantially, staff will add comments to explain why.

Data Collection Method

Transportation Planning Manager will identify target milestone dates and record actual dates for each.

Frequency

Transportation Planning Manager will update information monthly.

Measured By

Transportation Planning Manager

Reporting

Community Development Department will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Transportation Planning Manager, Community Development Director and the Municipal Manager will use the information to monitor if development of the AMATS 2035 Plan is proceeding according to schedule and to identify the reasons for any changes to the original schedule.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Administration Division
Community Development Department

Measure #40: Conduct training sessions for department's managers about municipal policies and procedures.
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide more training for department's managers about municipal policies and procedures.

Definition

The Administrative Division plays a key role in helping managers in the department to improve their knowledge about municipal policies and procedures in various areas such as payroll, purchasing and contracting, and budgeting. This performance measure tracks the number of formal training sessions that are provided each year.

Data Collection Method

Administrative staff will schedule, prepare and track the training sessions that are held each year.

Frequency

Administrative staff will strive to hold at least four formal training sessions each year on different topics.

Measured By

Administrative staff

Reporting

Community Development Department will report on training sessions held in its performance measure reports.

Used By

The Community Development Director will use feedback from staff to plan and tailor future training sessions to meet managers' needs.