Livable Sustainable Neighborhoods Initiative

6 Month Assessment

Assessment and Progress Report

INTERIM CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

AND CORPORATION COUNSEL

Saundra Kee Borges, Esq.

10 September 2012

Hartford, Connecticut

Pedro E. Segarra
Mayor

September 10, 2012

When I announced the Livable and Sustainable Neighborhoods Initiative to the public in June 2011, I expected City departments would work as a team to bring change to Hartford. LSNI staff reported steady progress and, indeed, the program was a success in many respects. Credible and accountable processes were developed and implemented to arrest and where possible reverse the spread of blight. Owners of blighted properties were warned and educated in the standards the community expected them to maintain. Owners repaired their properties or were cited and fined. The message went out that Hartford was serious. LSNI staff followed through and the program expended to include health nuisances, emergency clean ups, and incentives to aid hardship cases fund repairs. In those respects LSNI was a success and will continue to be a success going forward.

Admittedly there were also disappointments. The long-standing isolation of some City departments continues to present challenges to City managers, but those challenges are not unusual in a new program and are being worked through as LSNI develops. Accountability remains a principal tenet of my vision for Hartford and the draft report prepared by LSNI staff and leaked to the press demonstrated that my expectations have taken hold. I was disappointed to learn that some of the stagnation of government-past lingers and that the perpetuation of this disconnect between departments was rooted in the managerial deficiencies of some of the professional staff upon whom I relied to implement my vision. I was disturbed by those revelations, and directed senior managers to review those concerns, respond decisively, and initiate change that would achieve my goal of a unified City government and an effective LSNI.

LSNI is new and innovative. As with any new program, there are bound to be challenges to which City managers must respond. LSNI has met and responded to a great many challenges, but the work is far from over. Hartford is a large City, and the problem of blight and urban decay is complex. There will be more challenges. And when they arise, my pledge to the City is that we will meet those challenges, resolve them, and move forward.

Pedro E. Segarra
Mayor

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2

LIVABLE & SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBORHOODS INITIATIVE 4

Vision and Concept 4

Program Organization 5

Program Strategy and Methods 6

Performance Review and Assessment 7

- LSNI Team Report 9
- Program Staffing and Personnel Management 10
- Parallel Initiatives Supporting LSNI 11
  - Hartford Police Department Quality of Life Teams. 12
  - LSNI Response to Litter, Graffiti and Illegal Dumping. 12
  - Coordination of Health and Human Service Nuisance Abatement. 13
  - Neighborhood Initiative Crew Clean Ups. 13
  - Housing Division Rehabilitation Funding. 14
  - Neighborhood Initiative Crew Clean Up and Billing Errors. 16
- Information Management 18
- Legislative Initiatives 18

PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS AND ENHANCEMENTS 20

CONCLUSION 22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Livable & Sustainable Neighborhoods Initiative (commonly referred to as the LSNI"), announced by Mayor Pedro E. Segarra in June 2011, tasked City officials to restore and revitalize Hartford's neighborhoods, in part, through targeted enforcement of property maintenance standards. The Mayor's vision of a "Livable and Sustainable" community directed the resources of City government to address four principal tasks: (1) create and implement an effective Blight Strike Force to combat and where possible reverse the adverse effects of urban decay and property blight, (2) promote infrastructure improvements and community development projects, (3) realign City programs to achieve the Mayor's vision, and (4) reliably and verifiably measure performance toward achieving the vision. As part of the initiative, City managers established a "Blight Strike Force" to pursue aggressive code enforcement utilizing dedicated staff and partnering that staff with property owners and community leaders to identify blighted conditions. Once identified, the Blight Strike Force would pursue enforcement of the City's Anti-Blight Ordinance (ABO) until each blighted property was remediated. Where enforcement was resisted or ineffective, properties would be acquired through foreclosure of tax and ABO liens, and thereafter sold to responsible owners and rehabilitated. Those properties that were unsalvageable would be demolished.

LSNI managers determined that the design and implementation of an effective enforcement program required the refashioning of inter-departmental priorities, strategies and resources among multiple, heretofore independent, City Departments into a unified task-specific enforcement team. As the Blight Strike Force concept developed, program staff created administrative structures to better coordinate the inter-departmental response to blight conditions and identified and replaced outdated and ineffective processes and procedures that stymied

government efforts to respond to constituent concerns and complaints with timely, efficient and verifiable internal processes, providing more effective management and accountability. LSIN replaced *ad hoc* and poorly defined enforcement strategies with orderly, standardized, and well-considered procedures aimed at encouraging compliance by property owners and responding firmly and decisively to non-compliance.

Challenges experienced in the first six (6) months of the program identified a number of communication, staff management and leadership, organizational, systemic and infrastructure modifications that managers considered and either have implemented or are preparing to implement to enhance program operation and efficiency. In addition, legislation proposed to the City Council by the Mayor will shift the costs of the program away from innocent taxpayers and onto the properties that are the source of blight and urban decay, providing dedicated funding for the next phase of LSNI which will require that the City take control of blighted properties that have not responded to ABO enforcement, and then maintain and dispose of those properties. LSNI continues to evolve in response to the dynamics of ABO enforcement and provides a viable, accountable and efficient process for blight control and eradiation.

LIVABLE & SUSTAINABLE NEIGHBORHOODS INITIATIVE

Vision and Concept

The purpose of the Livable & Sustainable Neighborhoods Initiative (LSNI) is to improve Hartford's neighborhoods by ensuring resources are used efficiently, the carrying capacity of infrastructure is not exceeded, diversity is treasured, citizens are engaged and involved and the local economy is vibrant.

Hon. Pedro E. Segarra
June 22, 2011

The Livable and Sustainable Neighborhoods Initiative (LSNI), first announced by Mayor Segarra in June 2011, envisions a comprehensive plan to invest City resources in a targeted and coordinated program aimed at arresting urban blight and decay and restoring the vibrancy of Hartford's business and residential communities. Drawing upon Hartford's earlier successes in eradicating blighted buildings and property conditions, the Mayor proposed an innovative, comprehensive strategy to combat blight and urban decay through intensified enforcement of the City's Anti-Blight Ordinance, Chapter 9 of the Code of the City of Hartford, Article V, Sections 91 through 9-98B, adopted by the Common Council July 13, 2009 (ORD 28-09) (hereinafter referred to as ABO). LSNI managers were charged to respond to three principal goals: (1) manage and coordinate the enforcement of the anti-blight ordinance, (2) engender a new level of efficiency, cooperation, and accountability within and among City departments responsible for enforcing local, state and federal laws, and (3) ensure that all property owners maintain their property at publically acceptable minimal standards reflecting positively on the public perception of Hartford as a safe, sanitary, secure, diverse, livable, and vibrant community.

Program Organization

Staff from Development Services (Licenses & Inspections and Housing and Property Management) teamed with staff from the Health and Human Services, the Police and Fire departments and the Corporation Counsel's office to form four teams, each assigned to one of four enforcement districts, North, South, West and Central, managed by one of four LSNI district captains. Between July and December 2011, L&I surveyed the entire City to identify blighted and vacant properties. Input was also solicited from neighborhood associations and constituents. LSNI teams began training in December 2011, overseen by the Corporation Counsel and COO's offices. Hearing officers were hired and trained by the Corporation Counsel's staff and prepared to respond to constituent appeals from enforcement activities. Teams were dispatched into the community beginning in January, 2012. Day to day responsibility for coordinating enforcement activities in the field was assigned to the district captains.

The administration established a reporting structure designed to keep managers informed of the progress of the initiative. LSNI district captains reported daily to the program administrator within the COO's office. The COO and Corporation Counsel met regularly with the program administrator, district captains and Corporation Counsel. Special Counsels met bi-weekly with LSNI staff to review the program and define program priorities. Informal updates on enforcement activities were transmitted through the program administrator and district captains individually to the program administrator, the Deputy Corporation Counsel and the Corporation Counsel as needed. Within the Corporation Counsel's office, two Special Counsel and the Deputy Corporation Counsel were assigned to support and provide legal advice to the program staff and to defend appeals filed by aggrieved property owners. LSNI staff reported monthly at the Mayor's Neighborhood Stat meeting with additional quarterly progress meetings

conducted by LSNI staff with the City's neighborhood associations to ensure the continued support and participation of the public.

Program Strategy and Methods

After considering various enforcement strategies and analyzing the enforcement mechanisms available to LSNI under the ABO and other provisions of state and City law, LSNI managers settled upon a strategy that initiated enforcement encouraging compliance and providing education prior to initiating more coercive enforcement tools. This "carrot and stick" approach, as it was characterized by LSNI managers, initiated contact with potential violators by alerting property owners of specific violations, providing education concerning the property maintenance obligations required by local and state law, notice of the consequences of continued violation of the ABO and property maintenance standards, and an offering opportunity to work cooperatively with neighborhood leaders and city officials in correcting the violations before pursuing punitive measures. Under this plan, statutory enforcement mechanisms leading to the imposition of fines would be initiated only after reasonable effort to secure compliance through less coercive efforts failed.

LSNI managers formulated a procedure with specified target action periods and enforcement activities to control and regulate the enforcement process. *See Appendix 1.* Template letters and violation notices were prepared and vetted by LSNI managers and Corporation Counsel staff for use by field enforcement personnel. The process was designed to limit the exercise of discretion by LSNI staff and to provide uniformity and predictability.

The City's information management system (MUNIS) was prepared to accept and manage information generated by enforcement activities and all LSNI staff was trained in the use of the MUNIS software.

A defined list of properties was selected from the blighted property lists prepared by staff and neighborhood leaders and assigned to LSNI captains and staff for the first of several rounds of enforcement. These initial enforcement efforts were designed to aid LSNI staff and managers in evaluating and refining the process, paperwork, and procedures. After completing several tests, the LSNI procedures were fully implemented.

Hearing officers were designated and trained by the Corporation Counsel staff to respond to appeals from property owner's cited and fined for ABO violations. LSNI enforcement staff were designated and prepared to present evidence at those hearings and justify their enforcement activities and decisions.

Performance Review and Assessment

Overall, LSNI has been successful in identifying blighted properties, particularly in response to blighted property complaints from community leaders and constituents. In the initial six (6) month period from roll-out to the current level of operations, LSNI has generated a high volume of inspections, abatements, citations and improvement in property maintenance compliance. As of August 30, 2012, LSNI enforcement activity directed at 65 properties has resulted in the assessment of fines totaling $2,598,322.00 and has collected approximately $30,000.00 in fines. The "carrot and stick" strategy realized significant compliance without the need to initiate formal enforcement activity. Of 190 preliminary anti-blight letters sent by LSNI staff at the beginning of the program, 32 property owners responded voluntarily and abated the property violations; a 16.75% voluntary compliance rate. Twenty property owners, roughly 10%, appealed citations issued when compliance could not be achieved through preliminary warnings and negotiation. The overwhelming majority of the citation hearings resulted in a favorable

decision for the City or abatement of the violations[1]. Only one of the 20 hearings has been appealed to the Courts.

LSNI also produced less measureable results that are nonetheless significant. LSNI's influence has reached property-owners who, although not directly targeted for enforcement, have responded to the City's renewed emphasis on property maintenance and have voluntarily initiated remediation of potential violations before being subject to enforcement activity.

LSNI's most successful strategy is a simple one, *follow-through*! Nothing has produced more results than the ability of LSNI team members to follow a complaint from the initial complaint to resolution. The second most successful strategy adopted by LSNI has been notifying lienholders that the assets securing their liens are blighted and subject to enforcement activity. Utilizing the process authorized by C.G.S. 7-148gg, the City systematically notifies banks, mortgage companies, and other interested parties of ABO violations and enforcement activity resulting in numerous lienholders proactively abating property maintenance violations to protect their interest or in some cases initiating their own enforcement actions against property owners. In effect, the LSNI team has been able to exponentially increase its effectiveness in responding to blight by recruiting lienholders as allies in the ABO enforcement process.

Neighborhood partners have responded enthusiastically to the initial successes of LSNI in obtaining ABO compliance and improvement in compliance with property maintenance standards. Compliance statistics for LSNI enforcement efforts are detailed in *Appendix 2*. As of the date of this report, cumulative fines assessed against targeted properties exceeds $2,000,000.00, which fines will continue to increase until the fines are paid (an unlikely event),

[1] Initially appeals were prosecuted by the LSNI field staff that issued the citations. The Corporation Counsel changed the process and directed that the appeals be prosecuted by City attorneys to maintain better oversight of the process.

the properties are either remediated or the City takes control of the properties through foreclosure of its resulting liens.

LSNI Team Report

In the course of preparing this report, the LSNI team, consisting of the four district captains and one of two special counsel assigned to the program prepared a draft report to be issued by the Chief Operating Officer in which they detailed what they considered the successes and failures or the program during its first six (6) months. The team report, leaked without authorization from City leaders to the media in advance of the completion of the official report, was highly critical of certain department heads and supervisors and expressed with candor the frustrations LSNI staff experienced in their dealings with other departments and with their own immediate supervisors.

The draft report credibly details the positive changes brought about by the program, including (1) City residents and NRZs have responded positively overall to LSNI's efforts to enforce the Anti-blight Ordinance; (2) daily interaction with residents and NRZs has increased the effectiveness of LSNI and other code enforcement efforts which affect quality of life; (3) interdepartmental communication has increased because of LSNI efforts to coordinate the City's response to complaints; (4) that there is still a need for improving coordination between all departments in order to streamline City responses and outcomes. In dealing with other departments, the LSNI team reported that (1) City departments outside of LSNI continue to exhibit fiefdom-like cultures that create difficulties in coordinating City response to constituent concerns; (2) City departments have failed to supervise and train employees resulting in lackluster performance, nonperformance, and lack of ownership of duties, responsibilities, and outcomes; (3) some City managers are in need of professional leadership training in order to effectively manage their subordinates (The status quo creates confusion resulting in paralysis at

the employee level); and (4) there exist serious deficiencies at the Development Services Department, DPW and HHS that require further inquiry and investigation.

The draft report provides an honest and candid assessment by the LSNI team and is credible to the extent that it reflects the perceptions and frustrations of the team members. However, the perceptions of the LSNI team members, although credible and valuable to program managers, reflect the limitations of the knowledge and experience of the authors in addressing personnel management in a civil service, largely unionized, workforce. Thus, while the frustrations of the authors may be valid in some cases, their perception of the cause of the frustration does not reflect an experienced and objective assessment of what they characterize as managerial failures. Working within the collective bargaining and civil service limitations confronting department heads, many of the personnel failures reflected in the report were timely and are being effectively addressed. To the extent the concerns expressed in the draft report have been confirmed and are not being timely addressed, the Mayor's senior staff has formulated and implemented an appropriate response which is detailed in this report.

Program Staffing and Personnel Management

In the course of the first six (6) months of the LSNI, it became clear to program managers that, within the LSNI team itself, certain staff assignments were not producing the desired program results and needed to be reevaluated.[2] The principal concern driving the reevaluation by senior managers focused on the "fit" of staff personalities to duty assignments and responsibilities in addition to the overall qualifications of the staff members themselves. In order to maintain the momentum of the program, on the recommendation of the COO, the Mayor reassigned the assistant to the COO to the department of Development Services, a position

[2] The HHS inspector described as resisting changes LSNI and HHS managers initiated concerning health nuisances in the draft LSNI staff report ultimately resigned.

perceived to be better suited to his skills and experience. As this reassignment was being implemented, one district captain resigned for health reasons, a second announced his intention to resign to relocate with his family, and a third resigned to pursue new professional opportunities following his graduation from law school. COO David Panagore resigned effective September 14, 2012. These reassignments and resignations will necessitate further reevaluation of the staffing needs of LSNI and a search for suitable personnel.

Within the office of the Corporation Counsel, as part of the 2012/2013 budget preparation, additional staff was added to accommodate increased legal needs of LSNI. An additional full time special counsel and a part-time paralegal position were added and filled, providing two full time attorneys and a part-time paralegal to support the LSNI's enforcement activities and the anticipated need to foreclose LSNI liens and take control of blighted properties that resisted earlier enforcement efforts.

Parallel Initiatives Supporting LSNI

In addition to the enforcement efforts of LSNI, other City departments initiated parallel community based enforcement programs combatting conditions that either contribute to blight or exacerbate the effects of blight on the City's neighborhoods. Other departments teamed with LSNI or the work of LSNI and another department intersected and required cooperative effort or response.

In these expansions of the Mayor's vision, there were two areas where LSNI expansion and association with tasks assigned to other departments did not produced acceptable results, prompting program managers to inquire further into the circumstances surrounding the program failures and, in at least one case, prompting specific remedial action. The first involved incentive funding for housing rehabilitation suggested by LSNI to financially challenged property owners

to assist in remediating blighted conditions. The second involved billing process errors for property cleanups performed by the LSNI Neighborhood Initiative Crew. Both program deficiencies are under review and in the case of the billing errors failure an automated work order process is under design to remove human factors and data exchange inefficiencies from the process and provide accountability and greater efficiency. These two deficiency areas are addressed in in detailed subsequently in this report at pages 14-18.

Hartford Police Department Quality of Life Teams.

Throughout July and August 2012, the Hartford Police Department dispatched "Quality of Life Teams" to various locations to respond to community concerns and provide a safe atmosphere within the City. The teams, comprised of redeployed School Resource Officers and other available officers were tasked to enforce city ordinances that impact quality of life such as excessive noise, public drinking, littering, loitering and parking violations and to make "one on one" contact with City residents.

LSNI Response to Litter, Graffiti and Illegal Dumping.

Although LSNI original mandate was to enforce community maintenance standards at fixed, privately owned property, staff identified various transitory activities that exacerbated the effects of property blight and expanded City efforts to respond to those additional blight conditions. Specifically, the LSNI team directed attention toward controlling and reducing graffiti and litter. Anti-graffiti legislation was studied and prepared by team members and is currently being reviewed by supervisors. To respond to littering the City acquired and is placing green technology (solar powered) "big-belly" trash and recyclable compactors at targeted locations throughout the City. To control illegal dumping, LSNI staff proposed and is preparing to implement video surveillance to aid in identifying persons responsible for illegal dumping and to provide deterrence.

Coordination of Health and Human Service Nuisance Abatement.

LSNI also expanded its work with other departments in their mission to control conditions contributing to blight. In the summer and fall of 2011, attorneys from the Corporation Counsel's Office conducted training sessions with health inspectors and their supervisors from the Health and Human Services Agency. The goal of the training was to modify work practices to improve efficiency and the reliability of citation and nuisance abatement efforts. A review of HHS processes and records demonstrated that the work-product included lack of proper documentation for inspections, untimely follow-up inspections, lack of evidence to substantiate health citations, improper notice to owners, and improper citations being issued. As a result of such procedural failure, HHS prosecutions were failing at hearing. After a period of adjustment, including the resignation of a resistant inspector, the modifications were fully implemented and have improved the efficiency and viability of HHS nuisance abatement activities. New legislation intended to clarify and streamline procedures for HHS removal of nuisance, abandoned motor vehicles has been proposed to the Common Council and is presently under consideration.

Neighborhood Initiative Crew Clean Ups.

In addition to implementing changes in enforcement processes and strategies, LSNI pursued hands-on removal of blight through its Neighborhood Initiative Crews. Building upon the Mayor's vision of promoting livable and sustainable neighborhoods, LSNI established dedicated DPW crews to handle the beautification efforts in the city by district. Neighborhood Initiative Crews responded to overlooked beautification concerns within the neighborhoods, removing debris, trash, overgrown vegetation and in some cases abating private property conditions. The crews collaborate with city departments such the Department of Health and Parks & Recreation and will program partners such as Community Court and Neighborhood NRZs to complete more complex initiatives within the communities. LSNI efforts to recover the

costs of NIC abatement of private property conditions revealed inefficiencies in the billing systems of the City, discussed at pages 16-18.

Housing Division Rehabilitation Funding.

LSNI managers explored offering assistance to property owners seeking to comply with the ordinance but financially unable to achieve compliance. The Housing Division's Director and Program Manager suggested that existing government programs were available to assist property owners pay for necessary repairs. Under the direction of the COO, the Corporation Counsel's Office included references to City sponsored programs available to provide funding for necessary repairs in the Preliminary Anti-blight Ordinance Letter ("PABOL"). The PABOL indicated that informational sessions concerning these programs were being provided by the City's Housing Division.

LSNI staff report that they researched the funding opportunities proposed by the Housing Division and determined that the programs did not functionally exist beyond the planning stages and could not confirm that the programs were funded adequately to offer assistance to property owners. It was unclear that the programs had any funds at all. These findings and concerns were raised by both attorneys at the Anti-blight Committee meetings. However Housing Division's staff assured that the programs were funded and would be ready to proceed.

LSNI staff report that they received repeated complaints from property owners indicating that their efforts to contact the Housing Division went unanswered. LSNI staff made phone calls to the posted Housing Division numbers referenced in the PABOL and confirmed that messages to that number went unanswered[3]. The LSNI staff and Corporation Counsel attorneys reported concerns to their supervisors. Multiple meetings were arranged between the ACOO and

[3] The Mayor personally made a call to the Housing Division contact number and his call too went unanswered.

the Housing Division but the Housing Division has uniformly failed to provide information as to what if anything was being accomplished at their informational sessions.

Of 190 property owners served with preliminary notices in the first six months of the program, LSNI was unable to confirm that any of those property owners was receiving funding assistance from the Housing Division. The single property owner pushed through the process by LSNI members declined to continue the application process after months of waiting for financial assistance.

The Housing Division Director disputes the LSNI report and indicates the funding programs he suggested are long standing programs for housing rehabilitation with income restrictions and established application and review processes. He indicates that he dedicated 80% of his professional staff (4 of 5) to work with LSNI and was prepared to attend planning meetings only to be told by LSNI managers that his attendance was not necessary.

City managers continue to investigate this failure of the LSNI and Housing Division funding programs to effectively integrate. The factual dispute between the LSNI report and Housing's response emphasizes the need to move beyond searching out blame for the failure and focus instead on modifying the program to achieve the desired end. Providing funding assistance to financially stressed property owners is an opportunity for the City to encourage compliance with the ABO and promote positive working relationships with financially struggling property owners. The lack of response by Housing Division staff to contacts initiated to explore such funding opportunities is particularly troubling and will be addressed by City managers as the program continues to develop with the goal being to extend the available Housing Division funding programs to financially stressed property owners to assist them in complying with property maintenance standards wherever possible.

Neighborhood Initiative Crew Clean Up and Billing Errors.

As previously reported, LSNI's jurisdiction expanded to include health nuisance abatements ("clean-ups"). Prior to the formation of LSNI, the Health and Human Services Department managed health nuisance abatements. The process depended on inspectors properly noticing and citing property owners. Where the owner failed or refused to respond to the notice, the City conducted a "clean-up" using Department of Public Works (DPW) crews after the time established by notice for the owner to respond had expired. After the abatement was completed, the property owner was billed for the cost of the "clean up", thus recovering the taxpayer cost incurred to maintain the private property. The practice before LSNI required the participation of two departments. DPW calculated the cost of the abatement (including overhead, wages, fringe benefits and disposal charges) and forwarded that cost assessment to Licenses and Inspections, which would then lien the property for the cost of the clean up within the statutory thirty (30) day period. Inefficiencies in the process resulted in the invalidation of many liens filed after the thirty (30) day period making them invalid. Additionally, even liens that were properly recorded were legally subordinate to other lienholders in line of priority. These practices rendered it nearly impossible for the City to recoup the costs associated with private property nuisance abatements.

After review by City attorneys, in the fall of 2011, a policy was adopted that clean-up bills would be certified to the real-property taxes of the subject property pursuant to C.G.S. 12-169b. That statute allows municipalities that incur expense in abating health and safety code violations to certify the expenses to the property taxes for that current tax year. The certification process allows the City to recover its expenses through the Tax Collector's Office and allows the City to also gain priority over any subsequent lien issued, the expenses becoming part of the tax

obligation of the property. Instead of waiting for years to possibly recover the funds, the statute empowers the City to collect them in the current tax year.

In January 2012, the LSNI team began to implement the enforcement of the Anti-Blight Ordinance and began the coordination of the health nuisance abatements. In total from late January 2012 through early June 2012, the LSNI Clean-City Crews abated 37 properties based on health nuisance violations. On March 7, 2012, the process for certifying clean-up invoices to the property taxes was finalized. Under the new procedure, the timely processing of abatement invoices remained critical, with the end date for filing established based on the date when the tax collector was required to generate the final tax bill for the property.

Although the various City officials and staff involved in the billing process blame one another for the failure, the 37 nuisance clean ups performed in the first six months of LSNI were not properly invoiced or billed and therefore the costs of those abatements could not be recovered. Regardless of who might be at fault, two things are apparent. First and foremost, blighted property conditions rising to the level of a health nuisance prompted decisive action and the nuisance was removed, protecting the health and safety of the community. Second, the system had far too many variables, was unnecessarily inefficient, and presented far too many opportunities for failure. The system failed and in its failure demonstrated the need for greater uniformity and less reliance personnel resources.

As a result, a new work order processing protocol is under development combining the City's 311 and MUNIS systems, removing much of the human element from the process of receiving, assigning and then billing for work order services provided by various City departments. Work orders will now be communicated directly through the 311 system to the responsible department. The department assigned the work order will complete the work

assignment, report its activities into MUNIS, detail the costs associated with the work in MUNIS, and MUNIS will then generate the appropriate invoices. Billing and financial accounting procedures will be automated and reports of billable or lienable work will be forwarded to the appropriate departments with greater efficiency, reliability and within the time frames established by the program staff. The automated process will minimize human error and provide enhanced accountability. If the system fails, there will be a traceable record to demonstrate where the failure occurred. Managers will be able to identify the source of the error immediately and take appropriate remedial action.

Information Management

Much of the LSNI's initial enforcement was premised on a study of vacant properties conducted by Licenses and Inspections in the fall of 2011. During that study, City workers canvassed the entire City and compiled a list of vacant property. During the study conducted by the Blighted Housing Special Assessment Committee in April of 2012, it was determined that significant errors existed in that survey and LSNI re-canvassed the City, finding an additional 500 vacant properties. The reliability of LSNI and inter-departmental efforts to respond to blight and arrest its progress depends heavily on the development, maintenance and exchange of reliable, up-to-date information about property conditions existing in the City. City personnel responsible for maintaining and supporting the MUNIS system indicate that the system remains under-utilized by all departments.

Legislative Initiatives

In addition to creating an administrative infrastructure and procedural framework to support the LSNI, the Mayor proposed, with the support of the Common Council, the appointment of committee pursuant to C.G.S. §7-148ff, consisting of 6 City residents, including one landlord, and 7 City staff, to study and report on the advisability of a special assessment on

blighted housing (Blighted Properties Special Assessment Committee). *See Hartford City Code Sec. 9-98(C) (Ord. 2-12)*. LSNI staff teamed with the Committee to complete a comprehensive analysis of the LSNI and reviewed the status of blight enforcement activities undertaken during the first four months of 2011, finding that the "organizational structure appears . . .to be meeting (if not exceeding) expectations and adequate to administer and enforce the existing [Anti-Blight Ordinance]". The Committee further endorsed the progress of the LSNI noting that "LSNI staff, working cooperatively with community leaders, HART, NRZ's, public safety departments, Licensing and Inspections, and the Corporation Counsel's Office, Housing and Health Departments, [had achieved], in just the past five (5) months, steady and growing success in obtaining owner cooperation in remediating blighted properties". Notably, in its report to the Mayor and Common Council, the Committee observed that

> City departments are developing strategies to reliably track data and costs associated with blighted properties . . . lack of data tracking related to vacant, abandoned and blighted structures is common throughout the country and presents a particularly difficult challenge for municipal officials. Efforts to develop efficient and reliable information gathering, recordation, maintenance and exchange resources within and between the involved departments is on-going and is viewed by the Committee as a critical component of a successful Anti-Blight program.

After careful review, the Committee recommended the implementation of a Blighted Property Special Assessment to reallocate the cost-burdens of the LSNI program to property owners whose properties burdened the community and redoubled efforts to develop data collection, management and exchange resources to more effectively identify and direct government resources to respond to ever-changing urban decay and blight conditions throughout the City.

PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS AND ENHANCEMENTS

Despite its overall success, LSNI has experienced challenges necessitating a reevaluation of staff performance and assignments, an intensified emphasis on reliable and comprehensive development and sharing of relevant data and information by all City departments, and a restructuring of inter-departmental management to ensure centralized control of the program and uniform support for the Mayor's vision.

As part of the present evaluation and following the resignation or reassignment of several key LSNI staff, personnel resources are being further evaluated. Vacancies within the LSNI staff will need to be filled with candidates possessing the knowledge, initiative and leadership skills necessary for the program to continue with the same efficiency. Oversight of the program will continue to be the responsibility of the COO with assistance from the staff of the Corporation Counsel.

In addition to expanding LSNI priorities to the work of other departments, LSNI will build upon the education and non-punitive compliance encouragement philosophy, integrating the LSNI activities with providing incentives and assistance to property owners through the programming of the Housing Division. The funding sources suggested but as yet unconfirmed by the Housing Division will be investigated to determine the extent of available funding and, once funding is identified, establishing a reliable process to release such funds to financially challenged property owners will be emphasized and implemented.

The most significant areas of program adjustment going forward will involve development of adequate funding resources to support the continuation and enhancement of the program, integration and refinement of internal processes for identifying blighted property and maintaining current information, development of reliable property billing and assessment

procedures, and the establishment of clearly defined priorities for securing control and subsequent management of blighted properties that fail to respond to City enforcement.

The Mayor, based on the analysis and recommendations of the Blighted Housing Special Assessment Committee, has proposed that the Council adopt legislation apportioning the costs of LSNI and collateral costs to the owners of blighted and abandoned housing in the form of a special assessment. That legislation is designed to provide dedicated funding for LSNI and shift the cost of services associated with ABO enforcement onto the properties driving those costs. The Committee also recommended that LSNI enhance and intensify its efforts to identify blighted and vacant property and maintain and exchange current property condition and enforcement information, efforts which the Mayor supports and which LSNI staff have and will continue to design utilizing the MUNIS software, starting with the new 311/MUNIS based work order process.

All City departments must assist in identifying blighted properties and maintaining the accuracy of City records. Police and Fire Department personnel working throughout the City must be encouraged to report vacant properties, graffiti and other blight conditions through the work order and MUNIS system. LSNI staff must reach out to other sources of information and develop relationships with utilities and the US Postal Service to maintain accurate records of property conditions and property vacancies. LSNI must regularly review the records of the City Clerk to ensure that vacant property registrations are reflected in MUNIS and ensure that the vacant property registration requirements of the ABO are enforced.

Finally, the percentage of property owners issued with ABO citations is significant. Of 190 properties identified and warned at the start of LSNI, sixty-five (65), roughly 34%, resisted City efforts and are facing foreclosure of ABO liens. In order to maintain the momentum and

credibility of LSNI enforcement efforts, the City will be forced to take control of many of these properties, maintain them, and ultimately assume responsibility for disposing of these properties through demolition or sale. Assuming control of these properties will increase the financial drain on the program and City resources. The proposed special assessment is designed to provide financing for property control, maintenance and disposition, but processes, procedures, priorities and strategies will need to be designed to move the program into this next phase. And while that next phase is being designed and implemented, LSNI must continue in the areas where it has succeeded to date. LSNI staff must continue to work with other departments to constantly develop and update relevant information, respond to blighted properties and nuisance conditions, and pursue enforcement activities.

CONCLUSION

As the LSNI approaches its first anniversary, staff resources have been directed to emphasize integrating the City's MUNIS management programming with the data collection, investigatory and enforcement processes developed during the first six (6) months of the program. The City's 311 and MUNIS systems are being adjusted to receive, assign, record and provide automated financial accounting of work order requests and assignments. Commencing October 1, the new 311/MUNIS based work order system will apply a uniform and automated computer process for receiving work order requests, assigning work order responses, recording and associating data with specific properties and work orders, and generating billing invoices, dispensing with a cumbersome manual paper-based system. The new computerized system will produce much needed efficiency, minimizing the opportunities for human error, reducing the time burden on participating departments, and providing greater accountability when and if processes fail.

To enhance the tools available for enforcement, legislation has been proposed to standardize the process for identifying and removing nuisance vehicles by HHS. One of the most significant revelations of the six (6) month trial period has been the development of a better appreciation by City managers of the financial cost of responding to blighted properties both during the initial enforcement of property maintenance standard and, where enforcement efforts fail, continuing the momentum of the program through foreclosure of liens and the resulting cost to the City of securing control, maintaining and ultimately disposing of blighted properties the City is forced to seize. In response, and in preparation for the next stage of the LSNI, the Mayor proposed a blighted housing special assessment reallocating the costs of the LSNI and shifting the financial burdens associated with blighted properties away from the innocent victims of blight and onto property owners who burden City residents and tax governmental resources by failing to maintain and utilize their properties at minimally acceptable community standards.

Finally, following the resignation and reassignment of several members of the LSNI staff, and a period of careful study of various personnel challenges that were reported by LSNI staff in a preliminary draft report, staff resources and departmental priorities are being adjusted to streamline the program, provide more clearly defined leadership and management, and thereby encourage greater inter-departmental support for and participation in LSNI by the various associated departments. The Mayor has reiterated to department heads his commitment to the LSNI program and expressed his expectation that all departments work cooperatively to support and advance his vision of a "Livable and Sustainable" Hartford.

Respectfully submitted,

Saundra Kee Borges, Esq.
INTERIM CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER
And CORPORATION COUNSEL

LSNI Anti-blight Process

The Anti-blight Ordinance requires that two (2) or more of the following violations exist on a property in order to begin enforcement action.

Anti Blight Citable Offenses Municipal Code Sec. 9-91:

1. Exterior windows or doors are broken or missing or are not secured and painted in accordance with Section 9-98(a) of the Hartford Municipal Code;

2. Exterior walls, roofs, stairs, porches, floors or chimneys are damaged, collapsing or deteriorating or permit the interior of the building to be open to the weather;

3. Foundation walls are damaged, collapsing, crumbling or contain open cracks or breaks;

4. Interior walls, stairs, porches, floors, ceilings, support pillars or beams are damaged, collapsing or deteriorating;

5. Exterior additions, including but not limited to canopies, marquees, signs, awnings, fire escapes, standpipes and exhaust ducts, are damaged, collapsing or deteriorating;

6. Fences are, broken, deteriorating to the point of decay, are in otherwise dilapidated condition, or are damaged to the extent that they allow access to the property;

7. Other conditions exist that reflect a level of maintenance which is not in keeping with community standards, including but not limited to graffiti that is clearly visible from the street;

8. The premises are attracting illegal activity as evidenced by multiple felony or misdemeanor arrests on the premises; multiple felony or misdemeanor warrants issued or served to a person residing in the premises;

9. The property is a fire hazard;

10. The property is a factor creating a substantial and unreasonable interference with the reasonable and lawful use and enjoyment of other space within the building or premises or within the neighborhood as documented and reported to the director of licenses and inspections by neighborhood complaints.

11. The property is a menace to the public health, safety, or welfare in its present condition because of rat infestation, overgrown vegetation, trash and garbage, abandoned cars, improper grading, or other factors.

Genesis of the Complaint:

1. Complaints. Complaints may come from the public directly or the NRZs to the ACOOs, through the 311 system, or from an inspector during the course of his or her work.

2. Case Assignment. ACOOs assign cases to LSNI inspectors based on geographic location. If complaint concerns health or building violations then the ACOO refers the proper inspector from each department to conduct an inspection.

3. Prior to conducting an inspection:
   a. Inspector prints property card, which indicates the most recent owner of record and owner's address.

4. Inspector inspects property:
   a. Verifies violation; if no violation is found the case is closed.
   b. If violation is present, continues inspection.
   c. Takes digital pictures – long shot(s) to identify location, close-up shot(s) to identify violations.
   d. Makes an attempt on site to contact the property owner.

5. Problem is severe and immediate threat to public safety: The inspector and supervisor meet to discuss the case and will follow current procedure for referral to property owner and Department of Public Works or appropriate City contractor for clean-up, board-up or other action necessary to make property safe and secure.

6. Inspector case work:
   a. Enters information into computer database, i.e., MUNIS.
   b. Uploads pictures.
   c. Scans "Notice of Violation" into MUNIS.
   d. Verifies property owner's mailing address based on property card.

7. Inspector mails "Notice of Violation".
   a. The inspector prepares file to issue a Notice of Violation.
   b. Notice of Violation requires compliance within thirty (30) days of receipt of the notice.
   c. One Notice of Violation per violation is issued.
   d. Notice of Violation includes detailed information of the specific violation on the property, how to remediate the violations, and a warning that failure to correct the violations will result in fines being issued at $100 per day per violation.
   e. Mails a Notice of Violation to the property owner by certified mail return receipt requested.

f. The original Notice of Violation must also be filed on the land records with the Town Clerk on the same day it is mailed. Notices of Violation may also be posted at the property when applicable.

8. Legal Notice Date. When the certified mail green card is returned signed, the date of signature becomes the legal notice date for the owner. If certified mail is unclaimed and returned undeliverable to the City the legal notice date shall be the date when it is returned undeliverable. If two weeks pass without the confirmation of delivery being returned to the inspector, the inspector shall research the date of the delivery by entering the certified mail tracking number into the United States Postal Service website. The date posted on the USPS website shall be the legal notice date for the owner.

9. Reinspection scheduled. Reinspection is scheduled no sooner than thirty (30) days after the date of delivery, notice date for the owner. Reinspection may be scheduled to confirm property owner's remediation of violations prior to the end of the thirty (30) day period upon request of the owner.

10. Inspector conducts re-inspection.
    a. If the violation(s) have been corrected, the case is closed.
    b. If the violation(s) still exist and time frame for correction has elapsed, (30) days, inspector conducts a re-inspection and takes notes on any continuing violation and new digital pictures. All documents and photos are uploaded into MUNIS.

11. Citation.
    a. Inspector completes citation. One citation per violation is issued.
    b. Enters information into MUNIS:
        1) Reinspection information.
        2) Scan citation into the case file.
        3) Enter new digital pictures.
        4) Draft Notice of Citation which will include:
            a) A listing of the specific violations on the property, how to remediate the violations, the amount of fines, penalties, costs or fees due, and notice of the owner's right to appeal the decision to a citation hearing officer;
            b) Frequency of the fine and how it will be imposed;
            c) The property owner may contest their liability before a citation hearing officer by delivering in person or by mail written notice within ten (10) days upon receipt of the date thereof to the Hearing Administrator;

d) If the property owner does not demand such a hearing, an assessment and judgment shall be entered against them;
e) Instructions on how payment can be made. Payment can be made at the Office of Corporation Counsel by personal check, bank check, or money order.

c. The fine shall be $100 per day and per violation for each day that each violation continues to exist. Such fines shall continue to accrue until the property owner presents evidence that the violation(s) have been remedied to the satisfaction of the inspector.

12. Citation package. The Citation package is sent by certified mail to the property owner; it will include:

a. Notice of Citation. One citation per violation issued.

13. Property owner corrects violation(s) and pays fines, case is closed. **Inspectors must never collect fines!**

14. Property owner is non-responsive - Property owner fails to correct the violation(s), pay fines, or request a hearing within 10 days of receipt of the notice of citation. As a point of clarity, there would be 10 days of fines accrued at this point if the violation was still outstanding.
a. ACOO informs Corporation Counsel of ongoing fines and non-compliance.
b. Hearing Administrator prepares file for submission to the Hearing Officer.
c. The Hearing Officer makes a decision based on a paper review of the case file.
d. If violations are affirmed by the Hearing Officer and default judgment entered, Hearing Administrator mails notice of decision to owner demanding payment of fines.
e. If owner does not pay fine within 30 days, judgment shall be entered in the superior court and a Blight Lien shall be recorded into the land records.

15. Property owner requests hearing within ten (10) days.
a. Hearing Administrator receives hearing request from the property owner.
b. All citations shall be stayed at this point.
c. Hearing Administrator schedules a hearing not less than fifteen (15) days or more than thirty (30) days from the property owner's request. Reasonable requests for postponement by an interested party may be granted.

d. Hearing Administrator sends notice of hearing to property owner and notifies the ACOO and inspector of the hearing date.
e. An attorney from the Corporation Counsel's Office shall present the case on behalf of the City.

16. If property owner has requested a hearing, the inspector and attorney shall meet to review file to include:
    a. File materials.
    b. Inspector testimony
    c. Recommendation to be made to the Hearing Officer

17. Hearing Administrator prepares case file for Hearing Officer; which should contain the following:
    a. Citations
    b. Notice of Violations
    c. Digital pictures that clearly demonstrate the violation(s)

18. Hearing Officer determines property owner is not liable for the violation.
    a. Hearing Administrator drafts Notice of Decision and mails to the property owner and to the supervisor.
    b. Inspector updates MUNIS, closing case.

19. Hearing Officer determines property owner is liable for the violation. Hearing Administrator drafts Notice of Decision and mails to the property owner. The property owner will have thirty (30) days to pay such assessment. Should the owner fail to pay within the thirty (30) day period, the assessment shall be referred to the superior court for entry of judgment and an Anti-blight Lien shall be filed in the Land Records.

LSNI: Accruing Fines from ABO Citations (as of 8/30/12)

65			TIMELINE Total # of Days	Day 0 Day 0	10 Days 10 Days	5 Days 15 Days	5 Days 20 Days									$2,598,322	$29,320	$9,166,805
Full Address	RD	Legal Status	Owner	Prelim Notice Letter	ABO Inspection Date	Notice of Violation Letter	30 Day Inspection for Citation	Appeal Correction Date	Vio Cited	# of Violations Cited	Fines Amount per Day	Accruing Days	Accruing Interest	Accruing Interest Days	Current Date or Stop Date	Total in Fines	Fines Collected	2011 Fair Market Value of Property
544 GARDEN ST	1	Forb.	Wells Fargo Bank	1/13/12	2/6/12	2/23/12	5/10/12	[illegible]	5	1,2,6,7,9	$500	112			8/31/2012	$0		$ 61,000.00
103 EARLE ST	1		Usher, Cassandra D. //	1/13/12	2/6/12	2/23/12	5/10/12		7	1,2,3,5,6,7,9	$700	112			8/31/2012	$78,400		$ 78,600.00
159 CAPEN	1		Mayo-Brown, Sheila	1/13/12	2/6/12	2/23/12	5/10/12		7	1,2,3,5,6,7,9	$700	112			8/31/2012	$78,400		$ 52,700.00
414 GARDEN ST	1		Morgan, Vina T.E.	1/13/12	2/6/12	2/23/12	6/5/12		5	1,2,5,6,7	$500	88			8/31/2012	$44,000		$ 203,000.00
97 WILLIAMS ST	1		Bank New York Trust	1/13/12	2/8/12	2/23/12	5/10/12		7	1,2,3,4,6,7,9	$700	112			8/31/2012	$78,400		$ 21,700.00
280 GARDEN ST	2		Gaddy,Charles Henry	2/7/12	3/5/12	3/12/12	7/13/12		6	1,2,4,5,6,7	$600	49			8/31/2012	$29,400		$ 43,800.00
68 JUDSON	2		Drake, Austin D.	2/7/12	3/5/12	3/12/12	6/12/12		6	1,2,3,5,6,7	$600	80			8/31/2012	$48,000		$ 64,800.00
78 MARTIN	2	Upheld	Vernon Avenue LLC	2/7/12	3/5/12	3/12/12	5/10/12	7/28/12	2	2,4	~~$200~~	~~46~~	1%	34	6/25/2012	$3,752		$ 86,500.00
128 EDGEWOOD	2		McBride, Stephanie Ann	2/7/12	3/5/12	3/12/12	6/4/12		3	1,2,7	$300	88			8/31/2012	$26,400		$ 71,100.00
270 ALBANY AVE	2		Managing Solutions LLC	2/7/12	3/5/12	3/12/12	6/12/12		7	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	$700	80			8/31/2012	$56,000		$ 165,700.00
96 NELSON	2		Hooks, Robert SR	2/7/12	3/5/12	3/12/12	6/4/12		5	1,2,4,6,7	$500	88			8/31/2012	$44,000		$ 78,500.00
86 OAKLAND TER	2		Santhouse, Fay	2/7/12	3/5/12	3/12/12	6/12/12		7	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	$700	80			8/31/2012	$56,000		$ 74,200.00
2 PLINY ST	2		Tinsley, Tyron H	2/7/12	3/5/12	3/12/12	6/5/12		7	1,2,3,5,6,7	$700	87			8/31/2012	$60,900		$ 81,500.00
712 GARDEN ST	3		Morrison, Linval	2/27/12	4/10/12	4/23/12	7/13/12		5	1,2,4,5,7	$500	49			8/31/2012	$24,500		$ 22,600.00
109 ENFIELD ST	3		Quintiliani, Anthony	2/27/12	4/10/12	4/23/12	7/13/12		5	1,2,5,6,7	$500	49			8/31/2012	$24,500		$ 82,700.00
19 OAKLAND TER	3		West, Louis R. // ATFH	2/27/12	4/10/12	4/23/12	6/20/12		6	1,2,3,5,6,7	$600	72			8/31/2012	$43,200		$ 66,300.00
11 JUDSON ST	4		James, Marva	3/6/12	4/20/12	4/27/12	7/13/12		6	1,2,3,4,6,7	$600	49			8/31/2012	$29,400		$ 19,637.00
638 GARDEN ST	4		New Antioch Baptist Church	3/6/12	4/20/12	4/27/12	6/20/12		6	1,2,3,4,5,7	$600	72			8/31/2012	$43,200		$ 147,800.00
48 BROOK ST	4		Coombs, Sharon T.	3/6/12	4/20/12	4/27/12	7/13/12		6	1,2,3,4,6,7	$600	49			8/31/2012	$29,400		$ 16,800.00
83 LOVE LA	4		Shannon, Clifton & Bertha K.	3/6/12	4/23/12	4/27/12	7/13/12		2	1,6	$200	49			8/31/2012	$9,800		$ 139,700.00
710 WINDSOR	4	Upheld	Hartford Rescue Mission Inc.	3/6/12	4/27/12	5/3/12	6/20/12	[illegible]	5	1,2,3,5,7	$100	72	1%		8/31/2012	$11,800		$ 389,700.00
100 WALNUT	4		Morgan, Reed, Edwards, LLC	3/6/12	4/27/12	5/3/12	6/20/12		4	2,5,6,7	$400	72			8/31/2012	$28,800		$ 66,100.00
9 ACTON	4	Upheld	BM Holding II LLC	3/6/12	4/27/12	5/3/12	7/13/12	[illegible]	5	1,2,5,6,7	$500	49	1%		8/31/2012	$24,500		$ 115,900.00
175 TOWER	4		McLean, Alda	3/6/12	4/27/12	5/3/12	6/20/12		4	1,2,5,7	$400	72			8/31/2012	$28,800		$ 88,900.00
684 GARDEN	4		Mansfield, Ruth & Lambert,	3/6/12	4/27/12	5/3/12	7/13/12		4	1,2,6,7	$400	49			8/31/2012	$19,600		$ 106,300.00
424 HOMESTEAD	5		777 Supermarket LLC (James	4/5/12	5/4/12	5/9/12	7/13/12		4	1,2,4,7	$400	49			8/31/2012	$19,600		$ 315,400.00
397 Sigourney	5		Britton, Christopher	4/16/12	5/4/12	5/9/12	6/20/12		7	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	$700	72			8/31/2012	$50,400		$ 22,500.00
26															NORTH	$991,152	$0	$ 2,683,437.00
755 Broad St	1	Upheld	Luis Marchand	1/13/12	2/1/12	3/19/12	5/7/12	7/20/12	3	2,5,7	$300	102	1%	42	8/31/2012	$43,452		$ 111,800.00
75 Ward St	1	Upheld	LS Ward Properties	1/13/12	1/30/12	3/5/12	4/17/12	7/28/12	6	1,2,5,7,9,11	~~$600~~	~~122~~	1%	34	8/31/2012	$18,224		$ 201,400.00
166 Affleck St	2		Joel Brody	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	5/18/12		5	1,2,4,6,11	$500	105			8/31/2012	$52,500		$ 206,400.00
168 Affleck St (sub parce	2		Joel Brody	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	5/18/12		5	1,2,6,7,11	$500	105			8/31/2012	$52,500		?
787 Park St	2		Putnam-Park Assoc. LLP	2/7/12	2/22/12	3/5/12	4/17/12		7	1,2,3,5,6,7,10	$700	136			8/31/2012	$95,200		$ 662,500.00
166-172 Ward	2		Stanley Milk	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	4/18/12		4	1,2,7,10	$400	135			8/31/2012	$54,000		$ 132,200.00
180-182 Ward	2		Terrence Weaver-Bey	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	5/7/12		6	2,3,5,6,7,11	$600	116			8/31/2012	$69,600		$ 117,000.00
523 Park St	3		Garrox Investment LLC	3/2/12	3/16/12	4/3/12	5/18/12		4	1,2,6,7	$400	105			8/31/2012	$42,000		$ 49,300.00
873 Broad St	3		Todd Meier	3/2/12	3/16/12	4/4/12	5/7/12		6	1,2,6,7,10,11	$600	116			8/31/2012	$69,600		$ 129,600.00
145 Lawrence St	3		Estate of Roberto Bustos	3/2/12	3/14/12	4/4/12	6/27/12		4	1,2,6,11	$400	65			8/31/2012	$26,000		$ 127,300.00
126 Hungerford St	4		126 Hungerford LLC	3/6/12	3/26/12	4/11/12	5/18/12		4	1,2,6,7	$400	105			8/31/2012	$42,000		$ 267,600.00
900 Broad St	4		Pacheco Properties LLC	3/6/12	3/29/12	4/11/12	5/31/12		4	1,2,5,7	$400	92			8/31/2012	$36,800		$ 325,300.00
12															CENTRAL	$601,876	$0	$ 2,330,400.00
~~605 Wethersfield Av~~		[illegible]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12/00/2011	$0	~~$27,320~~	$ 167,500.00
49 Annawan St	1		SVL Associates LLC	1/13/12	1/31/12	3/2/12	5/4/12		8	1,2,4,5,7,9,10,	$800	119			8/31/2012	$95,200		$ 134,800.00
16 Warner St	1		Helen and George Leapahart	1/13/12	2/21/12	3/3/12	4/16/12		6	2,5,7,9,10,11	$600	139			8/31/2012	$83,400		$ 274,000.00
98 Whitmore St	1		Ramone Manning	1/13/12	1/31/12	3/3/12	4/16/12		7	2,5,6,7,9,10,11	$700	139			8/31/2012	$97,300		$ 156,700.00
5 Barnard St	1		Alecia F. Walters	1/13/12	1/31/12	3/3/12	4/16/12		5	1,2,5,7,9	$500	139			8/31/2012	$69,500		$ 157,100.00
1180 Broad St	2		1180 Broad St Inc	1/30/12	1/31/12	3/3/12	5/4/12		5	2,5,7,9,10	$500	119			8/31/2012	$59,500		$ 134,800.00
~~44 Mountford St~~	~~2~~	[illegible]	~~Timothy Gaffey~~	~~1/30/12~~	~~2/21/12~~	~~3/3/12~~	~~5/4/12~~	~~7/21/13~~	~~3~~	~~2,7,9~~	~~$300~~	~~105~~	~~1%~~	-	~~7/25/2012~~	$0	~~$2,000~~	~~$ 168,500.00~~

APPENDIX 2 Page 1

65			Cumulative Total # of Days	Day 0 Day 0	30 Days 30 Days	5 Days 35 Days	5 Days 60 Days									$2,598,322	$29,320	$9,166,805
Full Address	RD	Legal Status	Owner	Prelim Notice Letter	ABO Inspection Date	Notice of Violation Letter	30 Day Inspection for Citation	Appeal Correction Date	Vio Cited	# of Violations Cited	Fines Amount per Day	Accruing Days	Accruing Interest	Accruing Interest Days	Current Date or Stop Date	Total in Fines	Fines Collected	2011 Fair Market Value of Property
68 Bonner St	2		Miguel Franco Sr.	1/30/12	2/21/12	3/3/12	5/4/12		5	2,4,7,9,10	$500	119			8/31/2012	$59,500		$ 83,700.00
541 Maple St	2	Upheld	Lisa Diaz	1/30/12	2/21/12	3/3/12	4/17/12	8/25/12	2	2,7	~~$200~~	~~126~~	1%	7	8/31/2012	$26,964		$ 152,200.00
591 Hillside Av	2	Upheld	Detlef Papp	1/30/12	2/21/12	3/3/12	4/17/12	8/31/12	1	7	~~$100~~	~~126~~	1%	8	9/7/2012	$1,728		$ 124,300.00
197 Bond St	3		Terraine Mccants	2/23/12	3/23/12	4/9/12	5/11/12		5	2,5,6,7,10	$500	112			8/31/2012	$56,000		$ 106,100.00
641 Wethersfield Av	3	Upheld	Roe LLC	2/23/12	3/23/12	4/9/12	5/11/12	8/20/12	6	1,2,7,9,10,11	$600	112	1%	12	8/31/2012	$85,792		$ 97,500.00
161 Franklin Av	4		Virgina Falcon	3/12/12	3/29/12	4/9/12	6/14/12		4	1,2,6,7	$400	79			8/31/2012	$31,600		$ 113,068.00
35 Benton St	5		Louis Sterling	4/17/12	4/27/12	5/8/12	7/2/12		5	2,6,7,10,11	$500	60			8/31/2012	$30,000		$ 144,600.00
63/65 Annawan St	5		Omar Frank	4/17/12	4/27/12	5/8/12	7/2/12		7	1,2,3,6,7,10,11	$700	60			8/31/2012	$42,000		$ 67,700.00
55 Lincoln St	5		David Martinez	4/17/12	4/27/12	5/8/12	7/9/12		4	4,7,10,11	$400	53			8/31/2012	$21,200		$ 133,700.00
28 Benton St	5	Upheld	Taylor Delone	4/17/12	4/27/12	5/8/12	7/18/12	[illegible]	4	1,2,6,7	$400	44	1%		8/31/2012	$2,000		$ 107,900.00
14/16 Shultas PL	7		Association Trustee HSBC	5/19/12	6/27/12	6/27/12	8/6/12		3	2,5,6	$300	25			8/31/2012	$7,500		$ 183,300.00
24 Shultas PL	7		Isidor Solis	5/31/12	6/25/12	6/27/12	8/3/12		3	1,2,4	$300	28			8/31/2012	$8,400		$ 147,800.00
97-99 Lincoln St	7		Michael Beer	5/19/12	6/25/12	6/27/12	8/6/12		4	1,2,4,6	$400	25			8/31/2012	$10,000		$ 168,900.00
18															SOUTH	$787,584	$29,320	$ 2,824,168.00
26 Chatham Street	1		MCBRIDE, LUTHER S. III	1/13/12	1/31/12	3/2/12	5/2/12		4	1,2,5,7	$400	121			8/31/2012	$48,400		$ 85,600.00
23 Sargeant Street	2		HUTTON, WALTER and CYNT	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	5/31/12		3	2,5,7	$300	92			8/31/2012	$27,600		$ 122,700.00
335 Laurel Street	2	Upheld	ZAPPULLA, SALVATORE	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	5/2/12	7/28/12	3	1,2,7	$100	121	1%	34	8/31/2012	$28,810		$ 128,100.00
63 Nies St	2	Upheld	*GORDAN-JAMES, MARLENE*	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	4/25/12	[illegible]	2	2,7	$200	128			8/31/2012	$30,800		$ 131,400.00
366 Laurel St	2	Upheld	MAHONEY, MICHELLE	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	5/31/12	[illegible]	3	1,2,7	$300	92	1%		8/31/2012	$7,800		$ 181,000.00
64 Hartland Street	2		TURNER, CATALINA	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	5/2/12		3	2,5,7	$300	121			8/31/2012	$36,300		$ 114,400.00
26 Gray Street	2		CANDILLO, PATRICK and REID	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	5/31/12		2	2,7	$200	92			8/31/2012	$18,400		$ 163,000.00
169 Bartholomew Av	2	Upheld	JOHN ADAMS of PARTNERS F	2/7/12	2/21/12	3/5/12	5/7/12	8/24/12	5	1,2,5,6,7	~~$500~~	~~116~~	1%	8	8/31/2012	$18,900		$ 322,600.00
16 Marshall St	4	Upheld	Jeff and Sarah Lynn	3/8/12	3/30/12	4/12/12	5/31/12	[illegible]	2	1,2	$200	92	1%		8/31/2012	$700		$ 80,000.00
9															WEST	$217,710	$0	$ 1,328,800.00

APPENDIX 2 Page 2