OVERVIEW: 2010 Department of Neighborhood Services

Finance & Personnel Committee October 13, 2009

Budget Data

	2009 ADOPTED BUDGET	2010 PROPOSED BUDGET	DIFFERENCE (amount, %)	
FTEs – O&M	169.58	157.5	-12.08 (-7.1%)	
FTEs - Other	33.5	34.5	1.00 (+3%)	
Salaries & Wages	\$8,042,152	\$7,817,370	-\$224,782 (-2.8%)	
Fringe Benefits	3,297,283	3,205,122	-92,161 (-2.8%)	
Operating Expenditures	858,896	908,650	49,754 (+5.8%)	
Equipment	60,000	5,000	-55,000 (-91.7%)	
Special Funds	1,846,000	1,890,000	44,000 (+2.4%)	
TOTAL	\$14,104,331	\$13,826,142	-\$278,189 (-2.0%)	

2010 Proposed Changes

- Eliminate Community Sanitation Fund: -\$30,000
- Do not fund 3 Residential Code Enforcement Inspector positions: -\$186,500
- Do not fund 2 Commercial Code Enforcement Inspector positions: -\$124,300
- Do not fund 3 Nuisance Control Officer positions (2.5 FTE): -\$140,200
- Net reduction in operating funded staffing strength from 2009 is approximately -2.6 FTE or -1.6%

2010 Proposed Changes

- NSP grant offset reduced by \$40,000
- Two FTE shifted to CDBG-ARRA funding for graffiti abatement
- Graduate Intern position not funded: -\$15,111
- Two Office Assistant II positions not funded: -\$60,178
- Computer replacement deferred until 2011: -\$55,000

Special Purpose Accounts

	2009 ADOPTED BUDGET	2010 PROPOSED BUDGET	DIFFERENCE (amount, %)
Graffiti Abatement	\$95,000	\$170,000	+\$75,000 (+79%)
Razing	\$360,000	\$1,050,000	+\$690,000 (+192%)
Essential Utility Services	\$75,000	\$75,000	0 (0%)

Capital Project

- Anderson Municipal Building Security Improvements
- Project cost of \$76,200
- Improve security for employees working at the Anderson facility
- Bullet resistant glazing and fiberglass in reception areas, improved security card access and doors, and security cameras
- Anderson facility houses Residential Inspection Division and Nuisance & Environmental Health Division staff

2010 Proposed Programs

- Vacant Building Registration Program
- Residential Rental Inspection Program
- Implementing programs requires Council action
 - Enact Ordinances
 - Amend Budget

Vacant Building Registration Program

Nature of the Problem

- Foreclosure issues have greatly increased number of vacant buildings in the City
- Vacant buildings are often not maintained and create neighborhood problems:
 - Attract nuisance and criminal activity into a neighborhood
 - Hazards for neighborhood children
 - Contribute to blighted conditions
 - Discourage investment in neighborhoods
 - Reduce property values

What is a Vacant Building?

- Definition: A building that lacks the habitual presence of human beings who have a legal right to be on the premise
- Generally, when buildings are unoccupied for a period greater than 30 days, then registration is required
- Exceptions include:
 - Seasonally occupied property
 - Properties in pre foreclosure program
 - Properties undergoing renovation
 - Properties vacant as a result of a natural disaster
 - Properties in probate not subject to bankruptcy

Purpose of the Program

- Develop a systematic approach to vacant buildings in Milwaukee
- Maintain and share data on vacant buildings with public safety agencies
- Monitor conditions of vacant buildings to prevent negative impacts on surrounding neighborhoods
- Provide an enforcement tool to ensure vacant buildings are maintained so hazards are eliminated

Program Details

- All vacant buildings registered with DNS
- The registration is valid for 6 months
- All vacant structures to be inspected at registration and renewal
- Inspection will require that buildings are:
 - Secure
 - Structurally sound and weather tight
 - Not housing hazards or fire loaded
 - The grounds are kept clear of trash, debris, vehicles and tall grass

Program Details (cont'd)

- No fee for the initial registration
- Base renewal fee of \$250
- Level of fees increase in \$250 increments per renewal period to a maximum of \$1,000 when the condition of the property is not maintained in a code compliant manner
- Exterior conditions to be monitored between registration renewals

Program Details (cont'd)

- There are 1,300 known vacant buildings with that number expected to increase
- Program duties will be performed by district inspectors; it is necessary to add
 - 4 code enforcement inspectors
 - 1 office assistant
- Revenue projected at \$325,000
- Budget estimated at \$303,731

Program Implementation

- November 2009
 - Initiate changes to computer system
 - Develop training program for staff
 - Initiate public awareness campaign
 - Initiate hiring process
- December 2009
 - Send out notification letters
 - Complete changes to computer system
- January 2010
 - Complete hiring process
 - Conduct staff training program
 - Initiate inspection scheduling

Program Implementation (cont'd)

- February 2010
 - Start inspections of vacant buildings
- July 2010
 - Send out renewal notices
- August 2010
 - Start the inspection of buildings with renewed registrations
- September 2010
 - Begin document preparation to place inspection fees on tax roll



















Other Cities with Similar Program

- Wilmington, DE
- Chicago, IL
- Alexandria, VA
- Richmond, VA
- Minneapolis, MN
- St. Paul, MN

- Dallas, TX
- Wheeling, WV
- Kansas City, MO
- Muskegon, MI
- Norfolk, VA
- Albuquerque, NM

201	0

PROPOSED BUDGET

LINE DESCRIPTION	UNITS	DOLLARS	
VACANT BUILDING REGISTRATION PROGRAM		_	
Code Enforcement Inspector II (X)	4	\$156,376	
Office Assistant III	1	\$33,355	
NET SALARIES & WAGES TOTAL*	5	\$189,731	
O&M FTE'S	5.00		
ESTIMATED EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS		\$77,790	
OPERATING EXPENDITURES			
General Office Expense		\$3,500	
Other Operating Supplies		\$1,400	
Vehicle Rental		\$9,600	
Professional Services		\$2,000	
Property Services		\$2,210	
Other Operating Services		<u>\$300</u>	
OPERATING EXPENDITURES TOTAL*		\$19,010	
EQUIPMENT PURCHASES		\$17,200	
TOTAL		\$303,731	

Residential Rental Inspection Program

Purpose of the Program

- Address ongoing quality of life issues for residents in two areas
 - 1. Lindsay Heights neighborhood
 - Area whose perimeter is defined by Edgewood Ave. to Hackett Ave. to Newberry Blvd. to Cambridge Ave.
- Ensure that rental units are safe and do not create hazards for occupants or surrounding residents

Need for Inspections in this Area

	Average Age of Buildings (years)	Percentage of Buildings that are Rental	Percentage of Units that are Rental	Percentage of Complaints at Rental Properties
Inspection District 1	82.7 years	47.5%	56.8%	72.4%
Inspection District 2	94.7 years	42.7%	62.9%	81.4%
City Wide	71.3 years	26.9%	47.8%	63.0%

Program Details

- Pilot program with a 5 year sunset unless reauthorized by Common Council
- DNS will evaluate the results of the pilot program and bring recommendations back to Common Council
- Regular inspection cycle to verify code compliance
- After inspection is approved, a rental certificate is issued
- Certificate valid for 4 years if no disqualifying violations found; 1 year if violations found
- Inspections done by appointment
- Certificate and inspection fee of \$85 per rental unit

Program Details

- Based on property recording information, there are 1,799 rental units in District 1 and 1,926 rental units in District 2
- Program requires adding five Code Enforcement Inspectors
- Revenue projected at \$316,625
- Budget estimated at \$318,688

Program Implementation

- November 2009
 - Initiate changes to computer system
 - Develop training program for staff
 - Initiate public awareness campaign
 - Initiate hiring process
- December 2009
 - Send out notification letters
 - Complete changes to computer system
- January 2010
 - Complete hiring process
 - Conduct staff training
 - Initiate inspection scheduling

Program Implementation (cont'd)

- March 2010
 - Initiate inspections of rental units
- September 2010
 - Begin document preparation to place inspection fees on tax roll
- November 2010
 - Begin monthly notifications to set up year 2 inspections
- December 2010
 - Complete the first round of inspections
- January 2011
 - Start second year of inspections

Program Goals

- Ensure rental units are safe
- Work with landlords to develop short-term and long-term strategies to improve safety and conditions of properties
- Through work agreements, safety issues will be corrected in a first phase and other maintenance issues will be corrected in a second phase
- Educate occupants and owners of the need to meet code requirements for building maintenance and occupant behavior

Typical Issues

- Creation of illegal rental units
- Overcrowding
- Fire safety
 - Electrical hazards
 - Venting of furnaces and hot water heaters
 - Placement of smoke detectors
- General Safety
 - Conditions of decks and porches
 - Safety of exits

Typical Issues (cont'd)

- Heating/plumbing systems
 - Not operating
 - Operate in a way that creates unsafe or hazardous conditions
- Construction done without permits
- Weatherization

Observed Conditions







Observed Conditions







• Our ultimate goal is to work with property owners to prevent situations like this



• Or this





Other Cities with Similar Program

- LaCrosse, WI
- Minneapolis, MN
- Alexandria, VA
- Los Angeles, CA
- San Bernardino, CA
- Annapolis, MD

- Lawrence, KS
- Waukegan, IL
- West Lafayette, IN
- New Haven, CT
- Williamsburg, VA

	2010		
	PROPOSED BUDGET		
LINE DESCRIPTION	UNITS	DOLLARS	
RESIDENTIAL RENTAL INSPECTION PROGRAM		-	
SALARIES & WAGES			
Code Enforcement Inspector II (X)	5	\$195,470	
NET SALARIES & WAGES TOTAL*	5	\$195,470	
	F 00		
O&M FTE'S	5.00		
ESTIMATED EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS		\$80,143	
OPERATING EXPENDITURES			
General Office Expense		\$4,000	
Other Operating Supplies		\$1,750	
Vehicle Rental		\$12,000	
Professional Services		\$2,500	
Property Services		\$2,450	
Other Operating Services		<u>\$375</u>	
OPERATING EXPENDITURES TOTAL*		\$23,075	
EQUIPMENT PURCHASES			
Network Hardware and Software		\$20,000	
TOTAL		\$318,688	

Unified Call Center

- Improved coordination of complaint responses that involve multiple agencies
- Simplify the process to make computer changes to support work process changes
- Provide desktop reporting for managers to identify complaints that are "falling through the cracks"
- Design data entry from the perspective of field staff and thereby reduce the amount of administrative time per inspection
- Provide inspectors access to data while they are in the field
- Establish automated scheduling of inspection requests
- Provide near real time sharing of inspection results with all departments

Map of Proposed District

