CITY OF CORVALLIS
PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE ADVISORY GROUP
MEETING AGENDA

4:00 p.m.
Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Corvallis/Benton County Public Library Main Meeting Room
645 NW Monroe Avenue

I. Visitor comments (up to 10 minutes)

II. Review October 23, 2013 meeting notes *(attached including Property Maintenance Code implementation protocols handout)*

III. Overview of anticipated Property Maintenance Code education and outreach approaches/efforts *(outline attached)*

IV. Continued discussion of Corvallis Property Maintenance Code content, standards and applicability *(questions/issues raised to date with responses attached)*

V. Next steps

VI. Other business

VII. Visitor comments (if time allows)

VIII. Adjourn

MEMORANDUM

October 25, 2013

TO: Property Maintenance Code Advisory Group

FROM: Ken Gibb, Community Development Director

RE: October 29 meeting packet

During the October 29 meeting our focus will move initially to discussion of an outline for Property Maintenance Code education and outreach. Effective community education, outreach and communication about the PMC program's intent, standards, and applicability will be key to its successful implementation. A general outline of an education/outreach approach is included in your meeting packet. As mentioned at the last meeting, we anticipate this item to be 30-40 minutes in duration.

Following a review of the outreach and education model we will return to a discussion of the PMC to address prioritized questions and issues that have been raised by the Advisory Group over the course of your work to date. The broad list of questions and issues, with brief staff responses, is included in your packet. As we discussed October 23, please review the list and select your top five issues/questions. Based on the collective responses, we will prioritize issues for further discussion. If you have issues or questions that have not been identified in earlier discussions, feel free to include them in your top five list. For efficiency purposes we request that you send your top five lists to both Kent Weiss (kent.weiss@corvallisoregon.gov) and to me (ken.gibb@corvallisoregon.gov) no later than noon on Tuesday October 29. This will allow us to tally results prior to the 4 p.m. meeting.

Please note that this meeting's location will move again: it will be held in the Corvallis Benton County Public Library main meeting room, located at 645 NW Monroe.

There is currently one additional Advisory Group meetings scheduled, on November 12, and we will be looking to schedule at least one more meeting to wrap things up in late November or early December. Meeting topics and locations will include:

Date	Location	Topics
11/12/13	Library Main Meeting Room	PMC program staffing/budget; follow up on outstanding issues
TBD	TBD	Follow up on outstanding issues; discuss/finalize overall PMC program design

We look forward to seeing you October 29.

City of Corvallis
Property Maintenance Code Advisory Group
Notes for the meeting of October 23, 2013
Meeting time: 4:00 p.m. Location: Fire Station Meeting Room, 400 NW Harrison Avenue

---

Members present: Allie Bircher, Amy Harding, Charlyn Ellis, Jerry Duerksen, Karen Levy Keon, Kari King, Ken Gibb, Rachel Ulrich
Staff present: Bob Loewen, Dan Carlson, Chris Westfall, Kent Weiss

I. Visitor comments – Brian Serbu of Coldwell Banker Valley Brokers noted he is unfamiliar with the charge of the Advisory Group and expressed concern with where it is going. Chair Gibb explained that the charge is based on City Council direction to staff, and noted that staff will provide him background on the Advisory Group's charge and the Collaboration Corvallis process.

   Larry Kampfer of Kampfer Enterprises suggested the Property Maintenance Code should be placed on a ballot before adoption. He feels the Code is not supported by the general public, and fears that Corvallis property values will fall if it is implemented. Karen Levy Keon shared that she believes the Mayor has charged the Advisory Group with moving forward with a Code to protect the interests of those in the community who do not feel comfortable speaking for themselves.

   Debra Weaver of the Willamette Association of Realtors said she believes the Mayor and some City Councilors think the Property Maintenance Code would apply only to rental units. Jerry Duerksen stated that the Advisory Group has been aware that the Code would apply to all properties, but that others in the community are probably not aware. Gibb noted that the model International Property Maintenance Code that is the starting point for the Advisory Group's discussions applies to all properties. Amy recalled earlier Advisory Group discussion that applying the Code to all properties would avoid creating different classes/subclasses of people.

II. Gibb thanked visitors for comments. He asked for comments or corrections regarding the September 24, 2013 Advisory Group meeting notes. No comments or corrections were offered.

III. Gibb introduced Housing Division Manager Weiss to provide a brief overview of the organizational structure of the Community Development Department and the proposed changes that would create a Housing and Neighborhood Services Division from what is currently the Housing Division. He added that Weiss would then provide an overview of the Property Maintenance Code (PMC) protocols that staff have developed for use in program implementation.

   Weiss provided an overview of an organizational chart depicting the Housing Division changes, noting that in addition to continuing to deliver federal programs for affordable housing and community development activities, the new Housing and Neighborhood Services Division will expand to include Property Maintenance Code (PMC) compliance, and outreach and education services for neighborhoods, OSU, tenants and landlords, and the community at large. He noted that the outreach and education topic will be covered during the Advisory Group's October 29 meeting.

   Weiss then provided an overview of seven PMC program implementation protocols, explaining that at this point they are a reflection of staff's conceptual thinking as to how the program will operate. He noted that more specifics will be added to the protocols over time as the Advisory Group completes its

work and the PMC discussion moves on to the City Council. A copy of the protocols as outlined is attached.

Protocol 1 - Complaints: Weiss explained that on the recommendation of the Collaboration Corvallis Neighborhood Livability Work Group the PMC will operate as a complaint based program. Currently the City's Rental Housing Program requires that complainants identify themselves; the Development Services Code Enforcement program does not require complainant identification. As envisioned the PMC will not accept anonymous complaints; complainants may request to remain confidential, but must identify themselves.

Amy asked whether the number of complaints filed by specific individuals could be tracked. Weiss answered that reporting is not currently done in this way, but that the software system used to enter and track complaint responses could do so. Rachel asked if there would be penalties in place for people who file invalid complaints. Weiss said that had not been considered, but shared his opinion that if that were the case a potential complainant might fear bringing a complaint forward if they thought there would be a penalty if they were wrong and it was proved to be invalid.

Protocol 2 – renter-occupied units. Weiss explained that the timing of responses to complaints would be based on the severity of the issue being raised. He clarified that Code Compliance staff would verify resolution of all complaints in renter-occupied units. He noted that for less serious issues the current Rental Housing Program has had a ten-day response timeframe based on allowing three days for mailing, but given the predominant use of electronic communication staff wonders whether that time frame should be shortened to seven days. The group's consensus was that because the use of mail for communication is still common ten days seems appropriate.

Weiss went on to explain that the Rental Housing Code approach to achieving compliance is to require that a tenant first attempt to resolve a problem through direct communication with their landlord, and if the landlord fails to address the problem the City then gets involved. Development Services does not have such provisions in their approach to code enforcement, and responds directly to complaints with no additional tenant/landlord communication required. Weiss noted that staff are seeking feedback on the question of whether the Rental Housing Code requirement for tenants to contact landlords should carry over to the PMC.

Housing Program Specialist Loewen offered that the Rental Housing Code approach has been effective from his perspective. However feedback from underrepresented tenants suggests they have difficulty with this because they are fearful of repercussions if they complain directly to their landlord. Code Enforcement Supervisor Westfall added that in his experience entire neighborhoods have had fear of filing a complaint about specific property owners or residents.

Much discussion followed regarding a requirement that a tenant communicate first with their landlord before the City would accept their complaint, with no clear consensus emerging. Gibb noted that this question will be added to the list of topics to be discussed in more detail beginning with the Advisory Group's October 29 meeting.

Protocol 3 – owner-occupied residences and other building/property types. Weiss explained that based on earlier comments received from the Advisory Group, staff intends that for complaints in these property types they will follow the same time frame protocols outlined for renter-occupied properties, but that complaints for issues falling under the second and third priority levels, letters outlining a complaint and the Code standard that applies would be provided along with direction/instruction to correct the violation within a specified time frame. In these cases staff would not inspect the correction

unless a subsequent complaint(s) for the same issue was received. Karen asked whether the City could provide information about resources available to help building owners carry out repairs; Weiss agreed that in cases where the City is aware of such resources it would pass that information along.

Protocol 4 – scope of investigations. Weiss again referenced earlier Advisory Group discussions and concerns about staff investigating and taking action on issues that were not included in an original complaint. He explained that staff's intent will be to investigate only the issue(s) forming the basis of a complaint, and not to conduct a comprehensive inspection of a unit once they arrive. However, if in the course of investigating that complaint something hazardous, such as dangerous/exposed wiring, is in plain sight, staff will have to address that issue as well. He also clarified that if multiple issues are included in a complaint, the investigation will be correspondingly broad. Charlyn asked how the City would keep its response narrow if a faulty water heater was reported but it turns out the home's wiring is inadequate. Westfall clarified that in such cases the City could look at the capacity of a home's wiring, gas piping and ventilation in order to determine why the water heater is faulty and how it should be addressed.

Protocols 5 and 6 – progressive enforcement. Weiss outlined the approach the City will take once a PMC complaint has been validated, noting that the City will provide a notice and order to undertake repairs within a specified time frame; if there is no response, a second notice and order and response time frame will be provided, and will state the City's intent to proceed to legal action if the situation is not addressed. If at the end of the specified time frame there is no action to address the violation, the City will proceed to legal action.

Weiss continued, noting that comments provided to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee and Livability Work Group suggested the City should implement increasingly severe penalties for repeat violators. In response the protocols include staff's intent to develop and utilize a Code Compliance matrix to tailor responses based on the severity of violations, as well as the frequency of occurrences of the same violation in the same property or multiple properties under the same ownership. Westfall explained the concept of utilizing a civil citation and hearings officer process to give the City more flexibility to progressively address violations through civil rather than or in addition to criminal sanctions.

Protocol 7 – appeals. Weiss explained that in cases where someone feels a complaint about their property is in error they could appeal the notice and order. The City's current appeal process would be utilized. Development Services Division Manager Carlson described the appeal process and the membership of the Board of Appeals, and noted that the Board currently hears appeals related to the Building Code, the Rental Housing Code, and the Fire Code.

IV. Next steps. Gibb provided an overview of the next meeting (October 29), noting that it will begin with a discussion of PMC-related outreach and education, to be followed by a discussion of the questions, issues and concerns that have been raised by Advisory Group members. He asked that members review the list of questions/concerns raised to date (included in the October 23 meeting packet) and let staff know by noon on October 24 if they would like to add items for discussion on October 29. Staff will provide brief responses/explanations for the items currently on the list, to be included in the packet for the October 29 meeting. The packet for that meeting will go out October 25; Gibb asked that Advisory Group members review the list of questions/responses before the next meeting, and then communicate their top five issues back to staff to provide a prioritized framework for the next discussion. Members may also add new items to this "top five" list.

V. Other business. Gibb referenced the responses to Amy's questions about current code enforcement programs raised following the September 24 meeting; there was no additional discussion of the

responses. He then handed out the City of Albany Property Maintenance Code, noting that it is based on the International Property Maintenance Code. He cautioned that based on input from the Corvallis City Attorney's office, Corvallis would not follow Albany's approach of including the word "should," rather than "shall," where compliance standards are described in the PMC.

VI. Visitor comments. John Wydronek offered support for the City implementing the PMC with progressive enforcement provisions. He noted his concern in the case of rental properties about the City being notified before a landlord has a chance to resolve an issue, and asked that this aspect be looked at carefully.

VII. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Corvallis Property Maintenance Code Implementation Protocols

---

1. As recommended to the City Council by the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee, the Corvallis Property Maintenance Code will operate using a complaint-based approach rather than an inspection-based approach:
   - Complaints will be taken on any issue that may be a violation of the Code.
   - To be considered a valid/actionable complaint, the complainant must identify themselves, but may request to remain confidential.
   - Anonymous complaints will not be accepted.

---

2. Complaints for residences that are renter-occupied:
   - Complaints will be taken on any issue that may be a violation of the Code.
   - Intended time frame for and type of response by Code Compliance staff will be determined based on the severity of the violation:
     - Life/safety issues will receive priority response (ex: dangerous wiring, no smoke detectors).
     - Next priority - health/serious livability issues with a targeted 48-hour response (ex: lack of water/hot water, complete lack of heat, rodent harborage).
     - Other issues will receive a targeted 7 (or 10?) day response (ex: inadequate heat, interior doors/locks).
   - Potential carryover from current Rental Housing Code policy: Require that a tenant notify their landlord of apparent violations in cases that fall under the 48-hour or ten day response time frame targets.

---

3. Complaints for owner-occupied residences, other building/property types:
   - Follow timeframes above for compliance responses.
   - In-person staff response for life/safety, health, or over/illegal occupancy issues.
   - For other issues send a letter noting the reported violation, providing the applicable Code standard, and providing direction/instruction to reach compliance within a stated timeframe.

4. Scope of investigations:
    - Investigations of complaints regarding specific, limited conditions would not be used as an opportunity to conduct comprehensive property inspections; complaints alleging a broader scope of concerns may require a correspondingly broad response.
    - Issues of a serious, life/safety nature that are identified in the course of a complaint investigation would be addressed.

---

5. Progressive enforcement:
    - In situations that are not deemed to be dangerous buildings, will achieve Code compliance through a series of violation notices.
    - First notice directs compliance and a call for inspection within a stated timeframe.
    - Second notice to be provided if there is no call for inspection or if mitigation is determined to be incomplete. Second notice will 1) direct compliance and call for inspection within a stated timeframe, and 2) state City's intent to initiate legal action if compliance is not achieved within that timeframe.
    - If no call for inspection, initiate legal action.

---

6. Progressive enforcement - possible future additional approaches to be considered:
    - Create and utilize a Code Compliance matrix that integrates a tailored response based on the severity of the violation, the frequency of recurrence of the violation on the subject property, and the frequency of the violation occurring on other properties under the same ownership.
    - Investigate implementing a civil citation/hearings officer process to allow flexibility in achieving compliance and imposing a progressive set of fines/penalties.

---

7. Appeals:
    - Code compliance system to provide an avenue for appeal of a determination of violation.
    - Appeal process will follow the current Development Services Division policies/practices.
    - Appeals will be heard by the City's Board of Appeals.

Property Maintenance Code Outreach and Education Approach Outline

I. Current/past/ongoing outreach activities
   - Property management/landlord meetings
   - Realtor meetings
   - OSU graduate and international student orientations
   - OSU START and Connect Programs
   - OSU Housing policy class
   - OSU Housing Committee
   - Community organizations (as requested)

II. Program implementation audience/partners
   - Tenants
   - Property owners/managers
   - Neighborhood associations/residents
   - Commercial/other property owners/associations
   - OSU
   - City/County departments
   - Advocates
   - Housing assistance providers

III. Outreach materials - program information
   - Program description
   - How the program works
   - What the program does/doesn't cover
   - How to access information
   - How to file a complaint

IV. Program Awareness
   - Partner network
   - City Web site
   - Social media
   - Staff presentations
   - Neighborhood association/community meetings
   - Brochure/other printed materials

To the degree possible, program materials will be designed and produced to be linguistically and culturally appropriate.

Questions/Issues Raised by Property Maintenance Code Advisory Group through 10/27/2013

From the September 10 PMCAG meeting:

How will responsibility for the condition and repairs required for fences be determined and enforced?

- Staff will attempt to see where the fence is located and on whose property by observing property pins or using tools such as GIS. Once the owner of the fence is determined a courtesy notice will be sent which shares the concern and requests compliance with the standards.
- In cases where there are circumstances that make it difficult to determine which property is responsible, such as when property lines are unclear, staff would propose to provide notice to neighboring property owners and attempt to resolve the issue collaboratively with an on-site meeting.
- Staff anticipates that an established time period for initial onsite meeting will be within 30 days.

What standards will be used to evaluate the condition of and need to address a building's exterior paint?

- According to Section 304.2, all exterior surfaces shall be maintained "in good condition…peeling, flaking and chipped paint shall be eliminated and surfaces repainted".
- Section 304.6 stipulates that all exterior walls shall be "maintained weatherproof and properly surface coated."
- Staff anticipates responding to complaints regarding the exterior paint of a building by issuing a courtesy notice to the owner (responsible party, per Section 301.2). The courtesy notice will include an explanation of the concern and relay the code requirements. It will also include a request for a follow-up inspection within X-days to verify completion. Staff anticipates that a reasonable time period for follow-up inspection will be within 12 months.
- It is not anticipated that the City will receive large numbers of complaints about minor compromises of painted surfaces, but in such instances staff would anticipate using a measured approach and give priority to addressing the most serious issues.

What assurances are there that current interpretations of Property Maintenance Code standards, and staff's explanations of its intended approaches to enforcement, will be continued into the future as new staff take over implementation and enforcement responsibilities?

- Current Development Services and Housing staff will be charged with the responsibility to implement the future IPMC.
- Any new staff hired will be provided with extensive customer service and PMC training.
- Development Services currently operates with approximately 180 documented processes, procedures, and interpretations covering a wide variety of topics which help provide consistent guidance, particularly in cases of staff turnover. Housing also has a set of program policies and procedures which provide day-to-day guidance for programmatic interpretations. The new Housing and Neighborhood Services Division will continue these practices.
- Topics that are not specifically defined in the adopted Property Maintenance Code (such as is noted in IPMC Chapter 2) will have interpretations drafted.

Why should the City and its Property Maintenance Code be concerned about the condition of interior, non-load bearing walls (paint, plaster) in owner-occupied homes?

- Buildings with poorly maintained interiors typically are noted as having deteriorated exterior conditions that lead to neighborhood blight and negatively impact property value and neighborhood livability. A Property Maintenance Code is intended to prevent the deterioration of buildings and in turn, promote the livability of the community.

Should indoor furniture being used and left outdoors be considered rubbish, and treated as such under the City's Property Maintenance Code?

- The City Council considered this matter in 2009 and then requested an update again in 2011. While this issue could be revisited, current policy is in alignment with previous Council direction.
- Staff evaluates whether the furniture items left outdoors fit the definition of Solid Waste, which is defined under CMC 4.01.010.
- If it is determined that an item is solid waste then it must be disposed of in a timely manner; however, if it is determined to not be solid waste then no action is taken.
- There is no current prohibition against allowing personal possessions to remain outdoors if the solid waste definition is not met.

Will the Code have provisions to allow residents to compost?

- The model PMC does not explicitly address composting; however, Sections 308.2/308.3 require only that rubbish and garbage be placed in *approved* containers so the City could work to create a standard for composting containers. The standards could include commercially produced composting containers, as well as design criteria for a do-it-yourself construction.
- CMC 4.02.040 RAT ERADICATION provisions specifically exempt residential composting of waste vegetable matter collected on private property from requirement for containment.
- Communities do specifically include language to support active composting of vegetable material (Portland is an example).

Should the owner/landlord of a rental property be required to contract for garbage/rubbish removal? Can't that be required of a tenant through a property lease?

- The rationale for assigning the responsibility to the owner is to eliminate confusion about whether the owner, the agent, or the tenant is responsible for providing the necessary storage containers and for ensuring removal of all solid waste.
- By assigning this responsibility to the owner (301.2, 308.1, 308.2.1/308.3.1), the continuity of containment and removal service is ensured, rather than introducing the potential for gaps or lapses in service coverage.

Will the Code stipulate a required frequency of garbage/rubbish removal?

- The model code does not state a specific frequency. The City's current intention is to align the requirements with CMC 4.01, or replace one with the other.

If a tenant causes a pest infestation but does not address it before moving out, what redress does the property owner/landlord have?

- Under state landlord/tenant law, the owner can address/correct the problem and charge the tenant's deposit for any associated costs.

Is it practical/realistic to expect that there will be no pests (e.g., fleas) in outdoor areas of a property?

- It is not realistic to expect that there will be no pests in outdoor areas of a property. What this provision of the PMC will accomplish is to provide a means to relief for someone who has an infestation.

Why should the Code be concerned with whether bathrooms/water closets have doors that lock?

- The intention of the provision of Section 503.1 is to ensure a meaningful measure of privacy for persons utilizing a common or shared toilet room or bathroom.
- The City has received complaints about rental living situations in which bathroom doors did not lock, and tenants felt their privacy/safety was being violated.

From the September 24 PMCAG meeting

How will the PMC address non-operational fireplaces?

- The requirement of Section 304.11 is specific to maintaining a chimney as structurally sound, safe, and in good repair. There is no requirement to maintain a fireplace as operational, simply that as an element of a chimney it (a fireplace that is operational, or not) must be maintained as structurally sound, safe and in good repair.
- Chimneys often provide the exhaust passage for fuel gas appliances, such as water heaters and furnaces.
- Even when a chimney is not utilized for any exhaust purpose, failure to maintain one will eventually result in deterioration and a real risk of potentially unsafe circumstances.
- Where a chimney is structurally sound but not effectively exhausting smoke from a fireplace, it could be decommissioned.

Should an electrical outlet in each bathroom be required? What if the current electrical system cannot accommodate an outlet in a bathroom – would the unit need to be rewired?

- The provisions of Section 605.2 are intended to minimize or eliminate the use of extension cords, as they are a safety concern – one often noted by the Fire Marshall. Household extension cords are designed for light duty use and the amount of electrical current that one may safely conduct is limited by the size of its conductors; they are easily overloaded and susceptible to causing fires. Extension cords are more susceptible to damage (cut, compression, pinch) than is permanent wiring, and they present a trip/slip and a shock hazard in wet locations.
- Most properly functioning electrical systems can accommodate a new electrical outlet in a bathroom; although a new single circuit may need to be installed or a nearby one altered it is not likely that a unit would need to be completely rewired for this purpose.
- Materials and methods are available that allow for proper protection of surface mounting of wires and outlets so that destructive measures to expose interiors of walls or ceilings are typically not necessary.

Should smoke detectors be required both inside and outside of bedrooms?

- Westfall explained during the September 24 meeting that this requirement aligns with current building and fire codes.

Is it necessary to be so specific with PMC standards, for example, the requirement that rooms have glazing equivalent to 8% of their floor space?

- Westfall explained during the September 24 meeting that alternative, mechanical means to achieve this lighting requirement could be utilized.

What if a room has a dimension of less than 7 feet? Would that mean the room could not be used for sleeping?

- Westfall noted during the September 24 meeting that this conclusion is correct, the room would not meet minimum dimensions and could not be considered as legal for sleeping purposes.

Is there rationale for the IPMC's floor space requirements for sleeping rooms and living/dining rooms?

- Westfall explained during the September 24 meeting that sleeping room requirements are based on what is needed to accommodate furniture and safe egress; living/dining room requirements are based on resident needs for usable space outside of their sleeping rooms.

Should the IPMC be applied to non-residential properties? (Reiterated in Amy's 10/24 e-mail)

- Providing minimums across all types and uses of properties is intended to ensure the ongoing maintenance of the whole built environment to:
    1. ensure consistent sanitation (garbage, rubbish, plumbing)
    2. minimize blighting impacts throughout the community
    3. protect the habitability, livability and property values of buildings and neighborhoods
    4. provide code authority under which to address safety concerns
    5. provide a current dangerous building code standard (1997 edition is currently used)

How will a code inspector handle a situation in which they inspect for one complaint issue but find other issues that do not comply with the PMC?

- As explained on October 23, the City intends to inspect/address only issues raised within the scope of a complaint, and will not seek to inspect on a more comprehensive basis. If during the course of inspection a hazardous or dangerous situation is in plain sight of an inspector, that situation will need to be reasonably remedied. Non-hazardous situations would be identified in a notice to the owner that simply makes them aware of the observation. Staff would request the circumstances be corrected and not likely reinspect.

Who can grant access to a property for purposes of inspection?

- Westfall explained on September 24 that the party in control of the space would need to grant access for a City inspection.

Could complaints by non-residents (e.g., neighbors) be limited to exterior conditions only?

- Complaints will be taken for any violation covered by the Property Maintenance Code. Anonymous complaints will not be accepted. In non-renter-occupied properties, in-person staff responses to complaints will be limited to dangerous/serious issues and issues of illegal or over-occupancy.

How will the prosecution of violations be handled? Would an owner who refuses to paint the exterior of their home be guilty of a misdemeanor?

- It is not the City's intent to criminalize non-compliance with all of the Property Maintenance Code standards. Staff will continue to evaluate and recommend alternative approaches to achieving compliance such as establishing a flexible schedule of responses in cases where compliance is not achieved (Similar to Eugene and Springfield).

From the October 23 PMCAG meeting, and from Amy Harding's 10/24 e-mail

Should a tenant be required to contact their landlord to request repairs before they may file a complaint with the City?

- The City Housing Division's Rental Housing Program requires such contact; the Development Services Division's code enforcement program does not.
- Tenants have expressed fear (founded or unfounded) that complaining to their landlord will lead to retribution.
- Landlords have expressed concern that they should be given an opportunity to address issues directly, without the involvement of the City.

The combined larger scope of city involvement in property maintenance issues and the possibility of the city serving as the "first responder" role regarding property maintenance issues will result in a huge work-load increase for city staff and continued inability to keep up (even with additional funds from fees to landlords).

- Approaches to limit the expansion of violations beyond the immediate scope of complaints were outlined on October 23. Information about anticipated budget and staffing issues will be provided during the Advisory Group's November 12 meeting.

If this code is to apply to all property in Corvallis, why does it fall on rental property owners to pay for its implementation and enforcement?

- Both rental unit-based fees and City General Fund resources will be used to support implementation of the Property Maintenance Code. Additional information will be provided during the discussion of the program's budget on November 12.