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SCANNING:

In October 1992 members of the newly formed San Diego Police Department Northern Division Neighborhood Policing Team conducted a door to door survey of residents in the Clairemont community of the City of San Diego. Our goal was to determine what residents in the area perceived as their most serious crime problems. Many of the residents surveyed in the area near the Mount Aguilar Apartments complained of disproportionately high crime associated with the Mount Aguilar Apartment complex. Throughout San Diego that apartment complex is infamously known as “The Blue Roofs”.

ANALYSIS:

Some of those surveyed stated they were afraid to even walk in the area of the Mount Aguilar Apartments during the daytime because of gangs and drug dealers living or hanging around there. Many of those surveyed believed most of the crime in the surrounding community could be attributed to people living in the Mount Aguilar Apartments. We asked Fiona Greenhalgh of our Crime Analysis Unit to evaluate an area within a 0.4 mile radius around the Mount Aguilar Apartments for calls for service from the police department. We found the Mount Aguilar Apartments had a much higher calls for service rate per capita than the rest of the surrounding residences, including other similar apartment complexes. Analysis of arrest report data showed a significant proportion of those arrested for crimes committed in that community were residents or guests of the Mount Aguilar Apartments. Senior officers we spoke with said the Mt. Aguilar Apartments had been a constant major source of crime problems for over 20 years.

The Northern Division Neighborhood Policing Team is made up of two person teams. The teams discuss their individual projects as a group in problem solving discussions during lineups. In discussing our Mount Aguilar Apartments project, one of our N.P.T. members, who had worked in the Northeastern Division, said the Mount Aguilar Apartments problems seemed similar to those of The Gardens, an apartment complex located in the community of Penasquitos. We contacted the Northeastern Division N.P.T. and found they were already addressing their similar problems at The Gardens using a traditional undercover drug enforcement operation.

The Mount Aguilar Apartment complex consists of 312 units situated in 17 separate multistory buildings. There is a single private street giving access to the complex. The physical layout of the complex prevented police from approaching without being seen, making it difficult to apprehend suspects engaging in criminal activity. Fifty percent of the units are Section-8 federally subsidized housing. The Gardens apartment complex consists of 504 units situated in 39 multistory buildings. Forty percent of those units are Section-8.
Both complexes had been owned by the same individual and managed by the Atlantic and Pacific Property Management Company for over 20 years. The owner was living in Florida and reputed to have ties to organized crime. An attempt by the San Diego Housing Commission to purchase the Mount Aguilar Apartments some years earlier was abandoned because of the alleged connection to organized crime.

H.U.D. had originally guaranteed a B.M.I.R. (Below Market Interest Rate) loan on the properties in return for the owner providing Section-8 and low income housing. H.U.D. realized many Section-8 families would lose their housing when the original contract expired in 1992. H.U.D. offered the owner an incentive to keep the Section-8 housing by allowing him to take cash equity out of his properties in the form of a B.M.I.R. second. The owner had just renegotiated his contract with H.U.D. and had taken approximately $17 million in cash equity out of the properties. As a condition of the new loan, H.U.D. had required the owner to make $2 million in physical improvements to the properties.

We contacted other officers who had previously attempted to address problems at the Mount Aguilar Apartments. All agreed the problems were rooted in poor management. Previous attempts to conduct undercover drug enforcement in the complexes had failed due to the network of relationships between management staff and residents. Family members of management staff were involved with illegal drugs. Management would offer to help police then would warn family members to protect them, and word of the undercover operations quickly spread throughout the complexes. Years of accepting tenants without proper screening had also resulted in an ever increasing percentage of undesirable tenants, forcing the law abiding tenants out of the area.

On January 4, 1993 we opened a P.O.P. project involving both apartment complexes. Our goal was to reduce crime, lower police calls for service and improve the safety and living conditions for residents in and around both apartment complexes. Even though the larger complex was not within our Division, we felt we could improve conditions at both complexes without any extra effort by improving the management practices of their common property management company. We felt the best way to accomplish this goal was to have the property management company establish and enforce a strict rental agreement and house rules along with a comprehensive screening process for prospective tenants. The strict rental agreement and house rules would facilitate the eviction of problem tenants while the comprehensive screening process would insure the vacancies would be filled by good tenants. Given the history of these two complexes, it seemed likely that some management personnel would have to be replaced to insure implementation of the proposed changes.

Having no previous experience dealing with rental property management, we met with members of the San Diego Housing Commission to get an idea of what laws we would be dealing with and what we could
expect of a good property management company.

Prior to formally contacting Atlantic and Pacific Property Management, we developed informants who worked within the main office of the management company. These contacts were later to prove invaluable in determining the truthfulness of what we would later be told by Atlantic and Pacific Property Management officers. On January 6, 1993 we had a meeting with the top three officers of Atlantic and Pacific Property Management. We had initially hoped to improve management through voluntary compliance and education. They told us they were eager to improve conditions in the complexes. They said they had tried to evict problem tenants in the past but had lost their cases when the tenants fought them in court. We suggested they develop a stricter rental agreement and house rules. They told us H.U.D. rules were making it too difficult for them to develop these stricter rental documents and screening procedures. Atlantic and Pacific Property Management told us H.U.D. required them to get approval of the new changes from the Mount Aguilar Tenants Association (M.A.R.A.), and that M.A.R.A. was fighting the changes. We contacted Sebastian Adame, the local head of H.U.D., and were told H.U.D. encourages tenant screening, strict rental agreements and house rules because they help to provide safer living conditions for the residents. Mr. Adame further advised that H.U.D. wants the residents to have input through associations such as M.A.R.A., but these associations are only advisory and could not block the establishment of stricter rules at the apartment complexes. In order to eliminate the misunderstanding between Atlantic and Pacific Property Management and H.U.D., and to proceed with our project, we arranged a meeting between Atlantic and Pacific Property Management, H.U.D. and ourselves. That meeting took place on the morning of February 11, 1993. At that meeting Atlantic and Pacific Property Management admitted they had falsely blamed H.U.D. for their own lax screening and eviction policies. We later met with the President of M.A.R.A. Our impression of M.A.R.A. was that it was made up of problem tenants who had formed an organization and voted themselves into office to avoid being evicted themselves. M.A.R.A. did not seem to represent the majority of tenants, but they were the only tenants organization in the complex and therefor had a certain amount of influence. Rather than helping us improve conditions, they proved to be an obstacle.

RESPONSE #1:

On the afternoon of February 11, 1993 San Diego Police Department Officers Gave Wagner and Pete Cohen put on a class for property owners and managers. This class was attended by our team, top management officers from Atlantic and Pacific Property Management and the top local management of H.U.D. We and H.U.D. recommended Atlantic and Pacific replace their current on-site manager, develop a screening process
for new tenants, develop a new stricter rental agreement and house rules, hire qualified security and develop a tracking process so they could document problems with tenants for eviction purposes. Atlantic and Pacific Property Management staff gave us a verbal commitment at that time that they would follow our recommendations. We agreed to help arrest, identify and document adult tenants and their guests who were involved in criminal activities once the new rental agreements and house rules were in effect and reliable personnel were in place at both complexes so our efforts would be documented for use in evictions. Juvenile offenders would have to be identified and documented by their security and management staff due to laws forbidding us from releasing juvenile information to them. We did not want to expend a considerable amount of city resources and time until Atlantic and Pacific Property Management had proven themselves capable and willing to utilize the resulting information. We had already done several investigations of tenants at their request and found that none of the information we provided to Atlantic and Pacific Property Management was being used to start eviction proceedings, even though the evidence we provided was sufficient to do so. We were initially told the new rental agreements and house rules would be signed and in effect by April 1, 1993. We were also told the on-site manager at the Mount Aguilar Apartments would be fired due to her long record of incompetence. Top management at Atlantic and Pacific Property Management told us they were having difficulty enforcing parking regulations and trespassing at both complexes. We inspected the complexes and gave them copies of the appropriate laws. We told them how to post their property to ensure legal enforcement. We also made ourselves available to Atlantic and Pacific Property Management on a 24 hour basis.

Atlantic and Pacific Property Management was advised to replace their current security guard with a legitimate security guard company so they could document problem juveniles and enforce house rules which we could not enforce. We did not consider the current security guard to be qualified, as we had arrested him twice for credit card theft. We were also concerned about his relationships with the various tenants, as he had apparently fathered children from three different women residents.

To keep patrol officers and others in our department updated on our project, we published update articles in our own Northern Division N.P.T. newsletter.

ASSESSMENT #1:

Atlantic and Pacific Property Management did not follow through with any of their part of the agreement. They moved the date for tenants signing the new rental agreements and house rules back several times. Atlantic and Pacific Property Management told us the delay in implementation of the new rental agreements and house rules was due to "delays caused by H.U.D. in Washington". A second meeting with
H.U.D. placed the blame back on Atlantic and Pacific Property Management. Once the new rental agreements and house rules were presented to the tenants, Atlantic and Pacific Property Management had difficulty getting the tenants to sign them, even though they had earlier agreed to evict those tenants who refused to sign. We helped coordinate, and attended a tenant’s meeting on March 11, 1993. The objective of that meeting was to explain the necessity for the new rules and to get tenant input. One of the main complaints we heard from tenants at that meeting was the lack of response by Atlantic and Pacific Property Management to tenant’s complaints of illegal activity by other tenants as well as to complaints of maintenance problems. On July 13, 1993 we found that 79 tenants still had not signed the new house rules. When we asked Atlantic and Pacific Property Management if they were going to honor their agreement with us by starting eviction proceedings on those tenants who had not yet signed the agreements, they were reluctant to do so, saying they were giving the tenants an extension on the due date.

Atlantic and Pacific Management did not replace the on-site manager at the Mount Aguilar Apartments until November 1993, ten months after they had originally agreed to. She was replaced only after another meeting with H.U.D. Atlantic and Pacific Property Management told us they had found a very aggressive manager to replace the present one. They claimed he had single handedly cleaned up a crime ridden complex in National City. We checked with National City Police Department and found the “crime ridden” complex he supposedly had cleaned up was actually a very quiet retirement complex which had no history of problems. No one at the complex even knew who he was. The manager turned out to be a friend of one of the Atlantic and Pacific Property Management officers who was owed a favor. Eventually the manager was replaced by someone from outside Atlantic and Pacific Property Management. She seemed to be much more eager to document and evict problem tenants than her predecessor. Unfortunately, she was closely directed by Atlantic and Pacific Property Management officers who would not let her make decisions. Several times she told us she wanted to begin eviction procedures against problem tenants, but was ordered not to by her supervisor. She was soon replaced by another manager who told us she would not be working there long because Atlantic and Pacific Property Management had not told her the truth about how bad the problems were at the complex.

We attempted to get credible tenants in the complex to run for office in M.A.R.A., but were told no one wanted to have anything to do with Atlantic and Pacific Property Management.

Even though we had told Atlantic and Pacific Property Management we could not help them enforce their house rules, they constantly called police to handle those types of problems at the complexes.

After a long delay, Atlantic and Pacific Property Management fired the original security guard and
contracted with Metro Security to patrol the Mount Aguilar Apartments. We continued to receive requests from the on-site management at Mount Aguilar Apartments to resolve house rules problems. On-site management told us there were just as many problems during the daytime hours as there were during the evening hours, yet there was no daytime security provided. On-site management also said Metro Security was to provide them with daily “activity reports” to document problem tenants. The few reports they had received were incomplete and uninformative.

On August 11, 1993 we spoke with the head of Metro Security and asked him about the reports. He said his employees were unable to provide accurate reports because the juvenile and adult tenants they had contacted had refused to identify themselves or where they lived. I asked him what other duties his patrol personnel had at the complex. He told me they had been contracted to do the following:

- Make 5 drive-through patrols during the hours of 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., illuminating the dark areas.
- Secure the laundry rooms.
- Enforce illegal parking in the red zones.
- Respond to disturbance calls when dispatched.

He was not aware of any special enforcement needs as mentioned in the Mount Aguilar House Rules. He said he had never even been given a copy of the house rules they were supposed to enforce. He went on to say he could have his entire patrol service on site at the Mount Aguilar Apartments and it would still be insufficient because they are unarmed and do not have the respect of the tenants. For example, when he first drove through the complex, juveniles threw rocks at his vehicle and he had to make an arrest. He also told us of an incident where a person who stopped one of his security guards to report a problem later had his windows broken out. Because of incidents like this, people were not willing to report problems, or did so anonymously.

We asked Metro Security if the tenants knew how to request help from their patrol personnel. The head of Metro Security said he had provided on site management with 500 flyers with the security company’s phone number in them to be given to the residents. We made a few random calls to residents of the complex asking if they had received the security patrol flyers. None of the residents we contacted had received the flyers or knew how to contact the security patrol for help. Some were not even aware they had security available.

We questioned our informants within Atlantic and Pacific Property Management about what was actually taking place with Atlantic and Pacific Property Management. Our informants said that while Atlantic and Pacific Property Management was telling us they were trying to make improvements, they were actually just stalling. They were ignoring and sometimes encouraging illegal activity, including Section-8 fraud.
informants said Atlantic and Pacific Property Management had spent years developing a situation where they paid themselves salaries which were much higher than the industry standard while doing little more than collecting rents. They said Atlantic and Pacific Property Management had no incentive to make the necessary changes to improve conditions at the complexes. Atlantic and Pacific Property Management planned to simply wait until we gave up, then go back to business as usual.

RESPONSE #2:

We had given Atlantic and Pacific Property Management more than enough time to make the agreed upon improvements. During that period, we had concentrated our efforts on documenting Atlantic and Pacific Property Management’s incompetence, and researching laws relating to abatement. We felt Atlantic and Pacific Property Management had become an unmitigatable roadblock which would have to be replaced before we could proceed. To accomplish this, we planned to address the problems at Atlantic and Pacific Property Management using a three pronged strategy. We wanted to have alternate plans of action ready in case others failed. Our primary assault would be through H.U.D., backed up by our own Drug Abatement Response Team (D.A.R.T.), and finally the California Board of Realtors. We wanted to force the owner to replace Atlantic and Pacific Property Management or lose his property. With H.U.D. we could impact the owner through his contract and financial obligations to them. If that failed, we could use D.A.R.T. to threaten to take the property from the owner by declaring it to be a public nuisance. If we were still not successful, we could use the California Board of Realtors to make it impossible for Atlantic and Pacific Property Management to continue operating as a business.

We were not sure how committed H.U.D. would be toward forcing the owner to replace Atlantic and Pacific Property Management. Within H.U.D. there was some disagreement as to just how incompetent Atlantic and Pacific Property Management was. We asked to see H.U.D.’s latest inspection and audit of Atlantic and Pacific Property Management’s handling of the two properties. H.U.D.’s own audit rated Atlantic and Pacific Property Management as substandard in many categories. We requested a copy of their audit which H.U.D. was reluctant to give us at that time. We were ultimately able to obtain the documents through the Freedom of Information Act.

Although drugs were not the primary problem at the complexes, we felt D.A.R.T. could use the same techniques they used in drug abatements, only using public nuisance laws instead. We contacted D.A.R.T. and explained our rather unusual proposal. In the “Be innovative and don’t be afraid to take chances” spirit of San Diego Neighborhood Policing, they enthusiastically agreed to help us and immediately put their team
on the project.

D.A.R.T. phoned Atlantic and Pacific Property Management to ask a few questions. The word "abatement" sent a shock wave through Atlantic and Pacific Property Management. Within 24 hours the owner's lawyer was calling D.A.R.T. wanting to know what the owner could do to eliminate any problems at his properties. They were more than eager to attend our upcoming meeting.

We had checked Atlantic and Pacific Property Management's business, real estate and brokers licenses. We researched the laws relating to these licenses and had contacted the California Board of Realtors. They felt we had enough documentation of Atlantic and Pacific Property Management's incompetence to warrant an investigation and possible revocation of their brokers license, making it impossible for them to operate as a property management company.

H.U.D. agreed to host a meeting with D.A.R.T. and us, which the property owner and Atlantic and Pacific Property Management would be required to attend. Prior to the meeting, the entire Northern Division N.P.T. conducted a survey of tenants at the Mount Aguilar Apartments to document discrepancies between Atlantic and Pacific Property Management's tenant list and the actual tenants. We also wanted to give the tenants an opportunity to voice their opinions about how Atlantic and Pacific Property Management was managing the complex. The responses from tenants about Atlantic and Pacific Property Management's service was almost unanimously negative. One of the most serious complaints we received was from several single women who said that in order to get any repairs done by the maintenance men, they had to either agree to have sex with them or buy drugs from them.

At the meeting we presented evidence of Atlantic and Pacific Property Management's incompetence in several ways. We presented our calls for service and crime statistic data, our log documenting each step we had taken in our project, the tenant surveys, a copy of the official H.U.D. audit, and photographs of the apartment complex taken just prior to the meeting. We also did criminal background checks on the last four tenants which had been accepted after supposedly being given extensive background checks by Atlantic and Pacific Property Management. We found all four had criminal records or past tenancy problems which would have made then unacceptable tenants.

In the original tenants meeting a year earlier, several women had said they were afraid to use the laundry rooms because they had no windows, and doors which could be easily locked from inside. We reminded Atlantic and Pacific Property Management of those women's fears and how they themselves had loudly proclaimed they would make the replacement of the doors and locks their highest priority. We showed them the photos of the still unchanged laundry room doors and locks. We held up the photo of the lock and
said, “If Atlantic and Pacific Property Management is incapable of changing a simple lock in a years time, then they are incapable of managing these apartment complexes.” The owner had to agree!

H.U.D. fined the owner $300,000 for the required improvements which Atlantic and Pacific Property Management had not completed in the requisite time.

The owner’s lawyer asked us for a detailed list of what we wanted done at the properties. The owner assured us he would spend whatever was necessary to accomplish our goals at his complexes. We then sent that list to the owner and also presented it to the new property management company at a later joint meeting at H.U.D.

**ASSESSMENT #2:**

On April 1, 1994, management of both complexes was completely taken over by a new property management company, Eugene Burger Property Management. The new management company was one of several companies recommended by H.U.D. which have good reputations for cleaning up problem complexes. Even though most of the new management’s time has been spent straightening out the clerical mess left by Atlantic and Pacific Property Management, we have seen more accomplished in their first month than Atlantic and Pacific Property Management was able to accomplish in a year. The Mount Aguilar Apartments finally has a resident manager who actually lives in the complex. She has a no nonsense, get tough attitude. She is not afraid to walk the complex grounds as was the previous manager. The new manager is actively seeking our help in documenting problem tenants for eviction purposes. Our team is using information provided by the manager and tenants to arrest problem tenants for offenses justifying eviction. Our first sweep through the complex produced five arrests in thirty minutes, resulting in three evictions. Tenants are reporting a significant reduction in gang and drug activity. We sense a completely different attitude when we go there now. The Northeastern N.P.T. reports similar improvements at The Gardens complex. Neighborhood Watch programs are being organized by the new management company to increase tenant involvement at both complexes.

◆ We have not had sufficient time to evaluate the long term changes in crime statistics vis-a-vis the change in management companies. However, we have found some significant trends in the data since we began this project. Crime Analysis Unit graphs of arrests at the Mount Aguilar Apartments show a steady increase during our project. These arrests were tenant initiated rather than police initiated. At the same time anonymous reporting of crimes has decreased. Police calls for service have decreased slightly. I believe these trends indicate tenants are losing their apathy and are now willing to come forward and do their part to help remove problem tenants from the complex.
CONCLUSION:

Although this has been a long term project, the number of hours we actually spent working on it was relatively small. During the time we worked on this project, we also successfully completed dozens of other P.O.P. projects.

The improvements we have seen in the first two months since the new management took over has more than justified our efforts. Future evictions and the replacement of bad tenants with well screened, qualified tenants should result in the realization of our original goal of reducing crime, lowering police calls for service and improving the safety and living conditions for residents in and around both apartment complexes.

This project could only have been successful with the teamwork, flexibility and support that Neighborhood Policing and Problem Oriented Policing provided. It did not just involve a two person team, it involved the coordination and cooperation of a team comprised of many different individuals and organizations. Special recognition should go to the Department’s Northern Division N.P.T., Northeastern Division N.P.T., D.A.R.T., and Crime Analysis Unit, as well as H.U.D., California Board of Realtors, and Mount Aguilar tenants. Most importantly, though, we must acknowledge a few Atlantic and Pacific Property Management employees who helped us by telling us the truth about the fraud within their company, even though they knew helping us to succeed would eventually lead to the elimination of their jobs.

The success of this project has also been important to the success of the Neighborhood Policing program within the San Diego Police Department. As with any new program, Neighborhood Policing has not won acceptance easily within our department. We knew we were taking on a project where others had tried but failed to improve conditions before. When we started we were told “The Blue Roofs” was a lost cause and that Neighborhood Policing was just a fad. Now people are taking a new look at “The Blue Roofs”. The Gardens, and at Neighborhood Policing.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION (ATTACHED):
Crime incident density maps prepared by SDPD Crime Analysis Unit (Analysis phase)
Crime case, arrest, and calls for service graphs prepared by SDPD Crime Analysis Unit (Scanning, Analysis, and Response phases)
Policies and procedures to be implemented at Mount Aguilar Apartments and The Gardens Apartments. sent to the property owner.
Northern Division N.P.T. Newsletter articles
3800 Caminito Aguilar
Crime Cases
January '93 - April '94
3800 Caminito Aguilar
Arrests
January '93 - April '94
3800 Caminito Aguilar
Calls For Service
January '93 - April '94
CITY of SAN DIEGO
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 9, 1994

TO: Mr. Alvin Mainik, Owner, Mount Aguilar Apartments and The Gardens Apartments.

FROM: Officers Tim Hall and Cindy Brady
San Diego Police Department, Northern Div. Neighborhood Police Team

SUBJECT: Policies and procedures to be implemented at Mount Aguilar Apartments and The Gardens Apartments.

We appreciate your attendance at the February 2nd meeting at the U.S. Department of H.U.D. and your commitment to providing safe and crime-free apartment complexes in San Diego. We realize that you had to make some very difficult decisions, especially considering your long term loyalty to Jackie Alvarez. We are also committed to a safe and crime-free community. We will make ourselves and our city's resources available to you so we can achieve our mutual goals.

Per your request at the meeting, we have compiled the following list of things which the San Diego Police Department and the U.S. Department of H.U.D. feel need to be done to improve and maintain your properties. Please feel free to contact us at any time for clarification or assistance with any of these items, or any other issues which may arise.

The following items are public safety issues which require immediate attention:

1. All buildings must be clearly marked with address identification numbers. In addition to the numbers on the front, all sides of each building will be marked so as to be easily identified when approached from any direction. All individual apartments will be clearly marked with identification letters. These numbers and letters shall comply with city code.

2. All private roadways in The Gardens Apartments complex need to be posted with street name signs. Although not required by code, the following improvements would greatly improve response time for emergency personnel at the complexes; If possible, place signs with maps of the apartment complex at strategic locations, such as at the main roadway entrances. Paint the building numbers on the roofs.

3. All laundry room doors should be replaced with metal see-through security doors equipped with deadbolt locks which can not be operated without a key. Laundry rooms should be locked nightly between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Keys to the laundry room should be maintained only by the management, maintenance, and security staff, and should not be distributed to tenants.
The following items need to be implemented by the property owner and property management company as soon as possible:

4. Have the new property management staff attend a San Diego Police Department Landlord Training Class. The class is free and can be scheduled at their convenience.

5. Maintain an on-site resident manager (not just a repairman), who will be available to the tenants and who can make management decisions.

6. Provide 24 hour on-site security personnel who will walk the complex grounds, respond to tenants calls for service, and document violations of the residential lease agreement and house rules. The manager must provide tenants with the security company phone number. The manager must maintain the documented complaints and make them available to police upon request.

7. Develop and use a comprehensive standardized report form for documentation of tenant violations and complaints.

8. Management and security personnel must maintain confidentiality of those persons who report complaints by not divulging their names to other tenants, except under court order.

9. Hold a tenant’s community meeting to introduce the new management staff and explain the new enforcement policies.

10. If necessary, update the residential lease agreement and house rules forms to insure they are legal and enforceable. (The current documents list Atlantic and Pacific Property Management as the management company.)

11. Ensure that all current tenants have signed the rental agreement and house rules, and that a copy of the signed document is in their tenant file.

12. Perform a thorough independent background check of all tenants prior to renting. Such background check shall include verification of employment history, rental history, and criminal history for the last five years using independent methods to contact employers, landlords, and criminal history sources to verify application information. Those applicants found providing false information on applications must be rejected. All applicants are to be treated equally and fairly.

13. Require that all prospective adult tenants produce valid photo California identification (driver’s license, identification card, or military identification) at the time of application for occupancy. A photocopy of the identification of anyone requesting a parking space in the complex parking lot would be maintained in the tenant’s file.
14. Give all new tenants an orientation to the project and have the terms of the residential lease agreement and house rules explained to them by the management staff.

15. Require that prospective tenants produce current paycheck stubs substantiating current employment, or require that prospective tenants produce current documentation substantiating source of income (e.g., welfare checks, unemployment checks, disability checks, etc.) prior to renting.

16. Immediately evict all tenants engaged in narcotic activity and other illegal activity on or in the immediate vicinity of the premises.

17. Have the manager maintain up-to-date records of all tenants and occupants in each apartment. Include in the file a copy of the signed residential lease agreement and house rules, a description of all tenant’s vehicles to be parked on the premises, the pre-acceptance background check, and all complaints lodged against the tenants and their guests. Make these records available to police for inspection upon request.

18. Post in visible and conspicuous locations in and around the premises, signs indicating, “NO TRESPASSING, NO DRUGS, NO DRUG DEALERS, NO LOITERING, NO WEAPONS, NO DRINKING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES” The signs should include the phone number of the on-site security company. The landlord, manager and security officers must vigorously enforce these orders.

19. All utility boxes and water heater, laundry and storage rooms should be secured according to proper standards of the Building and Safety and Fire Departments to prevent the hiding of contraband and weapons.

20. Install effective high intensity lighting throughout the exterior of the building, if not already in place, and immediately replace any worn or damaged lighting. Ensure that these lighting devices are checked for proper working condition daily.

21. Maintain duplicates of all keys or other security devices for the manager and security officer. Whenever locks are changed, new duplicates should be distributed immediately to the manager and security officer. Any changes in tenancy in any unit shall result in new locks being installed and new keys being distributed as above.

22. Where they are required to be located, ensure fire extinguishers and fire alarms are in proper working condition.

23. Properly post parking lots and entrances for towing of illegally parked vehicles. Remove abandoned or disabled vehicles from property immediately. Strictly enforce “NO PARKING” in red zones.
24. Instruct the apartment maintenance personnel to quickly remove all graffiti from exterior and interior of the building and apartments, including stairways, halls, parking areas, laundry rooms, fences, etc.

25. Ensure that vacant units are kept secured during the vacancy. Vacant units should have window coverings removed so that the interior is clearly visible from the outside.

26. Keep all permits valid, current and available for inspection on the premises through the manager or security guard.

27. Correct all violations of laws and codes within 30 days of notification of violation. If a shorter period of time is required by the notifying agency, the violation will be corrected within that shorter time period.

28. All tenant modifications to patios and balconies, such as blinds and shades, must be checked to see if they conform to the prior written permission requirement of the current residential lease agreement and house rules. Those items which were installed in violation of the agreement should be removed to eliminate hiding places and provide a cleaner more uniform appearance.

29. Maintain landscaping so as to eliminate hiding places.

30. Inspect each apartment at least once a year for smoke alarms, fire extinguishers, pests, cleanliness and habitability.

31. Enforce all rules of the rental agreement and house rules aggressively and fairly. Notify residents of violations in writing and place a copy of the violation in the tenant’s file. The manager must aggressively and fairly seek eviction of all tenants whose actions or activities justify eviction based upon the terms of section #23, Termination of Residency, of the Residential Lease Agreement.

Sincerely

Timothy C. Hall

cc: Sebastian Adame, U.S. Department of H.U.D.
Guy Swanger, Sergeant, San Diego Police Department, Drug Abatement Response Team