Development Services Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Development Services works to facilitate development in accordance with municipal codes, municipal design criteria, and municipal construction standards. We protect public health through regulation of on-site water and wastewater systems. We respond to our customers seeking building, right-of-way, and land use permits or inspections or code enforcement information with open, friendly, cost efficient and effective service.

Core Services

- Enable property development through building and land use permitting;
- Ensure new construction meets municipal standards for protecting safety, public health, and environmental quality; and
- Enforce municipal codes to protect public assets such as rights-of-way and to promote clean and attractive neighborhoods.

Building Safety Division Development Services 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 prompt and efficient permit processing, timely plan reviews, and same-day as requested construction inspection services.
- 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:

<u>Measure #1:</u> Average number of minutes for first customer contact (*Permitting Mgt. Unit*)

Ave	Average Number of Minutes for 1st Customer Contact						
Q1 2020	Q2 2020	Q3 2020	Q4 2020				
13.01 minutes	minutes	minutes	minutes				
2,824 customers	customers	customers					
4 employees	employees	employees	employees				
Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019	Q4 2019				
8.11 minutes	13.14 minutes	25.10 minutes	27.17 minutes				
2,781 customers	4.353 customers	4,418 customers	3,664 customers				
5 employees	5 employees	4 employees	4 employees				
2018 Qtr Avg	2017 Qtr Avg	2016 Qtr Avg	2015 Qtr Avg				
15.15 minutes	15.74 minutes	14.22 minutes	14.25 minutes				
3,857 customers	3,790 customers	3,955 customers	4,201 customers				
4.75 employees	4.1 employees	4.3 employees	5 employees				
2014 Qtr Avg	2013 Qtr Avg	2012 Qtr Avg					
19.20 minutes	22.34 minutes	19.15 minutes					
4,488 customers	4,049 customers	3,536 customers					
4 employees	4 employees	3 employees					

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						
Q1 2020	Q2 2020	Q3 2020	Q4 2020				
80% in 4 days	% in 4 days	% in 4 days	% in 4 days				
97% in 10 days	% in 10 days	% in 10 days	% in 10 days				
229 Reviews	reviews	reviews	reviews				
Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019	Q4 2019				
88% in 4 days	84% in 4 days	76% in 4 days	91% in 4 days				
97% in 10 days	93% in 10 days	94% in 10 days	97% in 10 days				
226 Reviews/qtr	701 reviews/qtr	629 reviews/qtr	315 reviews/qtr				
2018	2017	2016	2015				
89% in 4 days1	87% in 4 days	88% in 4 days	87% in 4 days				
96.5% in 10 days ²	98% in 10 days	99% in 10 days	98% in 10 days				
1,749 reviews/yr ^{.3}	No Grand Total (no data for 1 quarter)	No Grand Total (no data for 1 quarter)	No Grand Total (no data for 1 quarter)				
2014	2013	2012					
86% in 4 days	77% in 4 days	73% in 4 days					
98% in 10 days	94% in 10 days						
No Grand Total (no data for 1 quarter)	1544 reviews						

¹Percent completed in 4 days for 2018 through 2012 is an average of the percentages reported for the first, second, and third quarters of each year. Hansen system does not timely report a 4th qtr percentage for each year.

²Ditto, percent reported for reviews within 10 days is an average of the percentages reported for 1st, 2nd, 3rd qtrs for 2018-2012.

³Total number of reviews completed equals grand total number of reviews completed for the year.

<u>Measure #3:</u> Percent of construction inspections completed same day as requested (Building Inspection Unit).

	Percent of Construction Inspections Completed Same Day as Requested						
Q1 2020	Q2 2020	Q3 2020	Q4 2020				
99.8%	%	%	%				
3,827 regular insp.	regular insp.	regular insp.	regular insp.				
15 inspectors	inspectors	inspectors	inspectors				
Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019	Q4 2019				
99.9%	99.8%	99.8%	99.7%				
4025 regular insp. 2447 earthquake insp.	5502 regular insp. 133 earthquake insp.	6158 regular insp. 55 earthquake insp.	5543 regular insp. 6 earthquake insp.				
15 inspectors	15 inspectors	15 inspectors	14* inspectors (1 elec. Insp. Retiring)				
immediately l	ackenzie earthquake o began damage assessi and 10 hours on Satur 19.	ment inspections, wor	king extra 2 hours				
2018 Qtr Avg	2017 Qtr Avg	2016 Qtr Avg	2015 Qtr Avg				
99.65%	96.6%	96.3%	94%				
6,158 inspections plus 790 earthquake insp.	5,382 inspections	5,470 inspections	6,274 inspections				
15.5 inspectors	14 inspectors	14.3 inspectors	15 inspectors				
2014 Qtr Avg	2013 Qtr Avg	2012 Qtr Avg					
92.8%	96.4 %	96.5%					
6,402 inspections	6,091 inspections	6,215 inspections					
14 + 2 shared use inspectors	14 + 3 shared use inspectors	15 + 3 shared used inspectors					

New Measure #4: Code Abatement Service Requests: new requests, number resolved, remaining open cases (Code Abatement Unit)

2020 DATA								
2020 SERVICE REQUEST TYPES	Q1 New Requests	Q1 New Requests Resolved	Q2 New Requests	Q2 New Requests Resolved	Q3 New Requests	Q3 New Requests Resolved	Q4 New Requests	Q4 New Requests Resolved
Abatement General Intake	6	5						
Abandoned Buildings	89	48						
Building Open to Casual Access	4	3						
Dangerous Building	15	6						
Fire Damaged Building	26	24						
Water Damaged Building	9	1						
Illegal Fill/Excavation	0	0						
Notice of License Requirement	4	3						
Notice of Permit Requirement	30	16						
Business License Inspection	147	94						
Code Compliance Inspection	24	21						
Misc. Service Requests	32	24						
TOTAL New Service Requests	<u>386</u>							
<u>New</u> Service Requests Resolved	<u>245</u>							
<u>Prior</u> Service Requests Resolved	<u>443</u>							
TOTAL <u>Resolved</u> this Quarter	<u>688</u>							
TOTAL <u>OPEN</u> Service Requests Remaining at End of this Qtr	<u>494</u>							

2019 DATA								
2019 SERVICE REQUEST TYPES	Q1 New Requests	Q1 New Requests Resolved	Q2 New Requests	Q2 New Requests Resolved	Q3 New Requests	Q3 New Requests Resolved	Q4 New Requests	Q4 New Requests Resolved
Abatement General Intake	4	4	6	5	7	5	3	3
Abandoned Buildings	7	3	15	6	142	138	119	98
Building Open to Casual Access	4	3	4	1	5	4	4	0
Dangerous Building	8	4	9	2	20	12	7	4
Fire Damaged Building	8	5	7	5	6	5	23	11
Water Damaged Building	11	3	12	9	9	5	9	6
Illegal Fill/Excavation	0	0	2	0	7	3	4	2
Notice of License Requirement	8	4	11	4	15	8	29	10
Notice of Permit Requirement	22	12	62	40	64	36	69	36
Business License Inspection	19	16	60	46	52	2	110	104
Code Compliance Inspection	44	34	23	19	20	12	25	23
Misc. Service Requests	24	8	34	16	40	22	29	16
TOTAL New Service Requests	<u>159</u>		<u>245</u>					
<u>New</u> Service Requests Resolved	<u>96</u>		<u>153</u>		<u>250</u>		<u>295</u>	
<u>Prior</u> Service Requests Resolved	<u>113</u>		<u>182</u>		<u>188</u>		<u>114</u>	
TOTAL <u>Resolved</u> this Quarter	<u>209</u>		<u>335</u>		<u>438</u>		<u>409</u>	
TOTAL OPEN Service Requests	<u>451</u>		<u>446</u>		<u>496</u>		<u>492</u>	

Remaining at End of this Qtr								
------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note that Code Abatement inspectors also performed 243 earthquake damage inspections during Q1 2019

2018 DATA								
2018 SERVICE REQUEST TYPES	Q1 New Requests	Q1 New Requests Resolved	Q2 New Requests	Q2 New Requests Resolved	Q3 New Requests	Q3 New Requests Resolved	Q4 New Requests	Q4 New Requests Resolved
Abatement General Intake	See older	measure	15	12	11	9	7	3
Abandoned Buildings	Dit	to	54	34	40	32	1	0
Building Open to Casual Access	Dit	to	9	7	3	1	6	1
Dangerous Building	Dit	to	8	2	5	1	10	5
Fire Damaged Building	Dit	to	11	8	4	4	4	4
Water Damaged Building	Dit	to	5	5	2	0	2	1
Illegal Fill/Excavation	Dit	to	9	2	4	1	1	1
Notice of License Requirement	Dit	to	45	18	21	6	5	4
Notice of Permit Requirement	Dit	to	71	28	61	41	42	11
Business License Inspection	Dit	to	19	19	30	10	29	25
Code Compliance Inspection	Dit	to	29	29	40	40	35	29
Misc. Service Requests	Dit	to	<u>43</u>	19	<u>45</u>	43	<u>18</u>	5
TOTAL New Service Requests	See older	measure	<u>318</u>		<u>266</u>		<u>160</u>	
New Service Requests Resolved				183		188		89
<u>Prior</u> Service Requests Resolved				<u>79</u>		<u>87</u>		<u>57</u>
2018 SERVICE REQUEST TYPES	Q1 New Requests	Q1 New Requests Resolved	Q2 New Requests	Q2 New Requests Resolved	Q3 New Requests	Q3 New Requests Resolved	Q4 New Requests	Q4 New Requests Resolved
TOTAL <u>Resolved</u> this				<u>262</u>		<u>275</u>		<u>146</u>
TOTAL <u>OPEN</u> Service Requests Remaining at End of this Qtr			<u>427</u>		<u>413</u>		<u>422</u>	

Measure #5: Percent of all required MOA development plan review responses provided to a customer within 15 business days of submittal (Private Development Section)

Percent of Development Review Responses Provided Within Fifteen Business Days						
Q1 2020	Q2 2020	Q3 2020	Q4 2020			
70%¹						
Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019	Q4 2019			
63%²	92%³	67% ⁴	62.5% ⁵			
2018 Qtr Avg	2017 Qtr Avg	2016 Qtr Avg	2015 Qtr Avg			
71.4%	89.3%	78.3%	89.3%			
2014 Qtr Avg	2013 Qtr Avg	2012 Qtr Avg				
80%	100%	95%				

¹ Ten reviews in Q1 2020, including Row permits. Seven were on time, several of those earlier than scheduled. Two were 4 & 5 days late due to workload. One was ten days late due to being misplaced and forgotten while quarantining and transitioning to working from home. Also Private Development's plan review engineer position has been vacant during Q1.

<u>Measure #6:</u> Percent of certificate of on-site approval (COSA) applications for existing wastewater (septic) systems reviewed within 3 business days (On-Site Water & Wastewater Section)

Percent of Certificate of On-Site Acceptance Applications Reviewed w/ 3 Business Days							
Q1 2020	Q2 2020	Q2 2020 Q3 2020 Q4 2020					
95 %	%	%	%				
3 staff	staff	staff	staff				
129 applications	applications	applications	applications				
Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019	Q4 2019				
90%	59%	74%	82%				
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 Staff				
88 applications	182 applications	187 applications	151 applications				
2018	2017	2016	2015				
93.8%	90.3%	82.3%	61%				
3 staff	3 staff	2.7 staff	3 staff				
650 applications/yr	577 applications/yr	614 applications/yr	684 applications/yr				
2014	2013	2012					
71% qtr avg	67% qtr avg	64% qtr avg					
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff					
665 applications/yr	658 applications/yr	582 applications/yr					

² Eight reviews in Q1 2019. Three were late: one by 1 day; one by 5 days, and one by 1 month. Responses were late due to resolving a stormwater outfall onto DNR property, a mistake on the due date within an internal distribution memo, and because the Developer placed the design review on hold while working to resolve a Scope of Work question. Most of the one month delay was due to the project having been placed on hold.

³Thirteen reviews in Q2 2019. One was late due to a late landscaping review from Planning.

⁴Three reviews in Q3 2019. One was late by 2 days.

⁵Eight reviews in Q4 2019. Three were late, two of which were discussed with the developer and engineer to request a time extension on PD comments. All parties were amendable to the time extensions.

Measure #7: Percent of private engineers' inspection reports submitted to the MOA that are reviewed and completed within 3 business days after date of submittal. (On-Site Water and Wastewater Section)

Percent of Inspection Report Reviews Completed within 3 Business Days					
Q1 2020	Q2 2020	Q3 2020	Q4 2020		
48% in 3 days	% in 3 days	% in 3 days	% in 3 days		
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff		
69 reviews	reviews	reviews	reviews		
Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019	Q4 2019		
42% in 3 days	53% in 3 days	54% in 3 days	47% in 3 days		
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff		
43 reviews	47 reviews	46 reviews	101 reviews		
Q1 2018	Q2 2018	Q3 2018	Q4 2018		
75% in 3 days	76% in 3 days	81% in 3 days	65% in 3 days		
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff		
60 reviews	45 reviews	77 reviews	110 reviews		
2018	2017	2016	2015		
74.3% in 3 days Qtr Avg	63.5% in 3 days Qtr Avg	11.5% in 3 days Qtr Avg	21% in 3 days Qtr Avg		
3 staff	3 staff	2.7 staff	2.7 staff		
292 reviews/yr	141 reviews/yr	125 reviews/yr	97 reviews/yr		
2014	2013	2012			
29% in 3 days Qtr Avg	27% in 3 days Qtr Avg	30% in 3 days Qtr Avg			
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff			
130 reviews/yr	126 reviews/yr	109 reviews/yr			

<u>Measure #8:</u> Percent of on-site well and septic permit application reviews completed within 3 business days (*On-Site Water and Wastewater Section*)

Pe	Percent of On-Site Permit Application Reviews Completed within 3 Business Days					
Q1 2020	Q2 2020	Q3 2020	Q4 2020			
92% in 3 days	% in 3 days	% in 3 days	% in 3 days			
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff			
52 permits	permits	permits	permits			
Q1 2019	Q2 2019	Q3 2019	Q4 2019			
64% in 3 days	47% in 3 days	68% in 3 days	75% in 3 days			
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff			
74 permits	196 permits	164 permits	93 permits			
Q1 2018	Q2 2018	Q3 2018	Q4 2018			
82% in 3 days	89% in 3 days	85% in 3 days	94% in 3 days			
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff			
34 permits	132 permits	175 permits	98 permits			
2018	2017	2016	2015			
87.5% in 3 days	72% in 3 days	43.5% in 3 days	43% in 3 days			
3 staff	3 staff	2.7 staff	3 staff			
439 permits	376 permits	359 permits	381 permits			
2014	2013	2012				
47% in 3 days	54% in 3 days	41% in 3 days				
Qtr Avg	Qtr Avg	Qtr Avg				
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff				
394 permits	353 permits	299 permits				

Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Division Development Services Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Protect the public health, safety, welfare and economic vitality by:

Protecting the travelling public and improving the quality, useful life, and safety of public infrastructure within the rights-of-way of the Municipality of Anchorage;

Improving quality of life and property values by ensuring compatible land uses through effective enforcement of Title 21, Land Use Planning Regulations;

Providing technical expertise and assistance to the general public and development community through review of development proposals, land use and building permits and facility licenses; and

Maintaining unique addressing and street names to ensure 911 public safety and conformance with Anchorage's land use regulations.

Direct Services

Right of Way Permitting & Enforcement

- Interpret, apply and enforce Anchorage Municipal Code Title 24, Streets & Rights of Way and eight other municipal codes;
- Investigate and resolve complaints of unsafe or illegal usage of rights-of-way;
- Inspect construction projects within municipal rights-of-way;
- Review construction plans and issue right-of-way permits on a timely basis; and
- Provide critical support for community events such as Fur Rendezvous and Iditarod.

Land Use Enforcement

- Interpret, apply and enforce Anchorage Municipal Code Title 21, Land Use Planning and eight other municipal codes; and
- Review and inspect marijuana businesses, day care centers, animal facilities, & businesses selling alcoholic beverages for compliance with municipal land use regulations when those businesses seek new licenses or renewals.

Addressing

- Maintain the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG);
- Provide critical support to maintain the 911 address data layer to support the Anchorage Police and Fire Departments; and
- Assign addresses to new construction and work to eliminate duplicate street names.

Accomplishment Goals

- Continue to make progress eliminating duplicate street names to ensure the uniqueness of each address, thereby improving E911 response times.
- Protect the traveling 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; and
- Provide timely and accurate services for:
 - Business facility reviews and inspections
 - Assignment of new addresses, and
 - Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

Performance Measures Definitions and Terminology

Example: Measure #11: Percent of land use enforcement *complaints* with **investigation** initiated within one *working day* of receipt. (Land Use Enforcement)

Complaint(s) is defined as a request for assistance or an allegation of a use or activity not permitted by applicable Anchorage Municipal Code (AMC).

Investigated or Investigation is defined as the formal examination or action by the assigned enforcement agency to resolve the request for assistance and/or determine whether a violation of municipal code has occurred.

Examples include but are not limited to: complaint review, contact of complainant or alleged violator, issuance of relevant correspondence, site visit and the like, and, completion of the supporting data entry and documentation of evidence and results.

Working day is defined as a scheduled shift a code enforcement officer is working who is responsible for the type of complaint and area the complaint is filed in.

"Working day" **does not** include scheduled days off such as weekends or holidays. However "working day" **includes** scheduled vacation days as management has the responsibility to provide area coverage during those times.

<u>Measure #9:</u> Inspections of permitted construction completed to ensure installation compliance w/ MOA standards & specifications (ROW Enforcement Section)

Right of Way Construction Inspections Completed						
Month/Year	# of ROW Officers	Accomplished	YTD			
Jan 20	7	1186	1186			
Feb 20	7	1704	2890			
Mar 20	7	1827	4717			
Apr 20						
May 20						
Jun 20						
Jul 20						
Aug 20						
Sep 20						
Oct 20						
Nov 20						
Dec 20						
Jan 19	7	962	962			
Feb 19	7	245	1207			
Mar 19	7	243	1450			
Apr 19	7	255	1705			
May 19	7	414	2119			
Jun 19	7	678	2797			
Jul 19	7	606	3403			
Aug 19	7	564	3967			
Sep 19	7	816	4783			
Oct 19	7	882	5665			
Nov 19	7	151	5816			
Dec 19	7	746	6562			
	Annual Totals - F	Prior Years				
2018	6.6	5,157				
2017	7	4,941				
2016	7	5,649				
2015	7	7,874				
2014	6.6	14,751				
2013	6	6,720				
2012	7	6,512				
2011	7	3,189				

Examples of inspection types are: initial, progress (there could be 4-6 or more progress inspections), final, and warranty.

Measure #10: Percent of all complaints of illegal uses within the rights-of-way with investigation initiated within one working day of receipt. (Right-of-Way Enforcement Section).

Percent of Illegal ROW Usage Complaints with Investigations initiated within One Working Day

	investigations initiated within One working Day										
Month	# of ROW	Number of	Number Percent Investigated within 1 within 1 Working		# Found to be no	Cases w Violations Closed this Quarter	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr (pre-existing				
& Year	Officers	Complaints	Working Day	Day	Violation	(new cases)	cases)				
Jan 20	7	152	152	100%	9						
Feb 20	7	224	224	100%	24	495	14				
Mar 20	7	130	130	100%	21						
Apr 20											
May 20											
Jun 20											
Jul 20											
Aug 20											
Sep 20 Oct 20											
Nov 20											
Dec 20											
Jan 19	7	118	118	100%	11						
Feb 19	7	179	179	100%	24	328	15				
Mar 19	7	43	43	100%	6						
Apr 19	7	64	64	100%	4						
May 19	7	74	74	100%	4	199	27				
Jun 19	7	63	63	100%	3						
Jul 19	7	58	58	100%	4						
Aug 19	7	61	61	100%	5	190	155				
Sep 19	7	64	64	100%	3						
Oct 19	7	78	78	100%	3						
Nov 19	7	130	130	100%	11	15	326				
Dec 19	7	129	129	100%	10						
Annual 7	Totals – Pri	or Year									
2018	7	1654	1654	100%	75	1,598	103				
2017	7	1,723	1,723	100%	129	1803	146				
2016	7	928	928	100%	57	821	93				
2015	7	887	887	100%	46	765	117				
2014	6.6	1,310	1,310	100%	119	1,491	226				
2013	6	1,848	1,864	101%*	189	1,738	279				
2012	7	2,478	2,457	99.2%	230	2,420	125				
2011 (3 qtrs)	7	1,523	1,493	98%	134	1,425	161				

^{*}Greater than 100% because officers observed & investigated other violations in addition to investigating complaints received same day.

<u>Measure #11:</u> Percent of land use enforcement complaints with investigation initiated within one working day of receipt. (Land Use Enforcement Section)

Percent of land use enforcement complaints with investigations initiated within one working day of receipt. (Land Use Enforcement Section)										
Month/ Year	# 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 20	6	79	79	100%	4	,	,			
Feb 20	6	56	56	100%	2	211	76			
Mar 20	6	160	160	100%	4					
Apr 20										
May 20										
Jun 20										
Jul 20										
Aug 20										
Sep 20										
Oct 20										
Nov 20										
Dec 20										
Jan 19	7	96	96	100%	6					
Feb 19	6	51	51	100%	3	194	99			
Mar 19	6	107	107	100%	4					
Apr 19	6	110	110	100%	6					
May 19	6	155	155	100%	7	365	55			
Jun 19 Jul 19	6	122	122	100%	9					
Aug 19	6	165 178	165 178	100% 100%	<u>8</u> 5	411	81			
Sep 19	6	101	101	100%	4	411	01			
Oct 19	6	117	117	100%	14					
Nov 19	6	127	127	100%	10	220	155			
Dec 19	6	65	65	100%	8	220	133			
	- Fotals – Pri		03	100 /6	O					
2018	7	1,231	1,231	100%	74	1,077	346			
2017	7.5	1,360	1,360	100%	64	1,265	187			
						-				
2016	7.4	1,320	1,320	100%	86	1,493	408			
2015	7	1,241	1,241	100%	71	935	302			
2014	6.2	1,310	1,310	1005	119	1,396	276			
2013	5	1,538	1,529	99%	118	1,118	416			
2012	6	1,826	1,749	96%	119	1,775	330			
2011 (3 qtrs)	6	1,194	1,031	86%	182	940	512			

^{**}Six officers and one lead officer were available to perform inspections in 2018.

Measure #12: Percent of final zoning inspections completed same day as requested (Land Use Enforcement Section).

2020	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Inspections Requested	24	38	30									
Completed												
Same Day	24	38	30									
% Completed Same Day	100%	100%	100%									
# of Staff	6	6	6									
2019	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Inspections Requested	14	20	27	23	55	68	82	105	97	32	36	40
Completed Same Day	14	20	26	23	55	68	82	105	97	32	36	40
% Completed Same Day	100%	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# of Staff	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6

Yearly	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
Inspections Requested	595	601	673	1165	531	773	428
Completed Same Day	595	601	673	1164	526	772	426
% Completed Same Day	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.1%	99.9%	99.5%
# of Staff	7	7.5	7.4	6.5	6.2	5	7

PVR Measure WC: Managing Workers' Compensation Claims

Reducing job-related injuries is a priority for the Administration by ensuring safe work conditions and safe practices. By instilling safe work practices, we ensure not only the safety of our employees but reduce the potential for injuries and property damage to the public. The Municipality is self-insured and every injury poses a financial burden on the public and the injured worker's family. It just makes good sense to WORK SAFE.

Results are tracked by monitoring monthly reports issued by the Risk Management Division.

