

---

## 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:

<b>Measure #1: Community sentiment about land use planning progress.</b>
--

Community Development mailed the 2<sup>nd</sup> annual community survey to all 38 community councils on January 9, 2012 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.

Councils were asked to return the surveys on March 30, 2012. The Councils requested an additional month to return surveys, pushing the due date to April 30, 2012. The results of the survey are posted on the Planning Division Website and can be viewed by clicking on the following link: <http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical> and once there, select 2012 Community Council Survey

**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:

<b>Q1 2011 Responses about Staff’s Services at the Public Counters</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Marked as N/A</b>
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%

<b>Q1 2011 Response about Staff’s Services at Public Counters</b>	<b>Completely Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	<b>Not Satisfied</b>
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.

<b>Q2 2011 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Marked as N/A</b>
Staff were readily available to assist me	67.9%	19.6%	5.4%	5.4%	1.8%
Staff were a valuable resource	67.95	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%

<b>Q2 2011 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters</b>	<b>Completely Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	<b>Not Satisfied</b>
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.

<b>Q3 2011 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Marked as N/A</b>
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%

<b>Q3 2011 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters</b>	<b>Completely Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	<b>Not Satisfied</b>
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.

<b>Q4 2011 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Marked as N/A</b>
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%

<b>Q4 2011 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters</b>	<b>Completely Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	<b>Not Satisfied</b>
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.

<b>Q1 2012 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Marked as N/A</b>
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%

<b>Q1 2012 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters</b>	<b>Completely Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	<b>Not Satisfied</b>
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.

<b>Q2 2012 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Marked as N/A</b>
Staff were readily available to assist me	53.3%	20%	0%	6.7%	20%
Staff were a valuable resource	57.1%	21.4%	0%	0%	21.4%
Staff were helpful, courteous & professional	64.3%	14.3%	0%	0%	21.4%
Staff provided clear, concise & correct info.	71.4%	7.1%	0%	0%	21.4%

<b>Q2 2012 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters</b>	<b>Completely Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	<b>Not Satisfied</b>
Rating of overall level of satisfaction with services provided	71.4%	7.1%	7.1%	14.3%

Q2: In regards to comments received, one person recommended that technicians who are assisting customers in person should not have to answer the phone. Others commented on exceptionally long wait times and that the counter work-stations were under staffed. Several complimented staff as being very helpful.

<b>Q3 2012 Responses about Staff's Services at the Public Counters</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Marked as N/A</b>
Staff were readily available to assist me	42.9%	4.8%	19.0%	9.5%	23.8%
Staff were a valuable resource	60%	13.3%	13.3%	6.7%	6.7%
Staff were helpful, courteous & professional	73.3%	13.3%	6.7%	6.7%	0%
Staff provided clear, concise & correct info.	66.7%	20%	6.7%	6.7%	0%

<b>Q3 2012 Response about Staff's Services at Public Counters</b>	<b>Completely Satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Somewhat Satisfied</b>	<b>Not Satisfied</b>
Rating of overall level of satisfaction with services provided	53.3%	6.7%	13.3%	26.7%

Q3: In regards to 12 handwritten comments, some complimented staff (6), while others complained about inadequate staffing and long waits (5). One comment concerning email capacity, customer sent 10MB email to permit clerk and it bounced back. Another commented that he received an email from the Muni that a permit was ready for pick up, when he arrived, he had to wait another hour for the permit.

---

**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 <sup>st</sup> Customer Contact			
			<b>Q4 2010</b>
			3.81 minutes
			2,284 customers
			4 employees*
<b>Q1 2011</b>	<b>Q2 2011</b>	<b>Q3 2011</b>	<b>Q4 2011</b>
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
<b>Q1 2012</b>	<b>Q2 2012</b>	<b>Q3 2012</b>	<b>Q4 2012</b>
16.29 minutes	18.47 minutes	24.82 minutes	
2,305 customers	4,096 customers	4,457 customers	
3 employees* – see note below	3 employees* - see note below	3 employees* - see note below	Note new employee, bringing total to 4, to start in December

\*Staffing in this unit has varied. For all of the first and second quarters of 2012, one of four counter staff has been out on extended leave. 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.

**Note that another permitting technician is scheduled to start work in December of 2012. If another permitting position included in the proposed 2013 budget is approved by the Assembly, then there will be a fifth person in 2013 --- which will help to improve customer wait times considerably.**

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 <sup>st</sup> -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:			
<b>Q1 2010</b>	<b>Q2 2010</b>	<b>Q3 2010</b>	<b>Q4 2010</b>
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	76% in 4 days	71% in 4 days	
97% in 10 days	93% in 10 days	91% in 10 days	
130 reviews	533 reviews	508 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%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			
# of Cases Reviewed	14	17	24	23	16	12	32	7	10			
# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	1	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%	98% same day	96.40%	
4195 inspections	5754 inspections	8574 inspections	
15 + 3 shared used inspectors	15 + 3 shared used inspectors	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
<b>Life Safety Service Requests</b>			
38 Received 33 Responded Same Day 86.8% same day	33 Received 25 Responded Same Day 76% same day	57 Received 10 Responded Same Day 17% same day	
<b>Other (Non-Life Safety) Service Requests</b>			
90 Received 77 Responded within 7 days 85.6% w/in 7 days  Also performed 13 building construction inspections	154 Received 107 Responded within 7 days 70% w/in 7 days  Also performed 65 building construction inspections	110 Received 93 Responded within 7 days 84.5% w/in 7 days  Also performed 301 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 (Private Development Unit)**

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									
Potter Highlands				6	Y	67						
WestPark Addition 3B				7	Y	67						
King Subdivision				8	N	67						
Amendments	0	0	0	1	N	N/A						
Spruce Ridge Estates							9	Y	67			
Uplands Phase II							10	Y	67			
Yosemite Drive – Eagle River Area High School (delayed by credit card deposit)							11	N	0			
Tanglewood Ridge (9/28/2012 – incomplete)							12	N/A	N/A			

I: application incomplete

**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	4	4	100	1	1	100			
Design Plan Approvals	1	1	100	6	6	100	4	4	100			
Notices to Proceed to Const	0	N/A	N/A	3	3	100	5	5	100			
Pre-Final Inspections	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	2	2	100			
Final Inspections	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	1	1	100			
Warranty Inspections	0	N/A	N/A	3	3	100	11	11	100			
Notices of Completion	1	0	0	4	0	0	5	5	100			
Notices of Rescission	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A			

**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%	69%	60%	81%	90%	69%	42%			
# of Cases Reviewed	11	17	25	19	20	26	19	16	12			
# of Staff	4	4	4	4	4	4	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%	100%	100%	

Private Development's plan review engineer position was vacant the entire 1<sup>st</sup> 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%	75%	46% <sup>1</sup>	
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	
92 applications	154 applications	196 applications	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the increase in workloads.

**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	38% in 3 days	18% in 3 days <sup>1</sup>	
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	
13 reviews	32 reviews	33 reviews	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the increase in workloads.

**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	50% in 3 days	24% in 3 days	
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	
28 permits	101 permits	115 permits	

---

## **Land Use Permitting and 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.

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

<b>New Measure: Percent of Inspections Completed Same Days as Requested in 2011</b>				
	# 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%
<b>Percent of Inspections Completed Same Days as Requested in 2012</b>				
	# 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				
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	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		
Aug	7	73	73	100%	7		
Sep	6/1 FMLA	68	68	100%	4		
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%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%			
# of Cases Reviewed	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0			
# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			

The senior Right-of-Way reviewer and one plan review technician are responsible for reviewing draft subdivision plans as well as all Right-of-Way permits, plats, and a multitude of other agencies' construction plan reviews. They also prepare comments on pending cases for municipal boards and commissions. Since 2008, the section has been reduced by 50 percent from 4 to 2 employees. Thus, subdivision plan reviews are being accomplished in time so as not to delay projects but not timely enough to meet this performance measure standard.

**Measure #20: Percent of land use enforcement complaints 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
<b>2007</b>	73%	88%	88%	87%	96%	97%	95%	97%	97%	100%	100%	100%
<b>2008</b>	100%	98%	95%	100%	85%	91%	98%	96%	94%	100%	100%	100%
<b>2009</b>	100%	100%	100%	84%	93%	95%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>2010</b>	100%	100%	100%	96%	99%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>2011</b>	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 ( <i>new cases</i> )	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr ( <i>pre-existing cases</i> )
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 ( <i>new cases</i> )	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr ( <i>pre-existing cases</i> )
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							
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**

													D e c
2011 Average # of Days to Complete  Total # Completed  # of Staff				Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov		
				15	20	12	7	16	19	8	20	8	
				22	12	11	9	13	14	10	14	0	
				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			
		3	2	4	8	17	38	61	90	75			
		75%	50%	75%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	100%			
		7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7			

**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	3	11	6	9	6	6			
Total # Completed	3	2	4	15	17	19	17	13	10			
# of Staff	2	2	2	2	2	2	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	18	27	7	0	63	0			
Total # Completed	4	11	4	8	8	11	0	6	0			
# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			

**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	27	2	48	16	3	8			
Total # Completed	37	28	13	47	1	12	12	8	6			
# of Staff	2	2	2	2	2	2	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%	91%	92%	89%	100%	95%	98%			
# of Addresses this Month	25	181	20	78	120	64	101	77	175			
# of Staff*	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	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%	100%	100%	75%	75%	100%	100%			
% of updates completed in 1 business day if Police/Fire request	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	86%	71%	80%	100%			
# of Staff	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	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	0	1	2	1	0	0			
# of Staff	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	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%	50%	48%	41%	25%	58%	83%			
# of Cases Reviewed	5	11	13	12	10	12	8	12	6			
# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	1	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	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	0	0	0			

---

**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. For 2012, check-ins with the responsible agencies will be conducted to gauge the status of implementation actions identified in each of the respective Plan areas. A status of “**complete**” will be noted for actions deemed complete by the responsible agencies; “**not started**” is defined as an action that no measurable work has begun, “**in progress**” is defined as work has started and where possible a comment will be made on the status of that action item, and “**ongoing**” identifies those actions that are continually monitored or updated by the agencies due to the nature of the action named. Where **no status** is indicated, work continues to identify the status of that particular action. The Plan tables will be updated continuously throughout the year. To review the status of the implementation actions for the plans listed in the table below, go to:

<http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical> - once there, select **Implementation Status for Select Adopted Plans (Performance Measure #30)**

Plan	Comments
Anchorage 2020: Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan	<b>Completed for 2011; 2012 check-in in progress.</b> See Anchorage 2020 Update Check-in completed for 2011. 2012 check-in, completed – read at <a href="http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical">http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical</a>
Anchorage Downtown Comprehensive Plan	Check-in completed for 2011. 2012 check-in, in progress
Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan Update	Check-in completed for 2011. 2012 check-in, completed - read at <a href="http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical">http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical</a>
Girdwood Area Plan	Check-in completed for 2011. 2012 check-completed - read at <a href="http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical">http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical</a>
Hillside District Plan	Check-in completed for 2011. 2012 check-in not started
Turnagain Arm Comprehensive Plan	Check-in completed for 2011. 2012 check-completed - read at <a href="http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical">http://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Physical</a>

**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 2012 are the following:

- East Anchorage District Plan (**new project added for 2012**)
- 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
<b><u>East Anchorage District Plan</u></b>					
Public Visioning Workshop	5-22-12	5-22-12		X	
Initial Review Draft Released	Nov 2012				
Public Hearing Draft Released	February 2013				
Planning & Zoning Commission Review	April 2013				
Anchorage Assembly Review	May 2013				
<b>Comments:</b> MOA hosted an Advisory Group meeting with the consultants in June 2012. Results of Visioning Workshop were reviewed and consultants received feedback to initiate the next steps. Consultants spent the quarter working on Plan focusing on summary of district profile and existing conditions. Consultants posted example maps from profile on the web site. Web site updated with Visioning Workshop results in June.					
<b><u>Government Hill Plan</u></b>					
1st Public Meeting about Project	11-30-11	12/3/11			4
Public Review Draft Released	5-31-12	See (1)			
Public Meeting regarding Public Review Draft	6-30-12	See (1)			
Public Hearing Draft Released	9-30-12	8-8-2012	52		
Planning & Zoning Commission Review	10-31-12				
Anchorage Assembly Begins Review of Plan	12-15-12				
<b>Comments:</b> (1) Review of the schedule required adjusting the timeline to bring the public hearing draft earlier to PZC rather than the target date. The staff team developed and analyzed development scenarios that were financially feasible in Anchorage's market and summarized the many community values heard into draft plan goals and policies. Focus was placed on preparing the Public Hearing Draft, which was released on August 8 <sup>th</sup> , 2012. The MOA received over 130 comments on the plan. MOA staff held a work session with the Planning & Zoning Commission on September 10, 2012 to familiarize them with the plan.					
<b><u>Historic Preservation Plan for Downtown, South Addition, Fairview, &amp; Government Hill</u></b>					
1 <sup>st</sup> Public Meeting about Project	Oct 2011	10-24-11		X	
Public Review Draft Released	July 2012	5/11/2012	50		
2 <sup>nd</sup> Public Meeting	Aug 2012	5/31/2012	61		
Public Hearing Draft Released	Oct 2012	9/7/12	24	X	
Planning & Zoning Commission Review	Oct 2012	10/8/12			
Anchorage Assembly Review	Nov 2012				
<b>Comments:</b> Over 1200 comments were received on the Public Review Draft of the HPP by the June 30, 2012 deadline. The project team spent the summer addressing the comments and incorporating the relevant comments into the Public Hearing Draft which was published on 9/7/12. Over 50 hard copies were distributed to agencies, groups and P&Z for their review and preparation of the Public Hearing to be scheduled in October					
<b><u>South Addition Historic Inventory &amp; Govt. Hill Oral History of Older Residents</u></b>					
<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	

Task	Target Date	Actual Date	Days Early	On-Time	Days Late
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	July 12, 2012			210
<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	June 2012			240
Draft 1 of written report	Oct 2011	Oct 2011		X	
Draft 2 of written report	Nov 2011	Jan 2012			60
Final Report	9/2012	9/12		X	

**Comments:** Government Hill Oral History: Government Hill Community Council asked in May 2012 if the Muni could complete additional interviews for the report. During May, June and July Muni staff performed 8 additional interviews. Interviews were then transcribed, edited, and incorporated into the final report. Muni staff also redesigned the front and back covers to reflect the additional participants in the project and add the new GH logo created especially for the GH projects. The final report has been edited and will be published in October to the Muni website.

South Addition Historic Inventory: The South Addition project was delayed due to input from the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office and additional input and comments from the residents. Muni staff attended meetings at resident's homes to garner additional information on historical properties attributed to the families with pilots in the World War II effort. Additional AHRS cards were completed in August and three potential historic districts were identified by SHPO and Muni staff during field reconnaissance in July. The delay has been related to Muni staff ensuring a more thorough review was completed and approved by SHPO staff

### **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		No	200+
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 Title 21 Rewrite was provisionally adopted by the Assembly in 2010. Staff was redirected from the above tasks from July through October 2011, in order to support Administration's review of Coffey proposed changes. It was further delayed one year including this reporting period to support PZC and Assembly Title 21 Committee review of all chapters of the Title 21 Rewrite, based on PZC re-opening of all chapters. Department was 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. PZC completed its deliberations on Title 21 Rewrite and Chapter 10. Staff presented a report on Chapter 10 to PZC on 7/9/2012. Assembly Title 21 Committee has completed a half of its work on the proposed amendments as of the end of this reporting period..

### **Anchorage Bowl Land Use Plan Map**

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				

Task	Target Date	Actual Date	Days Early	On-Time	Days Late
Introduction at Assembly	8-31-12				
<b>Comments:</b> 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 also depends on whether staff resources continue to be re-directed to Title 21 Rewrite Project. The LUPM project is anticipated to resume following Assembly completion of its review and adoption of Title 21 Rewrite anticipated at the end of 2012.					
<b>Commercial Lands Study – Complete</b>					
1 <sup>st</sup> Project Advisory Committee Meeting	9-16-10	9-16-10		X	
2 <sup>nd</sup> Project Advisory Committee Meeting	12-16-10	12-16-10		X	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Project Advisory Committee Meeting	4-14-11	4-14-11		X	
4 <sup>th</sup> 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
<b>Comments:</b> The consultant's work and contract were completed on schedule by 12-31-11. Staff edits have been incorporated into the final report. The report will be used to inform the Anchorage Land Use Plan Map work.					
<b>West Anchorage District Plan – Complete</b>					
1 <sup>st</sup> 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	7/10/2012		No	150
<b>Comments:</b> 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. Plan underwent additional review by the Administration and was transmitted on 6/5/2012. Assembly held a work session on the Plan on 7/6/2012. <b>Adopted July 10, 2012</b>					
<b>Wetlands Management Plan Update</b>					
Technical Review Draft Release (1)	Oct 2011	10-10-11		X	
Public Meeting (2)	Jul-Sep 2011				
<del>Public Review Draft Released (3)</del>	<del>Jul 2011</del>				
Public Hearing Draft Released	Aug 2011	May 2012			200+
Planning & Zoning Commission Review (4)	Sep 2011				
Anchorage Assembly Review	Oct 2011				
<b>Comments:</b> (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					

Task	Target Date	Actual Date	Days Early	On-Time	Days Late
not be produced because Technical Review has taken its place. (4)In keeping with PZC's direction to not schedule the work session and public hearing for the AWMP until after Title 21 Rewrite and other date sensitive plans have moved out of PZC, the work session and public hearing is tentatively scheduled in November.					
<b>Anchorage Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2011 Update - Complete</b>					
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
<b>Comments:</b> 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.					
<b>Anchorage Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2012 Update - Complete</b>					
Analysis and distribution of survey to agencies	4/11/12	4/11/12		X	
Agency review completed	5/11/12	5/11/12		X	
Analysis of survey results	6/10/12	6/10/12		X	
Draft report completed	6/15/12	6/15/12		X	
Final report completed and sent to US Department of Commerce for 6/30/12 deadline	6/30/12	6/30/12		X	
<b>Comments:</b> The 2012 CEDS Update was completed and submitted on June 30, 2012.					

**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%	100%	100%	94%	79%	100%	100%			
# of Cases Reviewed	7	12	15	11	9	18	19	10	3			
# of Staff	3	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	3			

**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	0	0	0	100%	100%				
# of Cases Reviewed	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2				
# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	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.**

Due to turnover and vacancy time in the supervisor position, a 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%	100%	97.9%	

Staff errors include items such as incorrect or missing information in a legal advertisement, not posting a legal notice on time, or other administrative issues that cause 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	50.5	50.4	

\*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 (2<sup>nd</sup> quarter includes figures for 1<sup>st</sup> 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	
Average revenue per case	2,543	2,630	2,557	
Tax subsidy	2,171	2,408	2,245	

---

**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:

<b>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.</b>
--

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	40	33	
# Commented on within 10 days		21	9	17	
% Commented on within 10 days		48%	23%	51.5%	
% Commented on by Deadline		60%	45%	78%	

Achievement of this goal was complicated in Q3 2012 by two factors. One employee was out on FMLA for much of the quarter, and one employee was acting as a section manager for the Current Planning Section, 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 <sup>nd</sup> 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	5/25/12			31
<b>Comments:</b> The update to the MTP was approved by the AMATS Policy Committee on 5-3-12 with a final approval letter from FHWA and FTA on 5-25-12, ahead of the deadline of 6-14-12					

---

## **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, administrative staff did conduct 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 and 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 administration group is to redirect staff to the new forms and processes to be used for Kronos.

For second quarter of 2012, we completed analysis of prior year expenditures, year-end expenditure projections for 2012, and prepared the 2013 budget explaining fiscal issues and working with management to make decisions to reach 2013 budget targets. We also reviewed all fees, last fee change dates, inflation data, and prepared fee changes proposal for 2013. We anticipated that this quarter would also have involved us in busily preparing for the launch of Synergy/SAP, but the Municipality has postponed the go-live date for that project.

For third quarter of 2012, the administrative staff expected to be very engaged in learning the new SAP system, but most SAP training has been delayed now until the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter. Administrative staff is working on a multi-year project to scan and digitize all records for elevators located in the Municipality (original as-built drawings, permitting records, inspection records). Staff has also worked this quarter on the following projects: with planners to prepare more historic preservation grant applications; with building code abatement inspectors on records management issues; and with Right-of-Way staff to assist with the heavy permitting volume. Administrative staff also completed the move of the AMATS transportation library to its new location.

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

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

---

**Performance Measure Methodology Sheet**  
**Community Development Department**

---

<b>Measure #1: Community sentiment about land use planning progress</b>
---

**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 1<sup>st</sup> 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**

---

<b>Measure #2: Percent complete – Users’ Guide for New Title 21 Land Use Code</b>
---

**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**

---

<b>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.</b>
---

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

<b>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. (<i>Plan Review Unit</i>)</b>
--

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

<b>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>)</b>
---

**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**

Measure 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**

Measure 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**

---

<b>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. (<i>Private Development Section</i>)</b>
---

**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**

---

<b>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>)</b>
---

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

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

**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 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**

---

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

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

<b>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>)</b>
--

**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**

---

<b>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>)</b>
---

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

<b>Measure #26: Percent of address and street GIS layer updates completed weekly or within one business day if requested by police or fire departments. (<i>Land Use Review &amp; Addressing Unit</i>)</b>
--

**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 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**

---

<b>Measure #30: Percent complete of an inventory of implementation actions and an implementation tracking system for adopted plans.</b>
---

**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**

---

<b>Measure #31: Implement Project Management by tracking number of days elapsed between target and actual Completion dates for long range planning studies</b>
--

**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**

---

<b>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.</b>
--

**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**

---

<b>Measure #33: Percent of Long Range Planning comments submitted to Private Development Section on or prior to comment due date for pending subdivision agreements. (<i>Long Range Planning Section</i>)</b>
---

**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**

---

<b>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</b>
--

**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**

---

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

**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 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**

---

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

**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**

---

<b>Measure #37: Average cost, fee revenue, and tax subsidy per case processed</b>
---

**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**

---

<b>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.</b>
--

**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**

---

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

**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**

---

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

**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.