Code Enforcement Data Analysis
Summer 2014
ACPHD Place Matters and CAPE

Overview and Background:

Given the connections between habitability issues in housing for Oakland renters, and health outcomes such as asthma and repository disease, ACPHD and the Place Matters Housing Work Group partners were interested in looking at the code enforcement complaints made since 2003 to get a sense of how extensive mold issues are across the city, as well as how they correlate with ACPHD's Asthma Start data on home visits of children suffering from asthma.

Beyond the health connections, the Place Matters Housing Work Group was particularly interested in any patterns of where and how habitability issues are distributed across Oakland, as well as patterns of ownership of the properties receiving multiple complaints.

This project sought to analyze the following questions:

- In the code enforcement data, are there specific properties with extensive occupied blight and health complaints? Are there repeat landlords/owners?
    - o   Frequencies of properties?
    - o   Frequencies of owners?
    - o   What is the role of investors who have been buying property in East and West Oakland? (Frequencies of specific LLC's/investors)
- What are the most frequent habitability issues impacting residents in Oakland? How extensive are habitability issues related to mold specifically?
- How are the occupied blight and health complaints distributed across Oakland? (see mapping)
    - o   What number and % of complaints occurred in each of the Oakland City Council members district?
- How is the prevalence of asthma in children distributed across Oakland? (see mapping)
    - o   What number and % of Asthma Start visits occurred in each of the Oakland City Council members district?
- Is there a pattern of single-family vs. multi-family homes for habitability issues?

Understanding these issues would allow us to better strategize around ways to protect the health of Oakland tenants. Some possibilities include targeting problem property owners to address habitability issues in multiple properties proactively, continuing to prioritize mold issues and expediting the enforcement process, etc.   Additionally, this analysis can serve to support advocacy around city-level policy to protect tenant rights and improve health.

Methods for Analysis:

Each question in the research project entailed unique data and processes for analysis. Below are the key data sets and processes used to address each question.

Question 1 and Methods:
Are there specific properties with extensive occupied blight and health complaints? Are there repeat landlords/owners?
- Frequencies of properties?
- Frequencies of owners?
- What is the role of investors who have been buying property in East and West Oakland? (Frequencies of specific LLC's/investors)

In order to answer these questions, the code enforcement data from 2003-2013 was sorted for CO0INSP (Occupied Blight), and CH-INSP—Health Inspection codes. The remaining data (n=43473) were sorted by property frequencies and owner frequencies. Owner frequency analysis is limited in that ownership of properties often changes, and there has been huge turn-over in real estate investing since the foreclosure crisis. To address this, frequency of ownership was compared with current data on LLC and Company property ownership provided through the State Department database.

There were many properties with unnamed owners that further research could investigate who owns the remaining properties.

Question 2 and Methods:
What are the most frequent habitability issues impacting residents in Oakland? How extensive are habitability issues related to mold specifically?

In order to better understand the habitability issues in Oakland, we focused on one year of complaints to get a snap-shot of habitability. Within the Code Enforcement code books, "occupied blight" includes: "interior habitability issues—tenant complaint" and "structural failures". "Health Inspections" include lead poisoning, mold, and pests/vectors. Because there is significant misclassification in the data set of exterior blight issues (trash, debris, etc.), a cleaning process was necessary before we were able to sort the data using word frequency software. Below is a description of the process.

Code Enforcement Data Analysis Word Frequency Cleaning Process:

1. We sorted data by station identification code—keeping CO0INSP (Occupied Blight), and CH-INSP—Health Inspection (which starts in 2011)
2. For our frequency tests, we then further focused on 2013, to get a representative image of a year of complains (n=1216)
3. We then further cleaned the data, deleting duplicates, and removing misclassified observations which should fall under exterior blight, vacant buildings, permit inspections, right of way, or substandard (public safety, abandoned homes, criminal activity, excessive trash). (n=883)
4. Next we ran all of the relevant 2013 description fields through a word frequency software (Text Master) and categorized the words related to mold, mildew, and their precursors. Words

included are: mold, mildew, water, leak*, plumbing, moist*, seepage, black, ventilation, flood*, rot*, condensation, corroded, and mildrew (misspelled in the data)

5. From here, we sorted the 2013 data to see how many of the 883 observations included at least one of these words.
6. We confirmed that each included observation was referenced mold, mildew, or a precursor.
7. We also sorted the remaining words into categories of heating/cooling issues, vectors, and infrastructure, which encompassed the majority of other habitability complaints.
8. Because some complaints include multiple habitability issues, the resulting percentages are not mutually exclusive.

Questions 3 and 4 and Methods:

How are the occupied blight and health complaints distributed across Oakland? (see mapping)
- What number and % of complaints occurred in each of the Oakland City Council members district?
- What is the rate of renters with code-enforcement complaints by district? (see mapping)

How is the prevalence of asthma in children distributed across Oakland? (see mapping)
- What number and % of Asthma Start visits occurred in each of the Oakland City Council members district?
- What is the rate of renters with AsthmaStart cases by district? (see mapping)

In order to answer questions about distribution of complaints, we used Esri GIS mapping software to map all of the occupied blight and health inspections complaints from 2003-2013. Mapping was done using parcel numbers from the data set. Maps were then broken up into Oakland City Council Districts to be able to assess which districts hold what percent of complaints.

Similarly, Esri GIS mapping software was used to map all of the ACPHD AsthmaStart home-visit data, to compare distributions. AsthmaStart data includes home-visits from January 1st, 2009- April 30th, 2013, with a total of n=1186 visits/observations. These observations were geo-coded and mapped. Maps were then broken up into Oakland City Council Districts to be able to assess which districts hold what percent of AsthmaStart visits. (*Note: not all AsthmaStart visits were renters, but renter vs. owner was not noted in the data base*)

In order to find rates, the number of cases was divided by the number of renters per city council district, and mapped as rates.

Question 5 and Methods:

Is there a pattern of single-family vs. multi-family homes for habitability issues?

In order to answer this question, the code enforcement data base was combined with assessor's data to see if any patterns were found in single vs. multi-family units.

3

Results:

Word Frequency Analysis Results:

- 33.4% (295 of 883) of complaints in 2013 related to mold or mildew
- ___% of complaints in 2013 related to mold, mildew, *or a precursor to mold* (including leaks, seepage, etc)
- Other key habitability issues

Healthy Homes Project Analysis:

- Between the start of the Healthy Homes Pilot in 2011 to the close of 2013, 244 inspections were made through the pilot

Health Inspection/Occupied Blight Complaints and Asthma Start Cases by City Council districts:

District	Representative	CH-INSP	CO-INSP	Health and Occupied Blight Inspections	% of total inspections	Asthma Start Cases	% of total Asthma Start Cases
1	Dan Kalb	24	2,234	2,258	11%	38	6.20%
2	Abel Guillen	30	2,444	2,474	13%	56	9.14%
3	Lynette Gibson McElhaney	45	2,534	2,579	13%	86	14.03%
4	Annie Campbell Washington	21	2,762	2,783	14%	51	8.32%
5	Noel Gallo	31	2,947	2,978	15%	99	16.15%
6	Desley Brooks	35	3,222	3,257	17%	144	23.49%
7	Larry Reid	31	3,319	3,350	17%	139	22.68%
Total		217	19,462	19,679		613	

Property Frequencies:

Below are properties with repeat code enforcement violation. These properties had between 10-30 complaints between 2003-2013. (Fill in AVE vs. Streets)

Note: please see data spread-sheet for owner information, as many of the properties had multiple owners over the course of 2003-2013 when complaints were made.

Properties with 10+ OB and HI Complaints		owner	Multi-family vs. Single Family
530 24TH	30		
5142 BANCROFT	20		
715 PERALTA	18		
2011 RUTHERFORD	17		

5506 TAFT	17		
3883 WEST	16		
634 15TH	15		
7867 BANCROFT	15		
8603 HILLSIDE	14		
1475 34TH	13		
2361 FRUITVALE	13		
8701 HILLSIDE	13		
1415 HARRISON	12		
2940 LINDEN	12		
9519 OLIVE	12		
0 SNAKE	11		
1050 28TH	11		
1946 13TH	11		
2206 E 21ST	11		
1018 E 23RD	10		
1026 E 12TH	10		
1521 2ND	10		
1821 FRUITVALE	10		
2040 102ND	10		
2203 9TH	10		
265 TUNIS	10		
392 11TH	10		
4139 BAYO	10		
6400 FOOTHILL	10		
644 14TH	10		
9833 WALNUT	10		

Owner Frequency Data:

	Top 44 Violators: Name	Frequency
1	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF OAKLAND	235
2	DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST	215
3	WELLS FARGO BANK	108
4	CITY OF OAKLAND	101
5	SILVEIRA J W & BARBARA O TRS	86
6	WILLIAMS ELIZABETH A	78
7	OAKLAND COMMUNITY HOUSING INC	73
8	US BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION TR	64
9	FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION	51
10	PHAM DUNG N	43

11	REO HOMES LLC	42
12	AURORA LOAN SERVICES LLC	37
13	DODG CORPORATION	36
14	HSBC BANK USA TR	36
15	TELLES WALTER P	34
16	MISRI ASHOK K ETAL	31
17	OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT	31
18	SPINARDI FRANK L JR	30
19	REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF OAKLAND	28
20	TYLA INC	28
21	GHATTAS ELIAS ETAL	27
22	BANK OF NEW YORK TR	26
23	PRIZE GROUP LLC & JT INVESTMENT CO LLC 15TH S ETAL	26
24	FREEMAN JON O	25
25	CORNEJO RAFAEL	24
26	PINEVIEW PARTNERS LLC	24
27	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	24
28	CHAO DANIEL K & ELLEN H	23
29	MAGGANAS ATHAN	23
30	EVANS WAYNE P	22
31	FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORPORATION	22
32	MA SANFORD K & GLORIA F TRS	22
33	YI NOEL & MEILING	22
34	MOSLEH MOHAMED	21
35	KWONG MONA	20
36	WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK	20
37	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF OAKLAND	19
38	GMAC MORTGAGE LLC	19
39	NATHAN RYAN K	19
40	PRIZE GROUP LLC	19
41	THOMAS RICHARD E	19
42	BUSK JOHN D	18
43	COMMUNITY FUND LLC	18
44	EPIC EQUITY LLC	18

Investors in Top 30 Oakland Investors List:

Name	Frequency	TOP 30 Investor Notes	Other Notes
REO HOMES LLC	20	REO	Top 30 Investor List
COMMUNITY FUND LLC	18	COMMUNITY FUND LLC	Owned Hillside Property

REO HOMES 2 LLC	17	REO	
ROSENAU INVESTMENTS INC	14	Rosenau Investments	
OAK FUND LLC	4	CRC Development & EB/Oak/LM Fund LLCs	
SGT TWO LLC	4	Wilson Young	
EB FUND I LLC	3	CRC Development & EB/Oak/LM Fund LLCs	
GARDNER WILLIAM M & JOYCE G	3		
COOPERBAND AARON & TANAKA FUMI	2		REO Total= 42
GARLIK INVESTMENT PROPERTIES INC	2		COMMUNITY FUND LLC total= 21
GOLDEN PINNACLE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	2		Rosenau Total= 19
GOLDEN STATE PROPERTY SOLUTIONS LLC & ALTERRE ETAL	2		CRC Development & EB/Oak/LM Fund LLCs total= 7
KWONG DAVID	2		
REO HOMES 3 LLC	2	REO	
ROSENAU INVESTMENT INC	2	Rosenau Investments	
RWW PROPERTIES LLC	2	RWW Properties/WESCO Realty	
SGT INVESTMENTS LLC	2	Wilson Young	
COMMUNITY FUND LLC & JASON CHM	1	COMMUNITY FUND LLC	
COMMUNITY FUND LLC & PASSLINE INVESTMENTS LLC	1	COMMUNITY FUND LLC	
COMMUNITY FUND LLC C/O JAVIER SANCHEZ	1	COMMUNITY FUND LLC	
CONSUMER SOLUTIONS REO LLC	1		
CONSUMER SOLUTIONS REO LLC C/O NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE	1		
CRC DEVELOPMENT LLC	1	CRC Development & EB/Oak/LM Fund LLCs	
CREST INVESTMENT LLC	1		
DFI PROPERTIES LLC	1		
GARDNER WILLIAM M	1		
GARDNER WILLIAM M & JOYCE G TRS	1		
KWONG CHRIS	1		
PASS LINE INVESTMENT LLC	1		
REO HOMES 2 LLC C/O NEILL SULLIVAN	1	REO	
REO HOMES LLCNAL ASSOCIATION TR	1	REO	
REO PROPERTIES CORP MAIL STOP DA-AM	1	REO	
ROSENAU INVESTMENTS INC C/O ATTN BOB ROSENAU	1	Rosenau Investments	
ROSENAU INVESTMENTS INC C/O ROSENAU INVESTMENTS	1	Rosenau Investments	
ROSENAU INVESTMENTS INC.	1	Rosenau Investments	
RWW PROPERTIES, LLC (NEW OWNER SINCE 5/7/09)	1	RWW Properties/WESCO Realty	
WESCO REALTY, LLC	1	RWW Properties/WESCO Realty	

Limitations and Remaining Questions for Further Research:

The Housing Work Group's (HWG) original set of research questions included a number of questions that we were unable to address given the data we had access to. In particular, the HWG was interested in looking at how effective code enforcement is at addressing the needs of tenants in a timely fashion. The code-enforcement data set included dates of initial calls and inspections, but the "abated", "closed", "filed" and "N/A" section did not give conclusive data on the outcomes of each case. When following-up with code-enforcement staff, it was clear that this section was up to the discretion of inspectors, and little could be drawn from the data. Future analysis of effectiveness of the code-enforcement process will need to involve a standardized method of describing the process.

In addition, HWG members had questions about Section 8 housing, and if there were distinctions in habitability issues for Section 8 tenants. We did not have enough information to assess this.   HWG members are also interested in the enforcement process for Section 8 housing, and how that processes may differ from other code-enforcement cases.

Additionally, the HWG is interested in how tenant harassment is connected to habitability issues, and if habitability issues are used to push tenants out of housing. The group was also interested in how this relates to gentrification and displacement and if there are patterns of habitability issues along the lines of gentrification susceptibility (as outlined in the CJJC report). Data on harassment will be essential for this analysis.

Given the level of interest and the possibilities of various proactive inspections opportunities, and because of the unique partnership between code-enforcement and community partners, an HIA may be a useful strategy to further investigate various proactive inspections solutions for habitability issues in Oakland. An HIA on code enforcement policies and practices has been done by Marin Legal Aid and Human Impact Partners and could serve as a useful model for further research.

Notes:

For all final data, see:
I:\Place Matters\Workgroups\Housing\Code-Enforcement and Harassment Data Analysis Project\Data Files

The tabs to look at are:

- See columns B and C in the tab <mark>"most common streets"</mark> (note that the owner match up sheet is in the tab <mark>"street to owner match up"</mark>. However, in the tab <mark>"most common streets"</mark> I did match up the first 11 or so street with the owners (see columns I, K, and L).
- See tab "<mark>owner aggregated freq</mark>" for th aggregated owner frequencies, and <mark>"owner as is freq</mark>" for the owner frequencies as they are originally noted.
- See tab <mark>"mold 2003 to 2013"</mark> for percentages of mold and precursor to mold notations.
- See tab <mark>"all categories 2013 data only"</mark> and look to columns BJ through BO for the percentages of the total number or observations each of the categories holds. Note that % add up to >100% because some rows have more than one category.

Name	Frequency
REO HOMES LLC	20
COMMUNITY FUND LLC	18
REO HOMES 2 LLC	17
ROSENAU INVESTMENTS INC	14
OAK FUND LLC	4