
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.

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 #1: Average number of minutes for first customer contact (*Permitting Mgt. 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 customers
4 employees*	4 employees	4 employees	4 employees
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
16.29 minutes	18.47 minutes	24.82 minutes	17 minutes
2,305 customers	4,096 customers	4,457 customers	3,284 customers
3 employees	3 employees	3 employees	3 employees
Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013
15.00 minutes	38.90 minutes	19.94 minutes	15.51 minutes
2,985 customers	4,625 customers	5,161 customers	3,425 customers
3 employees	5 employees	4 employees	5 employees
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
16.53 minutes	19.11 minutes		
3,765 customers	5,037 customers		
4 employees	3		

Measure #2: 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 & working 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	76% in 4 days	71% in 4 days	Waiting for IT staff to split 2012/2013 data so that this may be computed
97% in 10 days	93% in 10 days	91% in 10 days	Not available
130 reviews	533 reviews	508 reviews	Not available
Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013
70% in 4 days	76% in 4 days	84% in 4 days	Waiting for IT staff to split 2013/2014 data so that this may be computed
94% in 10 days	85% in 10 days	98% in 10 days	Not available
205 reviews	527 reviews	648 reviews	Not available
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
88% in 4 days	85% in 4 days		
100% in 10 days	96% in 10 days		
207 reviews	591 reviews		

Building Safety added a plan reviewer for the third quarter of 2013 and now has two plan reviewers who primarily do residential review. They are assisted by two primarily commercial plan reviewers when necessary

**Measure #3: 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)

Percent of Construction Inspections Completed Same Day as Requested			
Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
99.4%	98%	96.40%	92%
4195 inspections	5754 inspections	8574 inspections	6335 inspections
15 + 3 shared used inspectors	15 + 3 shared used inspectors	15 + 3 shared used inspectors	14+3 shared inspectors
Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013
98.80%	95.8%	94.5%	96.4% ³
4741 inspections	5649 inspections	7646 inspections	6328 inspections
14 + 3 shared use inspectors	15 + 2 shared use inspectors ¹	14 + 2 shared use inspectors ²	14 + 2 shared use Inspectors ⁴
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
97.2%	92.3%		
4718	6172		
14 + 2 shared use inspectors	13 + 2 shared use inspectors		

¹ Note that we lost one of our shared use inspectors due to retirement.

² One structural inspector was out on FMLA from July 1, 2013 through Oct 30, 2013.

³ Inspectors worked approx. 370 hours of overtime in 2013 to maintain customer service.

Measure #4: 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 (also performed 3 building inspection*)
2008	379 investigated (also performed 1 building inspection*)
2009	552 investigated (also performed 134 building inspections*)
2010	455 investigated (also performed 330 building inspections*)
2011	500 investigated (also performed 939 building inspections*)

Q1 2012	Q2 2012	Q3 2012	Q4 2012
Life Safety Service Requests			
38 Received 33 Responded Same Day/ 86.8%	33 Received 25 Responded Same Day/ 76%	57 Received 10 Responded Same Day/ 17%	34 Received 17 Responded Same Day/ 50%
Other (Non-Life Safety) Service Requests			
90 Received 77 Responded within 7 days/ 85.6% Also performed 13 building construction inspections	154 Received 107 Responded within 7 days/ 70% Also performed 65 building construction inspections	110 Received 93 Responded within 7 days/ 84.5% Also performed 301 building construction inspections	139 Received 88 Responded within 7 days/ 63% Also performed 248 building construction inspections
Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013
Life Safety Service Requests			
21 Received 14 Responded Same Day/ 66%	24 Received 12 Responded Same Day/ 50%	17 Received 6 Responded same day/35%	7 Received 3 Responded Same Day/43%
Other (Non-Life Safety) Service Requests			
86 Received 51 Responded within 7 days/59% Also performed 29 building construction inspections	157 Received 99 Responded within 7 days 63% w/ 7 days Also performed 6 building construction inspections	122 Received 106 Responded within 7 days 86.9% w/7 days Also performed 132 building construction inspections	65 Received ¹ 52 Responded within 7 days 78.5% w/7 days Also performed 50 building construction inspections

Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
Life Safety Service Requests			
4 Received 1 Responded Same Day/25%	10 Received 2 responded same day/20%		
Other (Non-Life Safety) Service Requests			
42 Received 35 Responded within 7 days/83% Performed 1 building const. inspection	120 Received 86 responded within 7 days/71% Performed 35 building construction inspections		

¹ The total number of service requests received is lower than normal because of a change in business practices. Code enforcement staff, rather than abatement officers, now responds to many housing complaints.

The code abatement inspectors handle code abatement (investigating complaints about dangerous buildings, looking for construction underway without permits) as their primary duty but help with regular building permit inspections when necessary (when sent to do regular inspections, code abatement work is delayed.).

Measure #5: 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%	100%	100%	100%
Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013
100%	100%	100%	100%
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
100%	100%		

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 #6: 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%
Percent of Certificate of On-Site Acceptance Applications Reviewed w/ 3 Business Days			
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%	75%	46% ¹	61%
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
92 applications	154 applications	196 applications	139 applications
Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013
78%	73%	53%	74%
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
107 applications	183 applications	217 applications	151 applications
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
92%	64%		
3 staff	3 staff		
111 applications	182 applications		

¹ Third quarter of the year is the busiest time of the year for On-Site Water and Wastewater. Certificates of On-Site Acceptance in Q3 2012 were 43% greater than in Q3 2011; inspection report reviews were 94% more in Q3 of 2012; and permitting was 14% higher in 2012 compared to 2011. Performance measures for Q3 of 2012 therefore are lower than previous quarters due to workload increases.

Measure #7: 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	38% in 3 days	18% in 3 ^{days1}	32% in 3 days
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
13 reviews	32 reviews	33 reviews	31 reviews
Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013
62% in 3 days	40% in 3 days	17% in 3 days	17% in 3 days
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
21 reviews	15 reviews	30 reviews	60 reviews
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
44% in 3 days	41% in 3 days		
3 staff	3 staff		
18 reviews	22 reviews		

Measure #8: Percent of onsite permit application reviews completed within 3 business days (OnSite 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	50% in 3 days	24% in 3 days	31% in 3 days
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
28 permits	101 permits	115 permits	55 permits
Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013
85% in 3 days	59% in 3 days	37% in 3 days	70% in 3 days
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
26 permits	103 permits	153 permits	71 permits
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
71% in 3 days	46% in 3 days		
3 staff	3 staff		
42 permits	128 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:
 - o Land use reviews/determinations;
 - o Administrative land use permits;
 - o Business facility reviews and inspections;
 - o Assignment of new addresses; and
 - o 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 #9: 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	7	209	209/1015	100%
May	7	164	164/1378	100%
Jun	7	135	135/612	100%
Jul	7	60	60/690	100%
Aug	7	69	69/528	100%
Sep	6/1 FMLA	52	52/585	100%
Oct	6	97	97/694	100%
Nov	7	123	123/173	100%
Dec	7	358	358/402	100%
Percent of Inspections Completed Same Days as Requested in 2013				
	# of ROW Officers	Requested	Accomplished	Percent
Jan	7	330	330/825	100%
Feb	7	87	87/515	100%
Mar	7	131	131/321	100%
Apr	7	68	68/413	100%
May	7	219	219/595	100%

Jun	7	365	365/629	100%
Jul	6	228	228/764	100%
Aug	6	188	188/672	100%
Sep	6	231	231/609	100%
Oct	5	69	69/884	100%
Nov	5	28	28/236	100%
Dec	5	8	28/257	100%
Percent of Inspections Completed Same Days as Requested in 2014				
	# of ROW Officers	Requested	Accomplished	Percent
Jan	6	297	297/1468	100%
Feb	7	185	185/3420	100%
Mar	7	1752	1752/3107	100%
Apr	7	113	113/1703	100%
May	7	307	307/642	100%
Jun	7	342	342/766	100%
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.
- The large number of inspections in December 2012 is attributed to end-of-the-year administrative clean-up that resulted in more inspections to bring the permits up to date.

Measure #10: Percent of all complaints of illegal uses within the rights-of-way 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 #10, 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 (new cases)	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr (pre-existing cases)
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 #10, 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 (new cases)	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr (pre-existing cases)
Jan	7	472	472	100%	47	1369	43
Feb	7	531	515	97%	39		
Mar	7	365	365	100%	46		
Apr	7	71	70	99%	12	194	5
May	7	64	62	97%	5		
Jun	7	81	79	98%	5		
Jul	7	46	46	100%	2	160	31
Aug	7	73	73	100%	7		
Sep	6/1 FMLA	68	68	100%	4		
Oct	6	112	112	100%	11	697	46
Nov	7	118	118	100%	2		
Dec	7	477	477	100%	50		
Measure #10, 2013 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 (new cases)	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr (pre-existing cases)
Jan	7	150	*166	100%	21	675	45
Feb	7	309	309	100%	57		
Mar	7	240	*245	100%	38		
Apr	7	120	118	96%	10	259	10
May	7	83	82	99%	4		
Jun	7	60	58	97%	4		

Jul	6	61	61	100%	4	199	101
Aug	6	108	108	100%	2		
Sep	6	70	70	100%	7		
Oct	5	83	83	100%	8	605	123
Nov	5	133	133	100%	6		
Dec	5	431	431	100%	28		
Measure #10, 2014 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	6	260	260	100%	12	616	58
Feb	7	152	152	100%	16		
Mar	7	151	151	100%	13		
Apr	7	45	45	100%	6	209	21
May	7	72	72	100%	6		
Jun	7	61	61	100%	11		
Jul							
Aug							
Sep							
Oct							
Nov							
Dec							

* In some instances the number of complaints investigated within one working day will exceed the number of complaints because violations were observed and documented by the Right of Way Officers or staff.

Measure #11: 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

[illegible]

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

Measure #11: 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 #11: 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	7	238	221	93%	12	620	39
May	7	274	263	96%	19		
Jun	7	178	172	97%	22		
Jul	7	136	125	92%	11	363	70
Aug	7	155	149	96%	7		
Sep	7	132	118	89%	5		
Oct	6	174	174	100%	9	511	123
Nov	6	174	174	100%	2		
Dec	6	84	84	100%	3		
Measure #11: 2013 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	5	94	88	94%	6	263	64
Feb	5	96	93	96%	12		
Mar	5	140	140	100%	9		
Apr	5	154	154	100%	4	444	74
May	5	210	210	100%	5		
Jun	5	168	168	100%	6		

Jul	5	126	126	100%	11	198	176
Aug	5	122	122	100%	5		
Sep	5	121	121	100%	3		
Oct	5	136	136	100%	10		
Nov	5	72	72	100%	7	213	102
Dec	5	99	99	100%	40		

Measure #11: 2014 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	75	75	100%	4	258	71
Feb	6	76	76	100%	3		
Mar	6	87	87	100%	1		
Apr	6	88	88	100%	1	473	34
May	6	97	97	100%	1		
Jun	6	98	98	100%	7		
Jul							
Aug							
Sep							
Oct							
Nov							
Dec							

- *Shows number of officers; 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 #12: 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 Average # of Days to Complete Total # Completed # of Staff				Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
				15	20	12	7	16	19	8	20	8
				22	12	11	9	13	14	10	14	10
				7	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2
2012 # of Inspections Requested # Completed Same Day % Completed Same Day # of Staff	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
	4	1	3	8	17	40	61	90	75	53	38	38
	3	2	4	8	17	38	61	90	75	52	38	38
	75%	50%	75%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%
	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	6
2013 # of Inspections Requested # Completed Same Day % Completed Same Day # of Staff	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
	27	31	35	42	57	93	92	186	85	76	33	16
	27	30	35	42	57	93	92	186	85	76	33	16
	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
2014 # of Inspections Requested # Completed Same Day % Completed Same Day # of Staff	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
	18	8	6	17	37	76						
	18	8	6	17	34	76						
	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%						
	6	6	6	6	6	6						

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 #13: Average number of business days to complete initial reviews of land use determinations (<i>Land Use Review</i>)

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

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	3	11	6	9	6	6	19	16	21
Total # Completed		3	2	4	15	17	19	17	13	10	28	6	26
# of Staff		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
2013		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days to Complete		10	13	7	33	13	15	9	17	22	25	17	13
Total # Completed		20	11	26	24	19	19	16	19	21	23	19	8
# of Staff		2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
2014		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days to Complete		18	33	23	12	20	20						
Total # Completed		11	11	15	15	14	27						
# of Staff		2	2	2	2	2	2						

Measure #14: Average number of days to complete initial reviews of administrative land use permits. (*Land Use Review*)

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	18	27	7	0	63	0	0	28	8
Total # Completed		4	11	4	8	8	11	0	6	0	0	17	22
# of Staff		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2013		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days		4	0	20	3	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	15
Total # Completed		6	0	3	2	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	5

# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2014	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days	24	46	13	5	7	12						
Total # Completed	18	34	5	11	4	1						
# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	1						

Measure #15: 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	50.5	50.4	45.0
Q1 2013	Q2 2013	Q3 2013	Q4 2013
50.5	46.8	53.6	49.7
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
51.1	See note		

Cityview software used to track zoning and platting cases was recently updated but querying functions in the new version are not working properly yet to extract and calculate the average days statistic.

*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 #16: Average cost, fee revenue, and tax subsidy per case processed.

Year	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Average direct cost per case	4,687	5,273	5,358	4,852	5,033	5,011	4,118	3,727
Average revenue per case	3,257	2,684	3,080	2,918	2,243	3,040	2,665	3,043
Tax subsidy	1,430	2,589	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	5,038	4,802	5,273
Average revenue per case	2,543	2,630	2,557	2,684
Tax subsidy	2,171	2,408	2,245	2,589

Cumulative Figures by Quarter for 2013				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Average direct cost per case	5,256	4,628	4,411	4,687
Average revenue per case	4,518	3,555	3,234	3,257
Tax subsidy	737	1,074	1,177	1,430

Cumulative Figures by Quarter for 2014				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Average direct cost per case	7,026	See		
Average revenue per case	2,930	Note		
Tax subsidy	4,096			

An IT project to migrate Planning's Cityview software to a newer web-based version is mostly complete but querying functions in the newer version are not properly working yet. Thus, staff is not able to calculate these statistics until querying functions are working.

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

Measure #1: 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

Measure 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 #2: 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

Measure 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 #3: 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 #4: 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 #5: Percent of review responses provided to a development team within 15 business days of a developer's submittal. (<i>Private Development Unit</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 #6: Percent of Certificate of On-Site Approval applications reviewed within three 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

Measure 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 #7: Percent of inspection report reviews completed within three 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

Measure 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 #8: Percent of on-site permit application reviews completed within three 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

Measure the 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 #9: Percent of inspections of permitted construction completed the same day to ensure installation compliance with MOA standards and specifications. (*Right-of-Way Enforcement Section*)

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

Measure 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 #10: Percent of all complaints of illegal uses within the rights-of-way inspected within one working day of receipt. (<i>Right-of-Way Enforcement Section</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
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #11: Percent of land use enforcement complaints 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 #12: Percent of final zoning inspections completed same day as requested. <i>(Land Use Enforcement Section)</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 #13: Average number of business days to complete initial reviews of land use determinations. (<i>Land Use Review & Addressing Section</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- o Land use reviews/determinations;
- o Administrative land use permits;
- o Business facility reviews and inspections;
- o Assignment of new addresses; and
- o 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 #14: Average number of days to complete initial reviews of administrative land use permits. (<i>Land Use Review & Addressing Section</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- o Land use reviews/determinations;
- o Administrative land use permits;
- o Business facility reviews and inspections;
- o Assignment of new addresses; and
- o 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
Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #15: 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 #16: 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.