

---

## Purchasing Department

*Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.*

---

### Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

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

2011	2012	2013	3Q 2014
.5%	.4%	.2%	.17%

Benchmark below 1%

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

2011	2012	2013	3Q 2014
1	0	1	3

Goal: 0

2011 (Bidding review upheld MOA decision, ERP)

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

**Measure #3: Expenditures in the local area**

2011	2012	2013	3Q 2014
79%	74%	44%	32%

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

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

2014 (percentage is skewed due to large dollar out of state purchases with no local sources such as Software providers, enterprise activity purchases for the ML&P power plant, and rollover of 2013 funding to 2014 funding, excluding these purchases the in state total is 49%, a decrease from last reporting period).

No formal Goal but matter of local interest