



DANE COUNTY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

Room 116, City-County Building, Madison, Wisconsin 53703
Phone (608) 266-4266 Fax (608) 267-1540

TO: Zoning and Land Regulation Committee members
FROM: Roger Lane, Dane County Zoning Administrator
SUBJECT: Resolution 572 affect on the Zoning Division
DATE: March 8, 2017

Resolution 572 was introduced to allow for the creation of a new bi-lingual Immigrant Affairs Specialist Position in the Office for Equity and Inclusion. In order to do so, the current vacant Zoning Inspector position will be removed from the Planning and Development Department budget. With this removal of the vacant position, the Zoning Division may experience an under-staffing situation in the near future that will have a negative affect on the quality of service of the division.

Virchow Krause & Company conducted an evaluation of the Planning and Development Department in 2005. The report detailed deficiencies in the department which included the need to maintain adequate staffing in the Zoning and Plat Review areas.

In 2010, the Zoning Division was fully staffed with 12.35 FTE. Over the past 7 years, the division has adapted to the fluctuation in the residential market. The division has consolidated job descriptions and expanded responsibilities of all personnel. As a result, the division has reduced our staffing needs to a lean 9.5 FTE. This consolidation was made without compromising services and actually improving the level of customer service. Having an efficient and lean division does not come without issues.

In April of 2016, the zoning division level went down to 8.5FTE due to a zoning inspector leaving for a planning position in the City of Sun Prairie. The workload of the vacant position thus had been temporarily spread to the Zoning Administrator and Assistant Zoning Administrators by attending to counter duties, permitting, and phone duties, along with the expected workload, with the understanding that the vacant position would be filled in the spring of 2017.

At 8.5FTE, the zoning division is experiencing inadequate staffing. Combined staff allowed absences, vacations, and sick leave account for one FTE. The reduced staffing levels is starting to cause delays in responding to phone calls, the issuance of permits, and a reduced time that inspector's are out in the field.

I understand that the recent legislation for Towns to opt out of County Zoning brings the necessary staffing levels of the Zoning Division into question. The Zoning Division has been anticipating this change by keeping the vacant position open until such time it is known the number of Towns choosing to opt out. Even though towns may opt out of the zoning aspect, the zoning division will still have statutory obligations in these municipalities. County Zoning Division will still be responsible for the administration of Floodplain, Wetland, Shoreland, Quarry Reclamation regulations in all of Dane County. Rural addressing will still be the responsibility of the Zoning Division as well.

I would ask that the Committee keep in mind that Zoning Division has been operating at its lowest staff levels in 7 years. I feel that the permanent removal of the vacant zoning inspector position at this time will create a staffing scenario which will cause a significant reduction in the quality of service that residents of Dane County expect from the Zoning Division office.

Lane, Roger

From: Hilbert, Hans
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2017 12:26 PM
To: Violante, Todd
Cc: Lane, Roger; Everson, Daniel
Subject: Follow up on Zoning Division workload conversation
Attachments: Zoning Division Workload.pdf

Todd,

As a follow up to our conversation last Friday I pulled together some additional data. I've added data from 2014 so we have a bit more of a history, as well as included all permits types. The results are in the attached PDF.

Page 1 summarizes the zoning division workload across all types of permits and services we provide for a fee (with the exception of land division, addressing, and mineral extraction). It excludes complaints and zoning status reports, as these are not customer driven and do not generate revenue. Complaints are also excluded because some inspectors are only tracking valid complaints, while others are tracking all complaints received.

Based on my analysis of the data I think it's very clear, down to the percentage, that the workload after the lose of the 5th inspector has been made up 100% by Roger, Dan, and myself. From 2015 the three of us have seen a cumulative 13% increase of work over past years, and this correlates exactly to the 5% of work Sarah did before she left in 2016, and the 18% she had done in previous years. For the rest of the zoning staff the workload has stayed relatively constant. Without rebalancing the workload, as we progress through 2017 I think it is safe to assume that the cumulative workload for the three of us will increase until we reach 18%--as that happens it pulls each of us away from the work that we are already struggling to keep a high priority in our respective areas.

Page two summarizes only zoning permits. The results are consistent with the above findings.

Dan and I are both willing to make sure the counter is staffed and customers are being taken care of, but we both agree that the increased workload is significantly cutting into other work we are assigned to do such as land division review, mineral extraction, shoreland, floodplain, addressing, ZLR, BOA, DCDB, etc. Tasks that I thought I'd have time to work on over the winter, such as providing data to the DCDB, have simply not happened as there hasn't been time to work on them.

Personally, I know that the reason I carried almost a quarter of the identified workload in 2016 is because I'm here in the office. If I was able to factor in land division review/mineral extraction workload, I'd suspect that we'd see that the results would reflect Dan at closer to 15-20%--and again it's because we're consistently in the office.

I realize that inspections and other field work is an important job and is work that needs to be done, but I think it's foolish if we continue to allow field and open days to continue as 40-60% of the work week for inspectors, especially when we have a combination of inspectors using their vacation primarily on counter days and never using their open days to work a full day in the office.

With everything going on—Town Opt out, Chapter 10 rewrite, Chapter 11 rewrite, mineral extraction, losing the 5th inspector, it is critical that everyone is bringing their A-game and if we are to continue operating on a shoestring staff, we need to make sure we have the best staff available.

Some suggestions as we move forward:

- Balance the workload over the entire year by overstaffing the counter with inspectors during the building-season, less during the non-building season to follow up on permit inspections.
- Eliminate “open days” from the schedule. Assign all inspectors to the counter except on field day. Even when we have 3 counter staff, there has been a need for the ZA or AZA to help out, it would also help cover the lunch hour and breaks.
- Assign objective projects with measurable completion expectations (Scanning, Database error correction, CUP/ Rezone map review, address review, cross training)
- Use each AZA once per week to provide counter coverage which would allow an extra field day to an inspector on a rotating basis.
- Develop a “use it or lose it” type system for the rotating field day or tie it directly to how many counter shifts were actually worked.

I sure others have ideas on how best to make this work, so hopefully we can get together to continue the discussion this Spring.

Hans



Hans Hilbert
Dane County
Assistant Zoning Administrator

Primary Contact for:
Shoreland, Wetland, & Floodplain Zoning
Board of Adjustment
608.266.4993

hilbert.hans@countyofdane.com
www.countyofdane.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this email including attachments is intended for the specific delivery to and use by the individual(s) to whom it is addressed, and includes information which should be considered as private and confidential. Any review, retransmission, dissemination, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please reply to the sender immediately and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system. Thank you.

2016											Percent
Row Labels	Permit Type									Grand Total	
	DCPCUP	DCPFAR	DCPFLO	DCPPAR	DCPREZ	DCPSHL	DCPVAR	DCPWTR	DCPZP	Grand Total	
AMA1	4				2				3	9	0.8%
DJE1	6			6	8				58	78	6.9%
HJH3	5		20		23	90	6	4	119	267	23.8%
PMK2	6	2			24				120	152	13.5%
RLB	6				17				138	161	14.3%
RWL1	1				8	1	1		38	49	4.4%
SCW1	2				20	1			113	136	12.1%
SJW3	3				10	1			46	60	5.3%
SSA1	4				36	4			167	211	18.8%
Grand Total	37	2	20	6	148	97	7	4	802	1123	100%

2015											Percent
Row Labels	Permit Type									Grand Total	
	DCPCUP	DCPFAR	DCPFLO	DCPPAR	DCPREZ	DCPSHL	DCPVAR	DCPWTR	DCPZP	Grand Total	
AMA1	1				2					3	0.2%
DJE1	3			11	6				32	52	4.0%
HJH3	7		10	1	13	84	7	2	113	237	18.3%
PMK2	3	8			22	2			161	196	15.2%
RLB	2				17				114	133	10.3%
RWL1	2				2				10	14	1.1%
SCW1	8				27	3			151	189	14.6%
SJW3	2				20	2			208	232	17.9%
SSA1	3		1		25	7			201	237	18.3%
Grand Total	31	8	11	12	134	98	7	2	990	1293	100%

2014											Percent
Row Labels	Permit Type									Grand Total	
	DCPCUP	DCPFAR	DCPFLO	DCPPAR	DCPREZ	DCPSHL	DCPVAR	DCPWTR	DCPZP	Grand Total	
AMA1	1				1					2	0.2%
DJE1	3			17	6				15	41	3.2%
HJH3	3		8		13	88	14	4	96	226	17.5%
KKP1				1						1	0.1%
PMK2	9	14		1	14	1			143	182	14.1%
RLB	3				20				147	170	13.2%
RWL1	1				3				9	13	1.0%
SCW1	9				25	3	2		158	197	15.3%
SJW3	5				29	1			195	230	17.8%
SSA1	8		2		52	2			163	227	17.6%
Grand Total	42	14	10	19	163	95	16	4	926	1289	100.0%

Workload summary

	2014	2015	2016
Everson	3%	4%	7%
Hilbert	18%	18%	24%
Klinkner	14%	15%	14%
Bartlett	13%	10%	14%
Lane	1%	1%	4%
Widish	15%	15%	12%
Sauer	18%	18%	5%
Schroekenthaler	18%	18%	19%

2016

User	ZPs issued	%
Schroecker	167	21%
Bartlett	138	17%
Klinkner	120	15%
Hilbert	119	15%
Widish	113	14%
Everson	58	7%
Sauer	46	6%
Lane	38	5%
Allan	3	0%
Grand Total:	802	

2015

User	ZPs Issued	%
Sauer	208	21%
Schroecker	201	20%
Klinkner	161	16%
Widish	151	15%
Bartlett	114	12%
Hilbert	113	11%
Everson	32	3%
Lane	10	1%
Grand Total:	990	

2014

User	ZPs Issued	%
Sauer	194	21%
Schroekthaler	163	18%
Widish	158	17%
Bartlett	147	16%
Klinkner	143	15%
Hilbert	96	10%
Everson	15	2%
Lane	9	1%
Grand Total	925	

Summary

User	2014	2015	2016
Bartlett	16%	12%	17%
Everson	2%	3%	7%
Hilbert	10%	11%	15%
Klinkner	15%	16%	15%
Lane	1%	1%	5%
Sauer	21%	21%	6%
Schroekenthaler	18%	20%	21%
Widish	17%	15%	14%