

CITY OF OAKLAND

BUILDING SERVICES DIVISION

The 2010-2011 Alameda County Grand Jury received numerous complaints from property owners regarding building inspection fines, protocols, and abusive practices in the city of Oakland's Community and Economic Development Agency's (CEDA) Building Services Division (Building Services). These complaints were consistent with issues that had been raised by the 1999-2000 Alameda County Grand Jury wherein they recognized improvement was needed in Building Services. The current Grand Jury's investigation determined that the recommendations of the previous Grand Jury had not been addressed, and in fact, the situation had deteriorated. The reviews, reports, interviews, and testimony provided to the current Grand Jury indicate that significant reform is needed as set forth in the body of this report.

Introduction

The city of Oakland addresses issues of neighborhood blight and substandard buildings through the Building Services Division of CEDA. This division is divided into two areas: 1) engineering for plan review and issuance of permits for new construction and renovation, and 2) inspections and code enforcement of property (buildings and grounds) suspected of being out of compliance with various blight, nuisance and safety standards.

The engineering group issues permits and reviews contracts and documents that are required for any construction project. After permits are issued, inspectors review the construction projects to make sure they are proceeding according to plan and to ensure current building codes and standards are being met.

The inspections group investigates and responds to complaints of violations, unsafe or unsanitary conditions, construction work without permits, graffiti,

substandard buildings, illegal dumping, trash and other blight-related issues. Additionally, inspectors have the authority to identify problem properties while in a neighborhood without having received a complaint.

Investigation

In 1999 an Alameda County Grand Jury investigated the city of Oakland's Building Services Division's operations, policies and procedures. That investigation resulted in three recommendations: 1) that the Building Services Division publish clear, written instructions for permit applications and for renovation of residential and small commercial properties; 2) that the Building Services Division's policy to aggressively seek building code violations be limited to include only life or health and safety violations; and 3) that the Building Services Division use prospective liens as a last resort.

In the complaints received by the current Grand Jury from property owners, the allegations included:

1. inconsistent standards for citing blight and nuisance/substandard violations;
2. lack of timely and understandable notice of violations;
3. lack of clarity about the abatement process;
4. difficulty in contacting and working with inspectors;
5. inconsistent evaluations by different inspectors working on the same case;
6. unprofessional, retaliatory and intimidating treatment by inspectors;
7. excessive and exorbitant fees, fines and liens;
8. unclear and ineffective appeals process that is sometimes ignored by Building Services personnel;
9. lack of a reasonable amount of time to comply and take corrective measures;
10. impropriety in the selection of abatement contractors, including allegations of ethical violations in awarding contracts and a lack of transparency; and

11. citizens feel discouraged from correcting blighted or substandard properties because it is too difficult and expensive to work with Building Services.

Upon review of the citizen complaints, the 2010-2011 Grand Jury examined the city of Oakland's Building Services operations, policies and procedures. Additionally, the Grand Jury compared the codes under which the cities of Oakland, San Jose and San Francisco handle blight issues.

In order to understand the department's process of blight abatement and make recommendations for improvement, the Grand Jury reviewed every written complaint received and supporting documentation about citizens' problems working with Building Services, and interviewed some property owners who filed complaints. We also met with current and former Building Service employees as well as contractors and city officials.

From the Building Services Department we requested information regarding several aspects of its code enforcement process, specifically regarding:

- a. inspectors (qualifications, training, performance standards, evaluation, supervision and authority);
- b. the inspection and abatement process (internal operating procedures, brochures and documentation provided to the public, notification of property owners, inspector communications with property owners, documentation of blight/nuisance cases, timelines for abatements, and compliance plans);
- c. the appeals process (explanation of process, fees, communication with property owners, frequency and number of appeals);
- d. fees (types, amounts, application, how appeal fees are determined);
- e. the use of liens (types of liens, timing, amount, purpose); and
- f. the city's process for performing abatement work (timing, procedures, communication with property owners, selection of contractors, and billing of owners).

The Grand Jury reviewed the information received from Building Services and studied nearly 50 of their files on properties with code violations. In contrast, when we reviewed the complaints from property owners, many of which included copies of their property files and documents from the city, we found they contained documents not provided to the Grand Jury by the city of Oakland. Despite making the request by subpoena, the city provided the Grand Jury with files that were incomplete which reflects the poor record keeping of the Building Services Division.

The Grand Jury’s investigation found flaws in the following areas: abatement process; policies, procedures and training; information communication and data management; due process; contracting; and appeals, as noted below.

Abatement Process

Throughout the Grand Jury’s investigation we noted a contrast between what the city stated its abatement process is and what many property owners experience.

The way it <i>should</i> work per Building Services	The way it <i>does</i> work per many property owners
An inspector visits the property, confirms whether there is a violation, and determines whether it is blight, public nuisance/substandard or dangerous/imminent hazard.	Definition of blight, public nuisance/substandard or dangerous/imminent hazard is not applied consistently by all inspectors, leading to confusion by homeowners.
A notice of blight or declaration of public nuisance/substandard is mailed to the property owner as listed on the Alameda County property rolls. The notice includes a description of the conditions, required actions and timeline, recourse for non-compliance, right to appeal (with payment of fees), and notice that failure to appeal waives the right to a future administrative hearing.	Notice is confusing; notice not received in all cases; insufficient effort is made by the city to contact property owners beyond the initial mailing.

(Abatement Process, continued)

The way it <i>should</i> work per Building Services	The way it <i>does</i> work per many property owners
Usually the owner has 14-21 days to appeal the violations; enforcement actions are suspended while the appeal is reviewed.	Appeals process confusing to homeowners; notice not received until appeal deadlines have expired; enforcement actions not suspended during appeal; building services inspectors discourage homeowners from appealing.
For violations deemed a dangerous or imminent hazard, the city can take immediate action to remedy the hazard, and the owner has 7 days to appeal.	In some cases, the city misapplies the imminent hazard designation and undertakes the abatement before the property owner has had a chance to appeal.
The owner must obtain permits (if applicable) and commence abatement work within 30 days; abatement work must be completed 30 days later. (Building Services can grant extensions as appropriate.)	Timelines to take necessary steps to remedy problems are unrealistic. It often takes the city so long to approve a permit that the property owner's deadline for abatement has already passed.
Building Services issues a demand for payment, including various fees and penalties and cost recovery if the city has performed abatement work. If the owner does not pay within 7 days, the city files a lien, special assessment of general tax levy or nuisance abatement lien against the property.	Unrealistic timeline for payment as the fees and penalties can cost many thousands of dollars; demand notice for payment not always received on time.

Policies, Procedures & Training

The Grand Jury learned there is a lack of consistency among inspectors in identifying and treating blight. For example, in one instance, an inspector cleared a property of a blight violation and two weeks later a different inspector visited the same property and offered a contradictory opinion, and told the property owner there was still a violation.

The Grand Jury found inconsistencies were due in part to the lack of a policy and procedure manual with clearly written guidelines for the day-to-day process of code enforcement. Instead, inspectors receive periodic training and are directed

to the city code that they are to enforce for guidance. Three Building Services witnesses who testified before the Grand Jury confirmed that there is no policy and procedure manual. Management fails to provide systematic, consistent standards or procedures, leaving inspectors to rely on each other for application and interpretation of the code.

The Grand Jury also learned that oversight of field operations of inspectors is lacking and there is no consistent system for maintaining files. Property records are not kept in one central location but rather in several locations, including individual inspectors' desk drawers. When asked, the city was unable to provide complete records because of this record-keeping problem. Moreover, there is no system in place for the department to get feedback from the public, or to make improvements. Improved training should include standards for interacting with the public.

The Grand Jury received complaints from property owners expressing fear of filing appeals or complaining in writing about the Building Services Division due to feeling intimidated by inspectors. These property owners gave examples of inspectors telling them they will lose their appeal and it will cost more money in the long run. In one case, it was alleged by a property owner that they were threatened with the possible loss of their home.

Information/Communication/Data Management

Building Services' data base is inadequate and fails to track various records associated with notifying homeowners for violations, inspections, upgrades, permits, appeals, etc., unless information is manually input by individual inspectors. The city imposes a 14.75% records management and technology enhancement fee to all property owners who receive violations, but it does not appear that this fee has resulted in an effective Building Services computer system.

The Grand Jury learned that the computer system currently being used by Building Services to input notes on cases is nearly 30 years old; there are different systems that are not coordinated and do not function together; and there is no central access to a file for either inspectors or the property owners. In addition, the city stated it does not have a tracking system for appeals and cannot provide any information on them.

Due Process (notice, liens, fees & fines)

Building Services' procedures for giving notice, recording liens and assessing fees and fines fail to provide due process. Building Services lacks clear written instructions or brochures to assist property owners in understanding their rights and responsibilities if they receive a notice of abatement, or what the process is for solving the problems in the most efficient and effective way. Efforts to notify property owners are inadequate.

A common problem noted by many property owners and acknowledged by the city is that the notice of violation does not always get to the property owner. City code allows for personal delivery, posting notice conspicuously at the property, or mailing a letter to the owner listed on the Alameda County Tax Assessor's Rolls. Common practice by Building Services is to mail a letter to the owner as listed on the County Tax Rolls and to take no further action to notify the owners. The tax rolls are often inaccurate. They often don't get updated until months after properties change hands or mailing addresses have changed. Failure to actually notify an owner does not stop the abatement process. This practice can immediately place a property owner in an untenable situation during a very time-sensitive process where fines can quickly accrue.

The Grand Jury found there is ineffective communication between inspectors and property owners. Owners complain that inspectors are difficult to reach because telephone hours are limited to two hours in the morning and two in the evening

on different days, and inspectors generally do not provide cell phone numbers for property owners to reach them during the day.

Many properties are declared blighted and prospective liens recorded before there is an opportunity for appeal or the property owner has had a chance to respond. The Grand Jury found examples where a prospective lien was recorded against the property within days of issuing the initial abatement notice. A prospective lien is a notice intended as a warning to property owners. Filing a prospective lien has been perceived as an encumbrance on a property, thus interfering with financial transactions related to the property. The Grand Jury reviewed property records from 2007 through 2010 with prospective liens ranging from hundreds of dollars to tens of thousands of dollars. Although Building Services has recently revised its procedure for prospective liens to be “not less than \$1,000,” the Grand Jury believes the use of prospective liens is inappropriate at any level.

According to property owner complaints, in many cases the city requires a compliance plan before an appeal can take place or before a lien will be cleared. A compliance plan is a written list of fees related to work that needs to be completed by the property owner. There is a city-imposed fee ranging from \$400 to \$1500 just to file this plan. Even the compliance plan includes fees unrelated to the actual cost to remedy blight: a 9.5% records management fee and a 5.45% technology fee. *(See Exhibit A, Compliance Plan)*

According to property owner complaints, Building Services imposed deadlines that were unreasonable and impossible to meet. For example, Building Services would give a homeowner seven days to correct a problem that required a permit, but the permit issuing process takes 14 days according to the city’s timeline. If a property owner fails to meet the deadline, significant penalties accrue, which may ultimately cost the property owners thousands of dollars. *(See Exhibit B, Code Enforcement Billing Request)*

The Grand Jury learned that fines are not aligned with the actual cost to remedy blight, but appear to be punitive in many cases. There is a perception by property owners that the fees are simply a way to generate funds for the city without regard for the residents' due process.

Examples of Liens, Fees and Fines

Issue	Alleged Violation	Comments
Excessive prospective lien with no abatement work performed by the city.	Vacant home. Damaged interior wall and ceilings. Building unsecured.	Property was vacant because it was transferring ownership at the time. Prospective lien for \$50K was filed 29 days from initial notice of violation. No remediation work had been done by the city. New owner required to sign a compliance plan and pay fees incurred by previous owner before prospective lien was released.
Excessive prospective lien with cleanup performed by city in January 2010.	Trash and debris. Abandoned construction site.	Prospective lien amount in excess of \$827K plus interest.
Excessive fees/fines.	Trash and debris, blight.	"Trash and debris, blight" turned out to be children's toys in the yard. This resulted in fees/fines of over \$18K and having to demolish a garage converted to an indoor/outdoor recreation room that had been approved more than 20 years earlier.

(Examples of Liens, Fees and Fines, continued)

Issue	Alleged Violation	Comments
Excessive lien.	Overgrown vegetation and trash and debris and feces in rear yard. Stagnant water in partially filled swimming pool.	Contract to clean up and fill swimming pool with dirt cost the city \$25K. Prospective lien placed for \$45K.
Excessive prospective lien with cleanup performed by city.	Parking lot - overgrown vegetation, trash, debris, and graffiti.	Prospective lien amount was \$50K plus interest.
Excessive prospective lien with NO work performed by city.	Overgrown vegetation, graffiti, trash, debris, broken windows.	After owner cleaned up and case was closed on 8/7/2009, prospective lien for \$35K was placed on 8/10/2009.
Egregious abuse of authority.	Blight, overgrown vegetation, trash and substandard interior.	Building inspectors had a warrant for entry to premises for inspection only (not to remove items); they removed and disposed of EVERYTHING in the house and had animal control take the property owner's dog. Subsequently the city recorded a lien for \$30K.
Fees/liens paid and reapplied.	Permit violation/owner change.	Previous owner paid off all fees and liens on closing. Within 2 weeks, Building Services reapplied all charges, fees and liens in the amount of \$29K to the new owner – with no work done by the city.

(Examples of Liens, Fees and Fines, continued)

Issue	Alleged Violation	Comments
City contracts for clean up before owner contacted.	Overgrown vegetation.	The contract bid for clean up of a property was approved prior to Building Services making contact with the property owner. A 10-day notice to abate should be given to owners with a 21-day appeals period. In this case, Building Services placed a \$10K lien because of the untimely contract to abate.

Contracting

The Grand Jury received information that suggested appearances of impropriety in the contracting process when the city undertakes abatement. When Building Services hires contractors to do abatement work on private property, it does not use the contracting procedures employed by other city departments. Instead, it maintains its own short list of qualified contractors and uses a short bidding process. Although many of the contracts are small clean-up projects costing only a few hundred dollars, many are in the range of thousand or even tens of thousands. Generally, in situations deemed to be an emergency, the contractor is selected by a building inspector in the field. In awarding emergency contracts, oftentimes the building inspector will call selected individual contractors and award the contract at the site through an abbreviated selection process. In reviewing property records and contracts, the Grand Jury learned that the same few contractors show up in the field on a regular basis and the winning contract appears to be disproportionately awarded to the same contractor.

The Grand Jury consistently heard that one contractor had inappropriate access to the private office of the former inspection manager. This particular contractor appeared to receive a disproportionately large percentage of contracts and

submitted a disproportionately large number of change orders that were approved. Testimony was provided that this same contractor had inappropriate access behind the business counter in the Building Services division. The contractor would submit the lowest bid and then provide a change order for a higher amount that was approved by the then-inspections manager. These change orders inflated the final price of the contracts, increasing the cost of the lowest winning bid. The Grand Jury received testimony that there was a personal relationship between the then-inspections manager and this contractor who was awarded the majority of the city's clean-up bids. This relationship included a personal 10-year interest-only loan that was given to the inspections manager by the contractor (reported two years after the fact on the inspections manager's Fair Political Practices Commission Form 700). Public records show the former inspections manager at one time also listed her address at a property owned by the contractor. The Grand Jury notes that this relationship contributes to a perception of impropriety.

Appeals

There is no clear, comprehensive appeals process, and Building Services does not always suspend its proceedings against property owners while an appeal is pending.

Many property owners complained that they are required to pay substantial fees prior to filing an appeal (or upon losing an appeal). The external review process described in the municipal code is rarely used and is costly and generally not understood. Property owners report they almost always lose appeals at the first step. The same inspector that issued the citation often conducts the initial appeal. The next level of the appeal involves a Building Services supervisor, who, it is reported, routinely denies the appeal. More fees are required to continue the appeals process, oftentimes adding up to more money than the actual citation itself. Property owners report it is cheaper to pay the fines than file an appeal.

Inconsistent record keeping makes it difficult for property owners to file appeals or obtain records for their appeal. Inadequate record keeping in Building Services also impacts the ability to track appeals. As an example, the Grand Jury requested the number of appeals denied by Building Services for a specific time period but Building Services was unable to provide this information.

Property owners are discouraged from filing appeals by Building Services personnel. Many complained they could not appeal without entering into a compliance plan and that fines would multiply if they lost an appeal. The abatement process is not always stopped while the property owner seeks an appeal. Inspections continue and abatement contracts are awarded, sometimes even before the period for appeal has run out. *(See Exhibits C & D, Code Enforcement Violation Appeal and Fee-Charged Re-inspection(s) Schedule)*

Examples of Property Owners' Comments About the Building Services Appeals Process:

One property owner bought a fixer house in Oakland. He claims he was told there is an appeals process but Building Services won't tell you about it and you cannot appeal until after you sign a compliance plan (which costs additional money).

One property owner received a warning notice threatening large fines if abatement did not occur. The owner did not understand because the property was well kept. The owner discovered that an employee of the city's Keep Oakland Beautiful Program gave a packet of blank warning notices to a neighbor who then distributed the notices throughout the neighborhood. The property owner then received a formal citation from Building Services regarding "offensive plant overgrowth" and then filed a written appeal that was misplaced by the city. The owner subsequently trimmed a shrub and the inspector told her by phone to disregard the notice. The owner asked for written confirmation of dismissal and the inspector refused. The property owner scheduled a re-inspection and the inspector failed to appear.

One property owner was fined twice, \$865 each time, for having garbage cans in his driveway. The second fine was after the property owner had removed the cans, but before he appealed. He claims he was then told by a Building Services inspector not to appeal, because if he lost, he would be fined a third time for \$865.

(Examples of Property Owners' Comments About the Building Services Appeals Process, continued)

The city continued to visit a property during the appeals process, even though all action is supposed to stop until the case is reviewed by an independent examiner. The original citation indicated there was overgrowth and debris on the property. The property owner cleaned up, but Building Services placed a lien anyway. Building Services denied the owners appeal, but sent the denial notice to the wrong address. There are multiple city actions, including inspections, which should have stopped as the result of the appeal. Ultimately, the work was completed and the inspector noted that the condition had been abated; however, a \$50K lien was left in place.

A bid for corrective work was awarded and approved by Building Services within 20 days of an abatement letter, before the 21 days for appeal had run.

Building Services awarded a clean-up contract within 30 days, prior to service of the notice (eliminating opportunity to appeal). Abatement letter was not sent to current owner.

Comparison to San Jose and San Francisco

The Grand Jury compared the municipal codes under which the cities of San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland address blight, nuisance, and other property code violations. The Grand Jury discovered that these Bay Area cities handle blighted property issues differently. (*See Exhibit E, Comparison Chart*)

- San Jose and San Francisco both specify neutral hearing officers to review all appeals. Property owners are to be notified early in the process of the time and location of such hearings. In Oakland, appeals generally are handled within the Building Services division.
- Neither San Jose nor San Francisco uses prospective liens in their processes, whereas the Oakland code appears to allow prospective liens as a way of notifying the property owner of a demand for payment (Municipal

Code section 15.08.13). San Jose and San Francisco use liens only after all invoices have been sent to the owner and payment has not been received within 30 days.

- San Francisco's code authorizes summary abatement (immediate abatement by the city) only if there is imminent danger in the adjacent public right-of-way. Oakland's code gives Building Services much more discretion in undertaking summary abatement actions.
- San Jose and San Francisco allow 30 days for payment of invoices for fees and abatement costs. Oakland allows only 7 days.
- San Jose and San Francisco call for contract bidding for abatement work to be handled in the same manner as other city contract bids, whereas Oakland uses a bidding process unique to the Building Services Division.
- San Jose and San Francisco specify fees that appear to be based on the actual cost of handling abatement violations. Their fees and charges appear to be invoiced toward the end of the process, after appeals have been considered. In Oakland, significant fees and fines begin immediately and are a central part of the abatement process. For instance, a compliance plan is essentially a list of fees; there is a fee for every action taken by Building Services, including generating and receiving individual documents it requires from the property owner. (*See Exhibit F, Master Fee Schedule*)

Conclusion

Building Services' code enforcement inspectors have aggressively pursued blight and sub-standard properties throughout Oakland as determined by their individual interpretations of the applicable city code. This has led to an inconsistent enforcement program backed by inspectors' threats of filing large liens on the offending properties. This creates an institutional reluctance to lend on these properties and reluctance by property owners to improve their properties.

In 2000 an Alameda County Grand Jury recommended that Building Services limit the use of prospective liens. The city's 2000 response suggested that it would consider use on a case-by-case basis. The current Grand Jury finds that the use of prospective liens continues to be abusive and inappropriate in that they are excessive in number; the amounts are open-ended; liens are not always mailed to the correct property owner; these prospective liens encumber the property title whether intended or not, and there is a perception that the fees associated with the liens are used by the city as a source of revenue. The 1999-2000 Grand Jury recommended that prospective liens should only be used as a last resort. The current Grand Jury recommends that Building Services stop using prospective liens altogether.

The Grand Jury found that property owners complained that it is extremely difficult to understand the process for appealing a citation, or to resolve issues with Building Services inspectors. Testimony confirmed there are no standard operating manuals or guidelines for Building Services inspectors. Property owners were frustrated by their inability to speak with inspectors who are only available for short periods of time on an irregular schedule.

The Grand Jury found an atmosphere of hostility and intimidation toward property owners within the Building Services division. When property owners complained, they were sometimes threatened with more fines or, in one case, even loss of their home. Some inspectors inappropriately used their law enforcement authority and their city-issued badges to intimidate property owners. Therefore, the Grand Jury believes that the city of Oakland should reevaluate its policy of granting law enforcement authority and related badges to building inspectors.

The Grand Jury is appalled by the actions of the city of Oakland's Building Services Division and its impact on property owners of Oakland. The significant contradictions between the testimony of Building Services employees and the testimony of property owners and contractors are disturbing. The division's

practices and its treatment of property owners appear to be a direct reflection of poor management, lack of leadership, and ambiguous policies and procedures. The Grand Jury concludes from witness interviews and reviews of documents that the city of Oakland's Building Services Division is an organization that needs a comprehensive outside management review, and one that could benefit from benchmarking other cities and counties.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 11-15:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must ensure that the true property owners are notified of violations through every stage of the abatement process.

Recommendation 11-16:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must provide the property owner a clear written description in simple-to-understand language on the notice of violation, and not just refer the property owner to a city code section.

Recommendation 11-17:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must implement a training program that emphasizes working with – not against – property owners.

Recommendation 11-18:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must eliminate the use of prospective liens.

Recommendation 11-19:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must revise fees and base them on actual reasonable costs incurred by the city.

Recommendation 11-20:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must establish deadlines for inspectors to respond to property owners.

Recommendation 11-21:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must develop an operations manual to ensure inspectors operate in a consistent manner in applying code enforcement.

Recommendation 11-22:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must develop a centralized case management system that is easily accessible to all inspectors and property owners.

Recommendation 11-23:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must establish a clear, simple, effective appeals process that is easily understood by property owners and provides clear instructions for use.

Recommendation 11-24:

The city of Oakland Building Services Division must immediately establish an ombudsman function (not a Building Services manager or inspector) to review all appeals and to assist the property owner.

RESPONSES REQUIRED

Mayor, City of Oakland

Recommendations 11-15 through 11-24

Interim City Administrator, City of Oakland

Recommendations 11-15 through 11-24

[This page intentionally left blank]



COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Community and Economic Development Agency
Building Services
250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor
Oakland, CA, 94612
(510) 238-3388

COMPLIANCE PLAN

Property Address: _____ Complaint# _____

Abatement Action: OHC- Substandard OMC - Injurious OPC - Nuisance OBC - HAZARDOUS

Parcel# _____ Station _____ District _____

_____	Owner/Seller	_____	Buyer/Owner
_____	Owner/Seller	_____	Buyer/Owner
_____	Address	_____	Address
_____	City/State/Zip	_____	City/State/Zip
_____	Telephone	_____	Telephone

PERMIT ISSUANCE

OAKLAND MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 15.08.370 PROVIDES FOR EXPEDITIOUS COMPLETION OF CORRECTIVE WORK ASSOCIATED WITH PRIOR ABATEMENT ACTIONS BY THE CITY. THE REHABILITATION SCHEDULE ATTACHED HERETO IS SUPPLEMENTAL AND IN ADDITION TO ANY OTHER CONDITIONS, RESTRICTIONS, OR REQUIREMENTS FOR PERMIT ISSUANCE. OWNER AND BUYER ACKNOWLEDGE THAT FAILURE TO ADHERE FULLY AND IN ALL MANNERS TO ALL PERMIT ENCUMBRANCES MAY RESULT IN IMMEDIATE REVOCATION OF PERMITS, FORFEITURE OF ALL FEES, AND CONTINUATION OF ABATEMENT ACTIONS.

COMPLIANCE PLAN TYPE (Check One): Not Substandard \$396.00* OR Substandard \$1,485.00*

Fee Applied: Yes No 3-R Report \$198.00* Fee Applied: Yes No Substandard Termination \$297.00*
3-R Report# _____

Permit# _____ Permit Expires _____ (No Extensions)

City Abatement Charges Due: \$ _____ Transferred County Fees: \$ _____

Performance Bond \$ _____ Performance Bond Processing Fee: \$297.00*

Monitoring Security Fees:

Monthly Completion _____ Phased Work
 Bi-Monthly \$99.00* X _____ Units = \$ _____ Schedule _____ Continuous

Certificate of Occupancy \$693.00 + \$99.00* X _____ Units = \$ _____

Construction _____ Loan OR Financing: _____ Bank Account

***Indicated Fees Do Not Include 9.5% Records Management Fee and 5.25% Technology Enhancement Fee
ALL FEES NON-REFUNDABLE**

_____	OWNER'S/SELLER'S SIGNATURE	_____	DATE	_____	BUYER'S SIGNATURE	_____	DATE
(AGENT MUST PROVIDE NOTARIZED AUTHORIZATION)				(AGENT MUST PROVIDE NOTARIZED AUTHORIZATION)			

***IF CHANGE OF OCCUPANCY, CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY APPLICATION NEEDED AT DATE OF PERMIT ISSUANCE.**

PERMIT RELEASED FOR ISSUANCE: _____ DATE _____
PRINCIPAL INSPECTION SUPERVISOR

July 2010

EXHIBIT A
Building Services Division



Building Services Department
 Inspection Services Section
 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor
 Oakland, California 94612
 (510) 238-3381

Code Enforcement Billing Request

Property Address: _____ Date: _____

Complaint#: _____ Parcel Number: _____

Owner's Name: _____ Mailing Address: _____

Attach Assessor & Win2Data print-outs

City/State/Zip _____

Instructions

1. Fill-in date in sequential order of each site inspection to be billed and check the Violation box that applies. (See PTS 503 screen)
2. Submit a separate Billing Request for the first and each subsequent site inspection.
3. Submit one Billing Request for the 1st & 2nd site inspections. Submit separate Billing Requests for subsequent site inspections.
4. Attach copies of the Prospective Lien processing form and a copy of the Clean Up Board Up Bid Request form.
(For a Blight violation)
5. Attach a copy of the Prospective Lien processing form. (For a Tenant violation)
6. Forward completed form and attachments to District Supervisor for approval, then forward to Accounting for processing.

Site Inspection(SI) Dates (To Be Billed) *

1. _____
 2. _____
 . _____
 4. _____

* Manager's approval required to bill more than 4 SI

Fee Assessment Period:
 _____ to _____

Violation (check one)

- Blight (Attach copy of Lien processing form and Bid Request forms)
- Tenant (Attach copy of Lien processing form)
- Garbage & Refuse
- Inspection Warrant (Attach copy of Warrant signed by a judge)
- Repeat Violator (Prior Complaint # _____)
- Registration Citation (Foreclosed and Vacant Building)
- Blight Citation (Foreclosed and Vacant Building)
- Other _____

By: _____ Approved: _____
 Type/Print Inspector's Name Supervisor's Signature

Submit separate Billing Request for separate parcels

Violation	Site Inspection		Processing Fee	Notice to Abate	Scheduled Re-Inspection	Prepare Invoice Fee	Record & Tech Fee	Total Fees Invoiced
	First + Second							
Blight and Tenant	First + Second	\$ 99	\$ 396	\$ 297	\$ 0	\$ 297	14.75 %	\$2,045.00
		\$ 396	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 297			
	Subsequent	\$ 396	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 297	\$ 297	\$ 1,136.00	
Garbage and Refuse	First + Second	\$ 50	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	0 %	\$ 100
		\$ 50	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0			
	Subsequent	\$ 50	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 50	
Inspection Warrant	Each	\$ 0	\$ 693	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 297	14.75 %	\$ 1,136.00
Repeat Violator	SUBMIT SEPARATE BILLING REQUEST FOR EACH SITE INSPECTION (see above for fees)							
Registration Citation	Total Fee: \$5,000.00							
Blight Citation	Daily Fee: \$1,000.00							

August 2010

EXHIBIT B
 Building Services Division



CITY OF OAKLAND, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
AGENCY (CEDA) BUILDING SERVICES DEPARTMENT 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Fl.,
Oakland, CA 94612 Inspection Services: 238-3381 FAX: 238-2959 TDD: 238-3254

CODE ENFORCEMENT VIOLATION APPEAL

Return this form and the mailing envelope within 21 days of receipt to:

City of Oakland
CEDA, Building Services Department
Inspection Services Section 250 Frank Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor
Oakland, Ca 94612

Property Address: _____ APN _____

Complaint# _____ Owner's Name _____

Mailing Address: _____
City State Zip

Contact Number: _____

Briefly describe the reason you believe the City has erred or abused it's discretion in determining that a violation exists. (Attach pictures, written documentation etc.)

You should contact the inspector, as indicated in your violation notification, if you have corrected the violation to avoid fee charges or to make arrangements to correct the violations. Your appeal will be reviewed and you will be notified of the status of your appeal within thirty (30) days.

If your appeal is **denied** and you do not correct the violations the City will continue abatement actions which include fee assessment, administrative fees and a \$113.00 **appeal processing fee. No further appeal action will be granted.** You may file against the City in Small Claims Court to recover any fees, penalties, or remove liens the City has charged or recorded on your property.

<i>Office Use Only</i>		
Receive Date: _____	District _____	Forwarded to _____
Determination: Approved: _____		
Denied: Owner Record Error <input type="checkbox"/> Violation Corrected <input type="checkbox"/>		
21 Day Appeal Deadline <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____		
Owner notice mailed _____	Date Contacted by Phone _____	Inspector _____

July 2010

EXHIBIT C
Building Services Division



Community and Economic Development Agency
 Building Services
 250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 2nd Floor
 Oakland, California 94612
 (510) 238-3381

FEE-CHARGED REINSPECTION(S) SCHEDULE

To:

Date:
 Complaint#:
 Re:
 Parcel #:

A scheduled Fee-Charged Reinspection made on _____ has revealed that previously described code violations have not been completely corrected. You are hereby notified that Fee-Charged Reinspections of the subject premises are scheduled to take place on the following dates:

Date	AM (9 – 12)	PM (1 – 3)	Reinspection Performed (Inspector's initials)
Fee-Charged Reinspection #1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Fee-Charged Reinspection #2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Fee-Charged Reinspection #3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Fee-Charged Reinspection #4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

(NOTE: Should abatement not be fulfilled by the above time frame, an additional Fee-Charged Reinspection schedule will be sent to you.)

You or your agent is required to be present to permit access for the required Reinspections. Should access not be possible, you will be billed accordingly. Should the bill not be paid as required, a lien shall be placed on the property with the Alameda County Recorder's Office. If you have any questions regarding this matter, contact the undersigned inspector.

MASTER FEE SCHEDULE

Fee-Charge Re-inspection Fee	<u>\$396.00*</u>
Lien Fee	<u>\$446.00</u>
Invoice Fee	<u>\$297.00</u>

Antoinette Renwick
 Inspections Manager

By:
 Combination/Specialty Inspector
 Phone: (510) 238 -

*Fee Does Not Include 9.5% Records Management Fee and 5.25% Technology Enhancement Fee

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: BILLING REQUEST	Date Submitted _____ APN No. _____	Supervisor's Initials _____ For Fee-Charge # _____
---	---------------------------------------	---

July 10

EXHIBIT D
 Building Services Division

EXHIBIT
Comparison of San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland Blight Abatement Codes

Code Provisions	SF Administrative Code Chapter 80 - Anti-Blight Enforcement Procedure	SJ Municipal Code Chapter 17.02 – Abatement of Nuisance on Private Property	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 8-Health & Safety, Chapter 8.24 – Property Blight	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 15-Buildings & Construction, Chapter 15.08 – Oakland Bldg. Maintenance
Responsible Party	Director of Public Works	Code Enforcement Division	8.24.05 Building Official	15.08.08 Building Official
Property Definitions	Blight – nuisance; substantial adverse impact on neighboring properties; accumulations of junk, vegetation, etc.; unpainted; deteriorated; defaced; containing equipment, vehicles, debris. (Does not include unsafe buildings which are responsibility of Dept. of Building Inspection.)	Nuisance – threatens injury or damage to health, safety, welfare or property; obstructs free use of property of others; interferes with comfortable enjoyment of life or property; failing to provide minimum standards of safety and habitability	8.24.02 Blight – abandoned, attractive nuisance, disrepair, inadequately maintained, dangerous condition, inappropriate vehicles/equipment, prohibited activities, lack of permits; detrimental to health, safety, general welfare; public nuisance, substantially impacts aesthetic or economic value of neighborhood	15.08.34 Substandard and Public Nuisance – unsafe, inadequate sanitation, nuisance, hazard (structural, electrical, plumbing, mechanical, fire, exits, vegetation, toxic, unstable), faulty weather protection
Enforcement Authority	Inspect, issue Notices of Violation, initiate abatement actions, pursue administrative penalties	Every abatement action or order is subject to review by designated commission	8.24.05/06 Inspect, enforce, establish guidelines, assess fees, abate per procedures of Chapter 15.08	15.08.08 Inspect, enforce, with powers of law enforcement officer
Notice of Violation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes violation Gives owner 15 days from service to commence abatement or appeal How to request a hearing How to request work extension. After 15 days, Director may initiate abatement, impose administrative penalty, charge for city’s abatement at \$400 or cost, charge for hearing costs 			15.08.35 Declaration of Public Nuisance-Substandard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of conditions Required actions, timeline Recourse for non-compliance Right to appeal-with payment of fees Notice that failure to appeal waives right to administrative hearing
Proposed Abatement Order	(May be concurrent with Notice of Violation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify property Describe conditions requiring abatement 		

Code Provisions	SF Administrative Code Chapter 80 - Anti-Blight Enforcement Procedure	SJ Municipal Code Chapter 17.02 – Abatement of Nuisance on Private Property	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 8-Health & Safety, Chapter 8.24 – Property Blight	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 15-Buildings & Construction, Chapter 15.08 – Oakland Bldg. Maintenance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe need for abatement Specify abatement actions and timing Advise if not completed in time, Director may cause abatement work and charge costs to owner Specify time and place of public hearing for owner to protest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State whether it will be restricted for use Specify actions to be taken and time limit Advise if not completed in time, City may restrict use and/or cause abatement work, charge costs to owner Specify time and place of public hearing for owner to protest 		
Method of Serving Notice of Violation or Abatement Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personally or by certified mail to address on assessment roll; otherwise, mail to property Effective at date of mailing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personally or by certified mail to address on assessment roll; otherwise, mail to property Effective at date of mailing 		15.08.11 Personally, by certified mail, or public posting
Timing for Abatement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If no City permit is req'd, work commences ≤15 days of date of Notice of Violation; completed ≤ 30 days after commencement. If City permit is req'd, permit application ≤ 15 days of date of Notice of Violation; work begins ≤ 30 days of permit; completed ≤30 days later. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If no City permit is req'd, work commences ≤15 days of date of decision by reviewing commission. If City permit is req'd, permit application ≤ 15 days of date of decision by reviewing commission; work begins ≤ 30 days of permit. 	8.24.08 Building Official may establish time durations for abating blight . . . “which serve the best interests of the city . . .”	15.08.37 Owner must obtain permits within 30 days of Declaration; complete work 60 days later
Fees (separate from cost of Abatement)	<p>Upon Notice of Violation, fees are imposed to cover costs of inspection and enforcement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blight inspection fee = \$250 +/- CPI, calculated to match costs. May add actual itemized costs (time & mat’ls., incl. other depts.) 		8.24.06 “Abatement” includes fees, charges, penalties, interest, cost to repair/remove condition, or any other abatement action determined by Building Official	15.08.13 Abatement of Violations - fees, costs, penalties, interest, per Master Fee Schedule including obtaining ownership reports, affecting abatement, ascertaining violations, collecting fees, processing and recording liens, providing

Code Provisions	SF Administrative Code Chapter 80 - Anti-Blight Enforcement Procedure	SJ Municipal Code Chapter 17.02 – Abatement of Nuisance on Private Property	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 8-Health & Safety, Chapter 8.24 – Property Blight	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 15-Buildings & Construction, Chapter 15.08 – Oakland Bldg. Maintenance notices
Failure to Comply	City may grant extension or cause abatement work necessary to remedy the nuisance	City may cause property to be restricted from use and/or cause conditions requiring abatement to be repaired, demolished, or abated.	8.24.06 & 8.24.08 City undertakes repairs, abates deficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15.08.35 Building Official will order vacancy; may demolish building and charge costs to owner 15.08.36 Building Official files Certificate of Substandard & Public Nuisance
Summary Abatement by City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must have “condition in the public right-of-way that is imminently dangerous” Send Notice of Summary Abatement Itemized costs recovered by City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If “imminently dangerous” Issue Notice of Summary Abatement, incl. actions by City to abate imminent danger Advise charges will be assessed, describe cost recovery procedure Advise how to protest at public hearing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8.24.07 If “dangerous and imminently hazardous”, may restrict use of property and require immediate repair 8.24.060 Any condition . . . may be abated by Building Official . . . in accordance with the procedures . . . in Chap.15.08 	15.08.37 “Failure to . . . complete the required work . . . shall result in the demolition of the building by the Building Official.”
Recording of Abatement Orders and Compliance	Director files certification of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nuisance property Proposed abatement actions City’s right to abate if owner fails to do so Cost of city’s abatement actions may become lien Notices have been served Director records Compliance Certificate upon completion of work and payment of fees/costs	City files certification of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nuisance property Proposed abatement actions If abatement actions req’d. after public hearing are not performed, City may cause abatement actions Cost of city’s abatement actions may become lien Notices have been served City files certification of compliance upon completion		15.08.36 If compliance is not had . . . Building Official files certification of Substandard and a Public Nuisance. Following compliance or demolition, Building Official files certification
Appeals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 15 days of date of Notice of Violation, owner files with Director a request for hearing 	Every abatement action or order is subject to review by designated commission		15.08.100 If deteriorated condition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written appeal must be received by Building

Code Provisions	SF Administrative Code Chapter 80 - Anti-Blight Enforcement Procedure	SJ Municipal Code Chapter 17.02 – Abatement of Nuisance on Private Property	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 8-Health & Safety, Chapter 8.24– Property Blight	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 15-Buildings & Construction, Chapter 15.08 – Oakland Bldg. Maintenance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for hearing suspends abatement order • Failure to file written protest or appear at hearing waives administrative remedies 			<p>Official ≤ 21 days of Notice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must include payment of fees • Failure to appeal waives right to administrative adjudication <p>If hazardous condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner may appeal to Hearing Examiner regarding alternatives to meet requirements <p>15.08.35 Written appeal of Declaration of Public Nuisance-Substandard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be received by Building Official within 14 days of service of Declaration (7 days if “dangerous or imminent hazard”) • Must include payment of fees <p>15.08.44 Enforcement of any declaration is stayed during appeal process (except vacate orders)</p>
Appeals Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 7 days of receipt of appeal, Director notifies owner of hearing to be held within 45 days of appeal • Owner and City exchange written information at least 5 days before hearing • Hearing uses neutral Hearing Officer outside Dept. of Public Works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission considers all evidence presented • Hearing 15-60 days from date of service of notice • Commission issues written decision “within a reasonable time” • If commission finds summary abatement was not warranted, owner will 		<p>15.08.41</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As soon as practicable, Building Official sets date, time, place of hearing • Written notice of hearing at least 7 days in advance <p>15.08.43 Hearing officer considers only issues included in written request</p>

Code Provisions	SF Administrative Code Chapter 80 - Anti-Blight Enforcement Procedure	SJ Municipal Code Chapter 17.02 – Abatement of Nuisance on Private Property	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 8-Health & Safety, Chapter 8.24 – Property Blight	Oakland Code of Ordinances Title 15-Buildings & Construction, Chapter 15.08 – Oakland Bldg. Maintenance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burden of proof is on City Decision within 10 days 	not be invoiced		
Abatement by City	By City or by contract, work only as necessary to abate or remedy nuisance	By City or by contract, work only as necessary to abate or remedy nuisance	8.24.06 & .08 City undertakes repairs, abates deficiency	
Contract Bid Process		Awarded pursuant to Title 4 of Code (i.e. like other city contracting processes)		
Recovery of Abatement Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodically or at the end, Director provides itemized invoice of enforcement and abatement actions, costs, and allowable inspection fees. Due 30 days after service of invoice Failure to pay may result in lien proceedings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon completion of each or all necessary abatement actions, City prepares itemized invoice of costs and allowable inspection fees Due 30 days after service of invoice Failure to pay may result in lien proceedings 	8.24.080 – Fees, charges, penalties and interest assessed for any abatement action . . . by the City . . . shall be recovered per Chapter 15.08.	15.08.13 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demand for Payment includes itemized list of fees, costs, penalties, etc. Served by regular mail, personal delivery, or public notice, including filing of Prospective Lien If not paid within 7 days of service, Bldg Official files lien or tax assessment
Appeal of Charges		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charges may be protested in writing to City Clerk; reviewed by City Council Protest in writing at least 24 hours before hearing on non-payment Notice is sent to owner at least 10 days before hearing Hearing by City Council may result in lien Delinquency fee of 10% may apply if not paid 30 days after lien is recorded 		



City of Oakland
Master Fee Schedule
Effective July 6, 2010

**COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC
 DEVELOPMENT**

FEE DESCRIPTION	FEE	UNIT
BUILDING SERVICES		
ADMINISTRATION		
A. DUPLICATION OF DOCUMENTS		
1 Microfilm Records	0.65	Document
2 Mailing	Actual	Cost
B. PERMIT APPLICATION FEE		
1 Building, Electrical, Mechanical, Plumbing Permits		
a. Filing	16.00	Permit
b. Routing - Project Value \$2,000 or Less	47.00	Permit
c. Routing - Project Value \$2,001 or Greater	55.00	Permit
d. Routing - Application and Issuance by Internet Connection	47.00	Permit
2 All Other Permits and All Other Engineering Process and Approval Requests (Application)	16.00	Permit
a. Filing	16.00	Permit
b. Routing	55.00	Permit
3 Mailing and Handling Charges Per 25 Count for Permit Application Forms	Actual cost or 8.25	Mailing
4 Service Charge for Verification of Proof of License and Workers Compensation Information Required by State Law for Approval of Permit Application	15.00	Verification
5 Zoning Sign-Off	54.00	Sign-Off
C. DUPLICATION OF ANY DOCUMENT NOT SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED IN THE MASTER FEE SCHEDULE		
1 Documents Routinely Produced in Multiple Copies for Distribution	0.10	Page (single sided)
2 Documents Routinely Produced in Multiple Copies for Distribution	0.20	Sheet (double sided)
3 Documents Not Routinely Produced in Multiple Copies for Distribution, Sent to a Commercial Copier for Direct Billing to the Requester	Actual	Cost
D. PLANS/MAP PHOTO COPY (COPIES LESS THAN 11"x17")	0.85	Map
E. DOCUMENT RESEARCH FEE	Actual cost or 7.00 minimum	Each, whichever is greater
F. PROCESS BILLING APPEALS AND REFUND REQUESTS THAT ARE DETERMINED TO BE UNFOUNDED	99.00	Appeal

EXHIBIT F (page 1 of 6)
 Building Services Division



City of Oakland
Master Fee Schedule
Effective July 6, 2010

**COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC
 DEVELOPMENT**

FEE DESCRIPTION	FEE	UNIT
G. PROCESS BILLING APPEALS WITH REFERRAL TO "COLLECTIONS"	99.00	Appeal
H. PROCESS BILLING APPEALS FOR SECOND RESEARCH/REVIEW	99.00	Appeal
I PROCESSING SECURITY DEPOSITS (BONDS, CASH, CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSITS, ETC.)	297.00	Each
J RECORDS MANAGEMENT FEE	9.5%	All Permit & Code Enforcement Fees, Penalties, & Interest
K TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENT FEE	5.25%	All Permit & Code Enforcement Fees, Penalties, & Interest
L. ELECTRONIC PAYMENT TRANSACTION FEE	Actual cost or 2.35 minimum	Each
M. COLLECTIONS -- PERMITS & CODE ENFORCEMENT		
a. Alameda County Collection Surcharge on General Levy	1.70%	Lien
b. City Collection Transfer to or Rescission from County	3.00%	Lien
c. Interest on Unpaid Fees and Penalties	10.00%	Annual

CODE ENFORCEMENT

A. VARIANCE FROM OAKLAND BUILDING MAINTENANCE CODE REQUIREMENTS		
1 Administrative	396.00	Application
2 Hearing Examiner	990.00	Application
B. SERVICE FEES		
1 Reinspection to Verify or Monitor Progress of Violations Abatement		
a. Conditions of Compliance	99.00	Inspection
b. All Others	396.00	Inspection
2 Certificate of Occupancy		
a. Basic	693.00	Building

EXHIBIT F (page 2 of 6)
 Building Services Division



City of Oakland
Master Fee Schedule
Effective July 6, 2010

**COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC
 DEVELOPMENT**

FEE DESCRIPTION	FEE	UNIT
B. SERVICE FEES		
2 Certificate of Occupancy		
b. Surcharge	99.00	Each tenant unit / space over 2
c. Re-Inspection	99.00	Inspection
3 Third-Party Contract	Actual	Cost
4 Complaint Investigation	99.00	Inspection
C. ADMINISTRATIVE FEES		
1 Contracted Work		
a. Demolition	31% or 1,980 minimum	Instance or Contract, whichever is greater
b. All Other	31% or 693.00 minimum	Instance or Contract, whichever is greater
c. Bid/Contract Development	396.00	Instance
d. Contractor Mobilization	10% or 297.00	Instance or Contract
2 Public Documents (Order, Invoice, Demand, Notice, Declaration, Lien, Release, Termination, etc.)		
a. Preparation	297.00	Document
b. Notarizing	99.00	Document
c. Recording	Actual cost or 50.00 minimum	Document
3 Court Action		
a. Judgment	Actual cost or 262.00 minimum	Instance, whichever is greater
b. Inspection Warrant	693.00	Instance
4 Real Property Title Research		
a. Report	Actual cost	Report
b. Processing	31% or 198.00 minimum	Report, whichever is greater
5 Compliance plan		
a. Building not declared substandard	396.00	Plan



City of Oakland
Master Fee Schedule
Effective July 6, 2010

**COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC
 DEVELOPMENT**

FEE DESCRIPTION	FEE	UNIT
C. ADMINISTRATIVE FEES		
5 Compliance plan		
b. Building declared substandard	1,485.00	Plan
6 Process Violation	396.00	Instance
D. SUBPOENA		
1 Witness Fee (Not Related to Employee's Duties)	150.00 + 0.585	Request + Mileage
2 Witness Fee (Related to Employee's Duties)	150.00	Request or Actual Cost
E. APPEALS TO HEARING EXAMINER		
1 Filing Fee	396.00	Instance
2 Review Appeal and Conduct Hearing	99.00	Instance
3 Processing Fee	Actual cost	Appeal
4 Reschedule Appeals Hearing	594.00	Appeal
	99.00	Instance
F. DUPLICATE RELEASE OF LIEN OR TERMINATION OF SUBSTANDARD PUBLIC NUISANCE		
	50.00	Document
G. PUSH CART FOOD VENDING		
1 Application Processing	75.00	Pushcart (non-refundable application fee to be applied to the permit fee)
2 Initial Permit Fee	455.00	Pushcart (includes application/ processing fee)
3 Permit Renewal Fee	455.00	Pushcart / Year
4 Late Fee		
a. Assessed as a percentage of permit fee based on length of time after date of the renewal letter as follows:		
1 30-60 Days	10.00%	Delinquent Per Permit
2 60-90 Days	20.00%	Delinquent Per Permit
3 After 90 Days	50.00%	Delinquent Per Permit
5 Legalizing Illegal Vendor	914.00	Pushcart

EXHIBIT F (page 4 of 6)
 Building Services Division



City of Oakland
Master Fee Schedule
Effective July 6, 2010

**COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC
 DEVELOPMENT**

FEE DESCRIPTION	FEE	UNIT
L. GRADING PERMIT		
2 Surcharge		
d. Over 10,000 Cubic Yards	0.55	Each C.Y. Over 10000
3 Review of Materials Related to Request for Emergency Grading Permit	917.00	Permit
4 Review of Plan Revisions		
a. Outside of Regular Working Hours	191.00	Hour or Fraction of
b. Regular Working Hours	131.00	Hour or Fraction of
M. WORK WITHOUT A GRADING PERMIT		
1 Work Commenced	Double all Fees	Permit
2 Re-Inspection Fee	393.00	Inspection
N. CONSULTATION REQUESTED FOR PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF IMPROVEMENTS AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS	131.00	Hour or Fraction of
O. MYLAR PLAN RETRIEVAL	4.65	Plan
P. CITY OF OAKLAND MAPS AND PLANS		
1 2,400 Scale	7.50	Map
2 1,500 Scale	7.50	Map
3 Plans (copies larger than 11"x17")	7.50	Sheet
Q. S-11 ENGINEERING REVIEW	917.00	Report
R. PARCEL MAP		
1 Tentative Map	1,310.00	Map
2 Parcel Map	1,179.00	Map
3 Amended Tentative Map or Parcel Map	524.00	Map
4 Revisions to Tentative Map or Parcel Map		
a. Regular Working Hours	131.00	Hour or Fraction of
b. Outside of Regular Working Hours	191.00	Hour or Fraction of
5 Certificate of Correction	524.00	Certificate
S. EIR ENGINEERING REVIEW		
1 Application	1,048.00	Review
2 Revisions	131.00	Hour or Fraction of



City of Oakland
Master Fee Schedule
Effective July 6, 2010

**COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC
 DEVELOPMENT**

FEE DESCRIPTION	FEE	UNIT
A. INSPECTION		
2 As Required by the Oakland Building Code or the Oakland Sign Code the Issuance of a Permit For Repairs/Additional/Alteration		
d. \$2,001 to \$25,000 Construction Value		
2 Surcharge	10.50	Each Add'l \$500
e. \$25,001 to \$50,000 Construction Value		
1 Basic	602.00	Permit First \$25,001
2 Surcharge	10.00	Each Add'l \$1,000
f. \$50,001 to \$200,000 Construction Value		
1 Basic	849.00	Permit First \$50,001
2 Surcharge	9.25	Each Add'l \$1,000
g. \$200,001 and Higher Construction Value		
1 Basic	2,246.00	Permit First \$200,001
2 Surcharge	7.25	Each Add'l \$1,000
B. INSPECTION AS REQUIRED BY THE OAKLAND BUILDING CODE FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A DEMOLITION PERMIT		
1 Basic	173.00	Permit
2 Surcharge	0.15	Square Foot
3 Commencing Work without Obtaining a Permit	10x	All Fees
C. COMMENCE OR COMPLETE WORK FOR WHICH PERMITS ARE REQUIRED BY THE OAKLAND BUILDING CODE, OAKLAND SIGN CODE, OR WINDOW BAR ORDINANCE WITHOUT FIRST HAVING OBTAINED THE REQUIRED PERMITS		
1 Work Commenced	Double All Fees	Permit
2 Investigation of Work	99.00	Inspection
3 Work Commenced and Completed Prior to Inspection	Quadruple All Fees	Permit
D. EXTRA INSPECTIONS		
1 Building Permit		
a. \$1.00 to \$2,000 Permit Value	99.00	Each Inspection Over 3

[This page intentionally left blank]