Purchasing Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

<u>Measure #1:</u> Cost to provide efficient purchasing services as a percent of total MOA purchases and compare to national benchmarks.

2011	2012	12/31/13	1Q 2014
.5%	.4%	.2%	.13%

Benchmark below 1%

Measure #2: Number of formal protests sent to Bidding Review Board (BRB)

2011	2012	12/31/13	1Q 2014
1	0	1	1

Goal: 0

2011 (Bidding review upheld MOA decision, ERP)

2013 (Contractor withdrew appeal subsequent to Bidding Review Board decision, BRB upheld MOA decision)

2014 (Referred to Bidding Review Board by the Assembly)

Measure #3: Expenditures in the local area

2011	2012	12/31/13	1Q 2014
79%	74%	44%	20%

2012 (decrease due to large GE Turbine purchase for ML&P)

2013 (decrease due to \$200M contract to Quanta Power Systems and \$44M change order to GE systems, without these actions, it was 76%)

2014 (numbers are skewed due to \$228M change order roll over activity with Quanta, GE Systems, and Alstrom Grid Contracts of moving 2013 funding to 2014 funding, w/o this action it was 75%)

No formal Goal but matter of local interest