
Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Community Development works to facilitate development and a multi-modal transportation system in accordance with municipal codes, protecting safety, public health and environmental resources, while also working to promote a healthy economy, strong businesses and neighborhoods, and recreational opportunities. We respond to our customers seeking code enforcement information, zoning or platting applications, building permits or inspections with open, friendly, cost efficient and effective service.

Core Services

- Enable property development through building permitting and creative and practical zoning regulations and plans that meet community expectations for our winter city community;
- Ensure new construction meets municipal standards for protecting safety, public health, and environmental quality;
- Enforce municipal codes to protect public assets such as rights-of-way and to promote clean and attractive neighborhoods;
- Support continued development of the community by planning for the community's long-term multi-modal transportation needs; and
- Work to achieve land use goals established through Assembly-adopted comprehensive plans for Eklutna/Eagle River/Chugiak, Anchorage Bowl, Girdwood and Turnagain Arm areas.

Building Safety Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Building Safety Section accepts applications for building, land use, and private development permits; performs plan reviews for compliance with code, municipal design criteria, and municipal construction standards; issues permits; performs inspections to assure safe development; and protects public health and environmental quality through regulation of on-site water and wastewater systems.

Direct Services

- Process permit applications, provide cashier services, and issue permits;
- Verify that plans meet minimum code requirements through plan review;
- Inspect construction for compliance with plans and adopted building codes;
- Administer subdivision, improvement to public place, and development agreements in accordance with code;
- Process applications and issue permits for water and wastewater systems serving single family homes in accordance with Anchorage Municipal Code 15.55 (Water) and 15.65 (Wastewater); and
- Process certificates of on-site systems approval (COSA) for existing single family water and wastewater systems.

Accomplishment Goals

- Continue to provide excellent customer service by providing prompt and efficient permit processing, timely plan reviews, and same-day as requested construction inspection services;
- Manage the private development process effectively and efficiently;
- Ensure development-related infrastructure is designed and constructed according to municipal design criteria, standards, codes, and practices; and
- Provide on-site water and wastewater permitting, certification, training and enforcement consistent with goals of protecting public health and environmental quality.

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

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

Average Number of Minutes for 1 st Customer Contact			
Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
12.36 minutes	14.91 minutes	16.07 minutes	
3,363 customers	4,898 customers	4,737 customers	
5 employees	5 employees	5 employees	
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
16.53 minutes	19.11 minutes	26.15 minutes*	15.00 minutes
3,765 customers	5,037 customers	5,330 customers	3,818 customers
4 employees	3 employees	5 employees*	5 employees
2013 Qtr Avg	2012 Qtr Avg	2011 Qtr Avg	
22.34 minutes	19.15 minutes	17.23 minutes	
4,049 customers	3,536 customers	3,722 customers	
4 employees	3 employees	4 employees*	

*Q3 2014 had 5 employees working the counter but 2 of the 5 were new hires and required substantial training, accounting for the slow wait times that quarter.

Measure #2: Percent of first-time residential plan reviews completed within 4 business days (Plan Review Unit)

Percent of 1 st -Time Residential Reviews Completed within 4 Business Days			
Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
87% in 4 days	86% in 4 days	89% in 4 days	
98% in 10 days	98% in 10 days	99% in 10 days	
211 reviews	593 reviews	474 reviews	
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
88% in 4 days	85% in 4 days	85% in 4 days	Waiting for IT staff to split 2014/2015 data so that this may be computed
100% in 10 days	96% in 10 days	99% in 10 days	Not available
207 reviews	591 reviews	571 reviews	Not available
2013	2012	2011	2010 (1 qtr only)
77% in 4 days ¹	73% in 4 days ¹	69% in 4 days ¹	75% in 4 days
92% in 10 days ²	94% in 10 days ²	92% in 10 days ²	98.5% in 10 days
1766 reviews ³	1544 reviews ³	1196 reviews ³	254 reviews

¹Percent completed in 4 days for 2013, 2012, and 2011 is an average of the percentages reported for the first, second, and third quarters of each year. Hansen system does not timely report a 4th qtr percentage for each year.

²Ditto, percent reported for reviews within 10 days is an average of the percentages reported for 1st, 2nd, 3rd qtrs for 2013, 2012, & 2011.

³Total number of reviews completed is the total number of reviews completed for the year (all four quarters summed together.)

**Measure #3: Percent of construction inspections completed same day as requested
(Building Inspection Unit)**

Percent of Construction Inspections Completed Same Day as Requested			
Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
96.1%	96.1%	89.1%	
5,032	6,502	7,346	
15 + 2 shared use inspectors	15 + 2 share use <i>Note 1 of 15 was out all qtr on FMLA leave and another 1 retired on 4/30/15</i>	15 + 2 shared use inspectors	
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
97.2%	92.3%	87.5%	94.0%
4,718	6,172	7,841	6,877
14 + 2 shared use inspectors	13 + 2 shared use inspectors	14 + 2 shared use inspectors	15 + 2 shared inspectors
2013 Qtr Avg	2012 Qtr Avg	2011 Qtr Avg	2010 Qtr Avg
96.4 %	96.5%	97.3%	99.4%
6,091 inspections	6,215 inspections	5,691 inspections	Not available
14 + 3 shared use inspectors	15 + 3 shared used inspectors	15 full +3 shared use inspectors	Not available

Measure #4: Percent of Life Safety Building Code Complaints Investigated within One Business Day and Percent of All Code Abatement Service Requests Initially Investigated Same Week as Received. (Code Abatement Unit)

Life Safety Service Requests			
Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
2 Received 1 Responded Same Day/50%	3 Received 2 Responded Same Day/67%	2 Received 2 Responded Same Day/100%	

Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
4 Received 1 Responded Same Day/25%	10 Received 2 responded same day/20%	7 Received 2 responded same Day/29%	10 Received 4 responded same Day/40%
Life Safety Service Requests – Continued			
2013 annual	2012 annual	Note that some of the requests that Code Abatement used to handle are now inspected by Land Use Enforcement in 2014/2015, so numbers from current years are not directly comparable to numbers from 2013/2012	
17 Received 9 Responded Same Day/ 48.7%	41 Received 21 Responded Same Day/ 57.5%		
Other (Non-Life Safety) Service Requests			
Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
64 Received 62 responded within 7 days/97% Performed 3 building const. inspections	115 Received 82 responded within 7 days/71.3% Performed 169 building const. inspections	103 Received 51 responded within 7 days/49.5% Performed 30 building const. Inspections	
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
42 Received 35 responded within 7 days/83% Performed 1 building const. inspection	120 Received 86 responded within 7 days/71% Performed 35 building const. inspections	131 Received 97 responded within 7 days/74% Performed 126 building const. inspections	82 Received 70 responded within 7 days/ 85% Performed 44 building const. inspections
2013 Qtr Avg	2012 Qtr Avg	Note that some of the requests that Code Abatement used to handle are now inspected by Land Use Enforcement in 2014/2015, so numbers from current years are not directly comparable to numbers from 2013/2012	
108 Received 78 Responded within 7 days/72.7% Performed 54 building const. inspections	123 Received 91 Responded within 7 days/ 75.7% Performed 156 building const. inspections		
Earlier Years (breakdown between life safety/non-life safety unavailable)			
2011	500 investigated (also performed 939 building inspections*)		
2010	455 investigated (also performed 330 building inspections*)		

Measure #5: Percent of review responses provided to a development team within 15 business days of a developer's submittal (*Private Development Unit*)

Percent of Review Responses Provided Within Fifteen Business Days			
Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
100%	86% ¹	71% ⁴	
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
100%	100%	93% ²	25% ³
2013 Qtr Avg	2012 Qtr Avg	2011 Qtr Avg	
100%	95%	77%	

¹Twenty-one reviews in Q2 2015. Two were late due to high workload for plan reviews and platting actions. One was late due to Westgate emergency overflow and required site visit with designer, developer, MOA HLB manager. Comments were delayed until site visit was completed.

²Fourteen plan reviews received in 3rd quarter of 2014; completed 12 within 15 business days: an 86% rate. However, rate is reported as 93% due to advance agreement with the developer (Alyeska Development) that a longer review period would be needed for the Arlberg Avenue project.

³Four submittals Q4 2014 and completed 1 within 15 business days. Two reviews were late because Street Maintenance in Public Works failed to meet the due date for comments with a reviewer out on extended sick leave. The fourth one was late as it had a number of issues and Building Official wanted to wait to provide review comments until a meeting was arranged between MOA and the developer.

⁴Seven reviews in Q3 2015. Two reviews were each one day late. One was late due to project drainage complexity, needed technical input from Street Maintenance. The other was late due to heavy final inspections workload.

Measure #6: Percent of Certificate of On-Site Approval applications reviewed within 3 business days (*On-Site Water & Wastewater Unit*)

Percent of Certificate of On-Site Acceptance Applications Reviewed w/ 3 Business Days			
Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
63%	64%	79%	
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	
114 applications	215 applications	214 applications	
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
92%	64%	57%	72%
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
111 applications	182 applications	222 applications	150 applications

2013	2012	2011	
67%	64%	80%	
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	
658 applications	582 applications	491 applications	

Measure #7: Percent of inspection report reviews completed within 3 business days (On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit)

Percent of Inspection Report Reviews Completed within 3 Business Days			
Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
38% in 3 days	19% in 3 days	13% in 3 days	
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	
26 reviews	19 reviews	24 reviews	
Q1 2014	Q2 2014	Q3 2014	Q4 2014
44% in 3 days	41% in 3 days	8% in 3 days	24% in 3 days
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
18 reviews	22 reviews	40 reviews	50 reviews
2013 Qtr Avg	2012 Qtr Avg	2011 Qtr Avg	
27% in 3 days	30% in 3 days	18% in 3 days	
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	
126 reviews	109 reviews	78 reviews	

Measure #8: Percent of onsite permit application reviews completed within 3 business days (OnSite Water and Wastewater Unit)

Percent of On-Site Permit Application Reviews Completed within 3 Business Days			
Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
63% in 3 days	30% in 3 days	38% in 3 days	
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	
51 permits	136 permits	136 permits	
Q1 2014	Q2 2014*	Q3 2014*	Q4 2014*
71% in 3 days	46% in 3 days	32% in 3 days	37% in 3 days
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	3 staff
42 permits	128 permits	151 permits	73 permits
2013	2012	2011	
54% in 3 days	41% in 3 days	67% in 3 days	
3 staff	3 staff	3 staff	
353 permits	299 permits	270 permits	

Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section

Development Services Division

Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Protect the travelling public and improve the quality, useful life, and safety of the public rights-of-way within the Municipality of Anchorage.

Improve quality of life and ensure compatible land uses through effective zoning review and enforcement of Title 21, Land Use Regulations.

Provide assistance to general public and development community through review of facility licenses, administrative land use permits, and business development proposals and assign and maintain unique addressing and street names to ensure conformance with Anchorage's land use regulations.

Direct Services

- Inspect construction projects within municipal rights-of-way;
- Review plans and issue right-of-way permits on a timely basis;
- Investigate and resolve complaints regarding illegal usage of rights-of-way.
- Enforce Title 21, the Land Use Code;
- Perform final zoning inspections of completed construction projects;
- Conduct land use reviews (at request of property owner, developer, mortgage lender, etc.) to determine a parcel's zoning status, conformity with other land use regulations, and/or eligibility for grandfather rights;
- Issue administrative land use permits for bed and breakfast establishments, antenna towers and attachments, snow disposal sites, adult entertainment establishments, and premises where minors are not allowed;
- Review and inspect day care centers, animal facilities (such as kennels), and businesses selling alcoholic beverages for compliance with municipal land use regulations when those businesses seek new licenses or renewals; and
- Assign addresses to new construction and work to eliminate duplicate street names.

Accomplishment Goals

- Protect the travelling public and the municipal rights of way, the largest single asset of the Municipality of Anchorage at +\$10 billion;
- Respond to land use code complaints within established timeframes;
- Complete final zoning inspections same day as requested;
- Provide timely and accurate services for:
 - o Land use reviews/determinations;
 - o Administrative land use permits;
 - o Business facility reviews and inspections;
 - o Assignment of new addresses; and
 - o Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses; and
- Continue to make progress eliminating duplicate street names to ensure the uniqueness of each address, thereby improving E911 response times.

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

Measure #9: Percent of inspections of permitted construction completed same day to ensure installation compliance w/ MOA standards & specifications (ROW Enforcement)

Percent of Inspections Completed Same Days as Requested				
Month/Year	# of ROW Officers	Requested	Accomplished	Percent
Jan 15	7	24	24 / 1,648	100%
Feb 15	7	19	19 / 430	100%
Mar 15	7	22	22 / 131	100%
Apr 15	7	36	36 / 429	100%
May 15	7	155	155 / 457	100%
Jun 15	7	284	284 / 700	100%
Jul 15	7	259	259 / 723	100%
Aug 15	7	224	224 / 884	100%
Sep 15	7	172	172 / 647	100%
Oct 15				
Nov 15				
Dec 15				
Jan 14	6	297	297 / 1,468	100%
Feb 14	7	185	185 / 3,420	100%
Mar 14	7	1752	1,752 / 3,107	100%
Apr 14	7	113	113 / 1,703	100%
May 14	7	307	307 / 642	100%
Jun 14	7	342	342 / 766	100%
Jul 14	6	241	241 / 594	100%
Aug 14	6	280	280 / 757	100%
Sep 14	6	235	235 / 584	100%
Oct 14	6	97	97 / 633	100%
Nov 14	7	17	17 / 431	100%
Dec 14	7	20	20 / 646	100%
Annual Totals – Prior Years				
2013	6	1,952	1,952 / 6,720	100%
2012	7	1,309	1,309 / 6,512	100%
2011	7	1,035	1,035 / 3,189	100%

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

Percent of Illegal ROW Usage Complaints Investigated within One Working Day

Month & Year	# of ROW Officers	Number of Complaints	Number Investigated within 1 Working Day	Percent Investigated within 1 Working Day	# Found to be no Violation	Cases w Violations Closed this Quarter (new cases)	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr (pre-existing cases)
Jan 15	7	114	114	100%	4	90	45
Feb 15	7	43	43	100%	2		
Mar 15	7	54	54	100%	2		
Apr 15	7	64	64	100%	2	159	26
May 15	7	54	54	100%	3		
Jun 15	7	55	55	100%	5		
Jul 15	7	55	55	100%	3	247	35
Aug 15	7	74	74	100%	4		
Sep 15	7	107	107	100%	7		
Oct 15							
Nov 15							
Dec 15							
Jan 14	6	260	260	100%	12	616	58
Feb 14	7	152	152	100%	16		
Mar 14	7	151	151	100%	13		
Apr 14	7	45	45	100%	6	209	21
May 14	7	72	72	100%	6		
Jun 14	7	61	61	100%	11		
Jul 14	6	45	45	100%	24	234	30
Aug 14	6	125	125	100%	5		
Sep 14	6	83	83	100%	6		
Oct 14	6	118	118	100%	6	432	117
Nov 14	7	40	40	100%	3		
Dec 14	7	158	158	100%	11		
Annual Totals – Prior Years							
2013	6	1,848	1,864	101%*	189	1,738	279
2012	7	2,478	2,457	99.2%	230	2,420	125
2011 (3 qtrs)	7	1,523	1,493	98%	134	1,425	161

*Greater than 100%, because officers observed and investigated violations in same day in addition to investigating complaints received same day.

Measure #11: Percent of land use enforcement complaints that are inspected within one working day of receipt. (Land Use Enforcement Section)

Percent of land use enforcement complaints that are inspected within one working day of receipt. (Land Use Enforcement Section)							
Month/ Year	# of LUE Officers	Number of Complaints	Number Investigated within 1 Working Day	Percent Investigated within 1 Working Day	# Found to be no Violation	Cases w Violations Closed this Quarter (new cases)	Cases w Violations Closed this Qtr (pre-existing cases)
Jan 15	7	80	80	100%	2	69	41
Feb 15	7	75	75	100%	2		
Mar 15	7	131	131	100%	4		
Apr 15	7	152	152	100%	13	369	40
May 15	7	166	166	100%	6		
Jun 15	7	56	56	100%	1		
Jul 15	*7 (6)	123	123	100%	13	247	127
Aug 15	*7 (6)	95	95	100%	10		
Sep 15	*7 (6)	129	129	100%	5		
Oct 15							
Nov 15							
Dec 15							
Jan 14	6	75	75	100%	4	258	71
Feb 14	6	76	76	100%	3		
Mar 14	6	87	87	100%	1		
Apr 14	6	88	88	100%	1	473	34
May 14	6	97	97	100%	1		
Jun 14	6	98	98	100%	7		
Jul 14	6	130	130	100%	5	274	80
Aug 14	7	114	114	100%	11		
Sep 14	7	97	97	100%	4		
Oct 14	6	90	90	100%	9	391	91
Nov 14	6	69	69	100%	4		
Dec 14	6	61	61	100%	5		
Annual Totals – Prior Years							
2013	5	1,538	1,529	99%	118	1,118	416
2012	6	1,826	1,749	96%	119	1,775	330
2011 (3 qtrs)	6	1,194	1,031	86%	182	940	512

*One officer is unavailable due to long term illness/FMLA. Five officers and 1 lead officer are available to perform inspections in this time period.

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

2015	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Inspections Requested	81	41	73	159	58	187	118	175	111			
Completed Same Day	81	41	73	159	58	187	118	175	111			
% Completed Same Day	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%			
# of Staff	7	7	7	7	7	7	*7 (6)	*7 (6)	*7 (6)			
2014	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Inspections Requested	18	8	6	17	37	76	82	99	58	43	62	25
Completed Same Day	18	8	6	17	34	76	80	99	58	43	62	25
% Completed Same Day	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# of Staff	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	6	6	6
Yearly	2013	2012				2011 (3 qtrs)						
Inspections Requested	773	428				125						
Completed Same Day	772	426				115						
% Completed Same Day	99.9%	99.5%				92%						
# of Staff	5	7				3						

*One officer is unavailable due to long term illness/FMLA. Five officers and 1 lead officer are available to perform inspections in this time period.

Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Anchorage: Performance. Value. Results.

Purpose

Facilitate land use development in accordance with Anchorage's zoning and subdivision regulations.

Direct Services

- Respond to public inquiries regarding land use development regulations and how regulations apply to given situations.
- Provide public processes for property owners to seek exceptions to (variances, grandfather rights, rezonings, etc.), or accommodation under (conditional uses, plat notes, etc.) Anchorage's zoning or platting regulations.

Accomplishment Goals

- Provide timely, clear, and accurate information about zoning and platting cases to the general public and to the citizens serving on Anchorage's four land use regulatory boards: Planning and Zoning Commission, Platting Board, Zoning Board of Examiners and Appeals, and Urban Design Commission.
- Examine and track the level of tax subsidy for the processing of zoning and platting cases.

Performance Measures

Progress in achieving goals will be measured by:

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

Average Number of Business Days to Complete Initial Reviews of Land Use Determinations

2015	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days to Complete	17	12	19	16	13	15	14	13	14			
Total # Completed	22	9	14	21	14	18	24	13	16			
# of Staff	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2			
2014	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days to Complete	18	33	23	12	20	20	6	37	38	44	24	26
Total # Completed	11	11	15	15	14	27	8	22	17	42	10	13
# of Staff	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Yearly	2013	2012				2011 3 qtrs						
Average # of Days to Complete	16			9		14						
Total # Completed	225			160		115						
# of Staff	2			2		2						

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

Average Number of Days to Complete Initial Reviews of Administrative Land Use Permits

2015	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days	9	0	27	8	0	4	0	1	28			
Total # Completed	8	0	1	6	0	2	1	1	3			
# of Staff	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
2014	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Average # of Days	24	46	13	5	7	12	22	11	96*	16	13	5
Total # Completed	18	34	5	11	4	1	5	2	2	10	3	10
# of Staff	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Average by Year	2013	2012				2011			2010			
Average # of Days	4			16		11			21			
Total # Completed	22			91		141			Not available			
# of Staff	1			1		2			Not available			

**Measure #15: Number of New Planning Applications Received in the Quarter
(Current Planning)**

New Applications in 2015 by Quarter				
Type of Case	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	Q3 2015	Q4 2015
AMATS Review	1	0	0	
Platting Cases	28*	34*	51	
Administrative Cases	5	9	7	
Zoning Cases	19	12	21	
TOTAL CASES This Quarter	53	55	79	

*Platting case numbers for Q1 & Q2 revised as database query using "date paid" for fees as a parameter for determining new cases falling within the relevant quarter was counting some platting cases more than once.

Former Performance Measure for 2010 - 2014

	Average Number of Days to Process a Case*			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
2014	51.1	Not available	Not available	Not available
2013	50.5	46.8	53.6	49.7
2012	53	50.5	50.4	45.0
2011	55	48	51	54
2010	77	61	69	61

Info about the Former Performance Measure and Why It Changed:

During 2014, the legacy Cityview software used to manage planning cases was modernized to a web-based version. Given the change in software, some of the reports that used to be generated from the old database are no longer available. The good news is that the querying capabilities in the new database are much stronger. The change in software requires modifications to Current Planning's performance measures.

Formerly, Current Planning reported on the average number of days to process a case using a report from the old database that is no longer available. Note that the average number of days also has only limited meaning. There are cut-off dates that applicants must meet to have their cases heard at the next board or commission meeting. Generally, if the applicant submits by the cut-off date, his or her case will be scheduled for the next meeting. If an applicant submits an application early (several days before the cut-off), the case is still heard on the same date as the ones submitted on the final cut-off date. Cases generally take longer than other cases if they are postponed. Often the applicant is the person deciding to postpone hearing of a case if an application is unlikely to be approved as is. An applicant will request a postponement so that he or she can make modifications that may make it more likely that the case will be approved. In other cases, a board or commission runs into the same problem that the Assembly does: not enough time to get through the whole agenda at a meeting, especially if there is a controversial item on the agenda that takes lots of time. Thus, a board or commission may postpone a case to the next meeting simply because meeting time ran out. That planning staff requests a postponement is very rare, less than 5% of all postponements. Thus, case duration data, as presented in the former performance measure, has only limited use in that cases generally run longer because an applicant or a board postponed cases.

**Measure #16: Average Cost, Fee Revenue, and Tax Subsidy per Case Processed
(Current Planning)**

Annual figures are the most reliable ones. The following breaks down figures by quarter, but direct costs and revenues are cumulative (2nd quarter includes figures for 1st quarter.) Given that revenues and expenditures are not evenly spread over all days of the year, the annual summary figures are more informative than the quarterly figures.

Cumulative Figures by Quarter for 2015				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Average direct cost per case	6,766	6,313	5463	
Average revenue per case	2,623	2,353	2467	
Tax subsidy	4,143	3,960	2696	
Cumulative Figures by Quarter for 2014				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Average direct cost per case	7,026	Due to upgrade of Cityview software from legacy system to new web-based version during this timeframe, reports for this measure were unavailable		
Average revenue per case	2,930			
Tax subsidy	4,096			
Annual Figures – Prior Years				
	2013	2012	2011	2010
Average direct cost per case	4,687	5,273	5,358	4,852
Average revenue per case	3,257	2,684	3,080	2,918
Tax subsidy	1,430	2,589	2,278	1,934

**Measure #17: Planning Case Action Statistics by Quarter
(Current Planning)**

This new performance measure tracks level of planning activity occurring by summarizing the actions taken by the department director on administrative cases, by the Assembly on cases requiring Assembly approval, and by planning board and commissions.

Planning Case Actions in 2015	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total
Planning Case Actions – Anchorage Assembly					
Approved	3	9	4		
Postponed (indefinitely or date certain)	6	4	3		
Denied	0	0	1		
Planning Administrative Case Actions – Department Director					
Approved	2	4	0		
Denied	1	0	0		
Planning Case Actions – Planning Boards & Commissions					
Approved	27	22	45		
Denied	1	1	1		
Postponed (indefinitely or date certain)	9	14	21		
Returned for redesign	0	2	0		
Information item only – no action required	0	2	0		
Resolution Actions – Planning Boards & Commissions					
Approved	23	26	20		
Postponed	3	0	2		
Planning Case Recommendations Made to Assembly by Planning Boards					
Approval Recommended	9	12	4		
Denial Recommended	2	1	1		
Recommendation Postponed (indefinitely or date certain)	11	4	3		
Case Withdrawn by Applicant/No Recommendation	1	0	0		

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

Measure #1: Average number of minutes for first customer contact. (<i>Permitting Management Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Continue to provide excellent customer service by providing prompt and efficient permit processing, timely plan reviews, and same-day as requested construction inspections.

Definition

Measure the efficiency of the permit management process by focusing on prompt, efficient customer service.

Data Collection Method

Data is collected by logging in the time each customer enters the processing area and stopping it with the first customer contact by a permit technician.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The permit technicians will maintain a continuous log of customers served using the measurement criteria. They will compile customer service information at the end of each day and week and store the data in an Excel spreadsheet. The permit management supervisor will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The permit management supervisor will create and maintain a weekly and monthly report in Excel from the data received from the permit technicians. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The permit management supervisor and engineering services manager will use the information to gain a clear understanding if customer service standards are effective. The report will be presented to the deputy director and director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

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

Measure #2: Percent of first-time residential plan reviews completed within four business days. (<i>Plan Review Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Continue to provide excellent customer service by providing prompt and efficient permit processing, timely plan reviews, and same-day as requested construction inspections.

Definition

Measure the efficiency of the permit management process by focusing on fluctuations in the time of completing initial residential plan review.

Data Collection Method

Data is collected automatically by the permit processing software by logging in the time each construction plan is routed for review and stopping it when the review is completed.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The permit technicians and plan reviewers will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to maintain and compile data of when the plans were routed and reviewed using measurement criteria. The engineering services manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The engineering services manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The permit management supervisor and engineering services manager will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director and director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

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

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

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Continue to provide excellent customer service by providing prompt and efficient permit processing, timely plan reviews, and same-day as requested construction inspections.

Definition

Measures the efficiency of service delivery of inspections by analyzing the ratio of inspections performed the same day as requested.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing number of inspections performed the same day as requested by the number of requested inspections and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Initial data is collected automatically by proprietary software and downloaded via a paper system into an inspection report. Each inspector manually enters the inspection request prior to leaving for the day's work and then enters the inspection results upon return. The data will be evaluated by comparing the number of inspections performed by the number of inspections requested for that time period, expressed in a percentile. *Note: Upon implementation of Hansen software in fall 2010 this will be an automated, "real time," process saving thousands of dollars via employee time saved.

Reporting

The chief of inspections will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The chief of inspections and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

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

Measure #4: Percent of life safety building code complaints investigated within one business day and percent of all code abatement service requests initially investigated same week as received. (*Code Abatement Unit*)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Protect the public by enforcing the building code by investigating code abatement service requests about structures that are unsafe or otherwise non-compliant with the building code and construction occurring without proper permits.

Definition

Tracks the number of code abatement service requests received each quarter.

Data Collection Method

Each code abatement service request is entered into the Hansen code compliance module and resolution of each request is recorded.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously.

Measured By

Running a report in the Hansen database to calculate the number of code abatement requests processed each quarter.

Reporting

The Chief of Inspections will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly.

Used By

The Chief of Inspections and Deputy Director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Private Development Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #5: Percent of review responses provided to a development team within 15 business days of a developer's submittal. (<i>Private Development Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Manage the private development process effectively and efficiently.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the private development process by focusing on fluctuations in the time plan submittal comments are reviewed and compiled.

Data Collection Method

Data is collected manually and entered into an Excel spreadsheet by logging in the date a complete plan set and a deposit are received and the time review responses for the submittal are sent to a development team.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Private development staff will enter accurate data into the Excel spreadsheet and will maintain and compile data of when submittals (plans and deposits were routed) and when submittal comments are sent to a development team using the measurement criteria. The private development manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The private development manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The private development manager and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director and director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

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

Measure #6: Percent of Certificate of On-Site Approval applications reviewed within three business days. (<i>On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide on-site water and wastewater permitting, certification, training, and enforcement consistent with goals of protecting public health and environmental quality.

Definition

Measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the on-site process by focusing on fluctuations in the time of completing certificate of on-site approval (COSA) reviews.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of COSA applications received within a designated time frame and completed within 3 business days, by the number of applications received within the same designated time frame, and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The plan reviewers will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to and will maintain and compile data of when the plans were routed and reviewed using the measurement criteria. The engineering services manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The engineering services manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The engineering services manager and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

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

Measure #7: Percent of inspection report reviews completed within three business days. <i>(On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit)</i>
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide on-site water and wastewater permitting, certification, training, and enforcement consistent with goals of protecting public health and environmental quality.

Definition

Measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the on-site process by focusing on fluctuations in the time of completing inspection report reviews.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of inspection reports received and completed within a designated time frame by the number of requests received within the same designated time frame, and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The reviewer will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to and will maintain and compile data of when the inspection was requested and the initial inspection performed. The engineering services manager will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The engineering services manager will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically and graphically.

Used By

The engineering services manager and deputy director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

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

Measure #8: Percent of on-site permit application reviews completed within three business days. (<i>On-Site Water and Wastewater Unit</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide on-site water and wastewater permitting, certification, training, and enforcement consistent with goals of protecting public health and environmental quality.

Definition

Measure the efficiency of the on-site process by tracking the number of permit application reviews within three business days.

Data Collection Method

The calculation by comparing dates for receipt of new applications to dates when permit reviews were completed.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously and updated quarterly.

Measured By

The reviewer will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to and will maintain and compile data of when permit application was received and when the review was completed.

Reporting

Community Development will include results in its regular performance measure reports.

Used By

The Engineering Services Manager and Deputy Director will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the Director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

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

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Protect traveling public and municipal rights-of-way as Anchorage's largest single asset valued at more than \$10 billion.

Definition

Measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the Right-of-Way Unit by focusing on fluctuations in the frequency of performing construction inspection in the rights-of-way.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing number of inspection requests received and completed within a designated time frame by the number of requests received within the same designated time frame, and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

The right-of-way inspector will enter accurate data into the permit processing system. The permit processing software is programmed to and will maintain and compile data of when the inspection was requested and the initial inspection performed. The lead right of way enforcement officer will compile and analyze the statistics weekly and monthly.

Reporting

The lead right-of-way enforcement officer will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically.

Used By

The lead right-of-way enforcement officer and chief of code enforcement will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #10: Percent of all complaints of illegal uses within the rights-of-way inspected within one working day of receipt. (<i>Right-of-Way Enforcement Section</i>)

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Protect traveling public and municipal rights-of-way as Anchorage's largest single asset valued at more than \$10 billion.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery of inspections by analyzing the ratio of inspections performed compared to the established time lines based on life/safety or impact on the community.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of code enforcement inspections performed within the established timelines by the number of required code enforcement inspections and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Data is collected automatically by Hansen software and can be extracted by Crystal Report.

Reporting

The lead right-of-way enforcement officer will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically.

Used By

The lead right-of-way enforcement officer and chief of code enforcement will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #11: Percent of land use enforcement complaints inspected within one working day of receipt. (<i>Land Use Enforcement Unit</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Respond to land use code complaints within established timeframes.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness of service delivery of inspections by analyzing the ratio of inspections performed compared to the established timelines based on life/safety or impact on the community.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of code enforcement inspections performed within the established timelines by the number of required code inspections and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Data is collected automatically by Hansen software and can be extracted using Crystal Reports.

Reporting

The lead land use enforcement officer will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically.

Used By

The lead land use enforcement officer and chief of code enforcement will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

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

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Perform final zoning inspections of completed construction projects.

Definition

Measures the effectiveness of service delivery of inspections by analyzing the ratio of inspections performed compared to the established timelines based on life/safety or impact on the community.

Data Collection Method

The calculation is performed by dividing numbers of final zoning inspections performed the same day as requested by the number of requested inspections and is expressed as a percentile.

Frequency

The data is collected continuously, compiled weekly and analyzed weekly and monthly.

Measured By

Initial data is collected automatically by proprietary software and downloaded via a paper system into an inspection report. Each inspector manually enters the inspection request prior to leaving for day's work and enters inspection results upon return. The data will be evaluated by comparing number of inspections performed by number of inspections requested for that time period, expressed as a percentile.

Reporting

The lead land use enforcement officer will analyze the collected data weekly and monthly. The information will be displayed numerically.

Used By

The lead land use enforcement officer and chief of code enforcement will use the information to gain a clear understanding if service is being delivered to established standards. The report will be presented to the deputy director at staff meetings and the public via the municipal website.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

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

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- o Land use reviews/determinations;
- o Administrative land use permits;
- o Business facility reviews and inspections;
- o Assignment of new addresses; and
- o Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses.

Definition

This measure calculates the average number of calendar days elapsing between receipt and completion of land use determination requests. A property owner, realtor, or financier, etc., may request a land use determination for a particular property parcel. Land use review staff will identify the zoning, allowable land uses, parking and landscaping requirements for the property and provide a written determination as to whether the property is in compliance with municipal land use regulations.

Data Collection Method

Each determination will be logged when received and logged out upon completion in an Excel spreadsheet. The log will provide data needed to compute average number of days to complete land use determinations.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The land use review manager will calculate and display results quarterly.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The land use review manager, director, and municipal administration will use results to monitor average wait times, to allocate staff resources appropriately, and to identify problems with processes, research methods, or staff training needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Land Use Permitting & Enforcement Section
Development Services Division
Community Development Department

Measure #14: Average number of days to complete initial reviews of administrative land use permits. (<i>Land Use Review & Addressing Section</i>)
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Provide timely and accurate services for:

- o Land use reviews/determinations;
- o Administrative land use permits;
- o Business facility reviews and inspections;
- o Assignment of new addresses; and
- o Maintenance of GIS map data layers for roads and addresses.

Definition

This measure tracks the number of calendar days elapsing between receipt of administrative land use permit applications and initial review of permits. Land Use Review processes administrative land use permits for bed & breakfasts, rooming houses, commercial kennels, antenna tower sites, adult entertainment facilities, and premises where minors are not allowed.

Data Collection Method

Each permit application will be logged upon receipt and again upon completion of initial review in an Excel spreadsheet. The log will provide data needed to computer average number of days to complete permits.

Frequency

This measure will be updated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

The land use review manager will calculate and display results quarterly.

Reporting

Community Development will incorporate results into its performance measure reports.

Used By

The land use review manager, director, and municipal administration will use results to monitor average wait times, to allocate staff resources appropriately, and to identify problems with processes, research methods, or staff training needed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #15: Number of New Planning Applications Received in the Quarter

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Support economic growth and community development by processing planning applications.

Definition

This measure tracks incoming planning applications as a measure of planning activity levels. Land use regulations apply area-wide. Before a new structure may be built, a land use review is a required step of the building permitting process for projects located inside the Building Safety Service Area (BSSA). Projects located in areas such as Eagle River, Chugiak, and Girdwood that are outside the BSSA do not require a building permit but must have a land use permit, verifying that the proposed project confirms with zoning and other land use requirements for the given project location. Planning applications are generally submitted in the earliest stages of preparing for new development. An applicant may wish to divide a land parcel into smaller parcels or may need a “variance” from a land use regulation to be approved or perhaps need a conditional use to be approved in order for a land use permit to be issued.

Data Collection Method

When an applicant submits a zoning, platting, or other planning application and pays the applicable fees, the application records in the Planning Division’s CityView database. Data tracking incoming applications is extracted from CityView.

Frequency

This performance measure will be updated each calendar quarter.

Measured By

Administrative staff will query CityView data to update this performance measure.

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 planning activity in the community. Changes in planning application levels help to reflect on the health of the local economy.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

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

Type

Efficiency

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Examine and track the level of tax subsidy for the processing of zoning and platting cases.

Definition

The Current Planning Section processes zoning and platting cases. Dividing total direct costs for the section by the number of cases yields average cost per case. Dividing total revenues for the section by the number of cases yields average revenue per case. The average tax subsidy per case processed equals the difference of average cost minus average revenue divided by the number of cases. Fees paid by zoning and platting applicants do not fully cover the direct operating costs of this division; this performance measure tracks the level of tax subsidy provided.

Data Collection Method

Data extracted from the Municipality's financial management system and zoning and platting case management system will be used to calculate costs, revenues, number of cases, and average cost, revenue, and tax subsidy per case processed.

Frequency

Average cost, revenue, and subsidy per case processed will be calculated at the end of each calendar quarter.

Measured By

Department's administrative staff will work with the Current Planning Section Manager to extract needed data, perform calculations, and display results using graphs and narrative.

Reporting

Community Development Department will incorporate results for this performance measure into its quarterly performance measure reports.

Used By

The Community Development Director and municipal administration will use the results to monitor whether tax subsidy levels are holding steady, increasing or decreasing and keep policy makers informed.

Performance Measure Methodology Sheet
Current Planning Section
Planning Division
Community Development Department

Measure #17: Planning Case Action Statistics by Quarter
--

Type

Effectiveness

Accomplishment Goal Supported

Support economic growth and community development by processing planning applications (same as PVR #15).

Definition

Municipal land use regulations apply area-wide. Although a few land use applications may be processed administratively, the vast majority of land use applications go to the Planning & Zoning Commission, the Platting Board, the Urban Design Commission or the Zoning Board of Examiners and Appeals for hearing and decision. While an applicant will want his or her application for zoning, platting, or other land use action to be approved, other persons may oppose an application for a variety of reasons. Whether a board or commission approves or denies an application cannot be labeled as a “good” or “bad” outcome. Thus, the Current Planning is able to quantify planning activity levels but cannot qualitatively label the results. Quantifying activity levels, however, is helpful given that upticks or downturns in planning activity levels reflect on overall economic activity in the community.

Data Collection Method

All information about planning applications is maintained in the CityView database.

Frequency

Performance measure is updated at the end of each quarter.

Measured By

Department’s administrative staff queries the CityView database to compile planning case action statistics for the quarter.

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 planning activity levels, as reflective of current planning workloads as well as local economic health.