

Code Enforcement Performance Audit



Independence you can rely on

July 2022

Laura L. Doud
City Auditor

SPECIAL NOTE: The fieldwork for this audit was performed from February 2019 to February 2020, however the release of the report had unexpected delays due to the coronavirus pandemic.



Table of Contents

Report Summary 2

I. Background 3

II. Findings & Recommendations 4

Finding #1: Notification letters about Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program inspections meet ordinance requirements but should contain additional information to encourage participation from tenants. 4

Finding #2: Information System configuration may limit Code Enforcement’s ability to respond to customer service requests in a timely and reliable manner. 6

Finding #3: Underdeveloped parameters related to closing no-access complaints and granting extensions result in inconsistent processes. 8

Finding #4: Code Enforcement should review response time data to fully evaluate operational efficiency and effectiveness. 9

Finding #5: Improper and outdated information system access controls were identified that could have created security vulnerabilities, however management reported that access was corrected. 10

III. Objective, Scope, and Methodology 12

IV. Management Response 13



Code Enforcement Performance Audit

July 2022

Report Summary



Why This Audit Is Important

The City is committed to improving the quality of life in Long Beach neighborhoods, commercial corridors, and industrial areas. Enforcing city codes regarding property conditions and responding to complaints of violations help deter substandard buildings and encourage property maintenance. With over 7,000 rental properties with four or more units, the City has many renters that need to hold landlords accountable for the conditions at their properties.

Audit Objective

Our audit assessed whether Code Enforcement in the City's Development Services Department has reliable processes to bring properties into compliance with city code. The focus of the review was on the inspection processes for complaint-based inspections and proactive inspections of rental housing.

Acknowledgement

We thank management and staff in Development Services for their collaboration, assistance, and cooperation during this audit.

What We Found

The Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program (Program) was added to the Long Beach Municipal Code, Chapter 18.30, in 2015 to safeguard the stock of decent, safe, and sanitary rental housing in the City and applies to rental properties that have four or more units. The code states that the City shall perform inspections of no less than 10% of the eligible rental units and shall mail a notice of inspection at least 14 days prior to the inspection. We found that Code Enforcement met the requirements for number of inspections and notification timeliness but can make some improvements to enhance its processes for the Program.

In addition, updates to the full Code Enforcement operation need to be made to ensure consistent processes for potential violations and effective evaluation of the performance of its programs.

What We Recommend

We recommend that Code Enforcement:

- Modify the inspection notification letters to promote education, transparency, and participation in the Program, such as stating the need for someone to be present to allow entry.
- Work with the Technology Department to develop proper system controls to route and assign complaints with entry errors to ensure all complaints are seen.
- Develop guidance surrounding the closure of potential violations and extensions granted to ensure consistency.
- Track response times and times until closure for complaints and monitor those trends over time to help inform staffing decisions and determine acceptable levels.

I. Background

The Department of Development Services' Code Enforcement Bureau is comprised of two Divisions: the Standard Code Enforcement Division and Multi-Unit Housing Division.

Code Enforcement building inspectors are responsible for enforcing specific portions of regulations contained in the Long Beach Municipal Code and Building Standards Code (city code). To do this, building inspectors perform property inspections, charge inspection fees, issue citations, and initiate the abatement process. Inspections conducted by the Standard Code Enforcement Division are generally complaint-based and are initiated by a Customer Service Request. Customer Service Requests can be submitted via one of the following avenues: phone, the online portal, email, in person at the Code Enforcement Customer Service Front Desk, or through a referral from another City department. Common city code violations include, but are not limited to, substandard buildings, property maintenance, inoperative vehicles, weed abatement, and land use violations.

The Multi-Unit Housing Division operates the Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program. The Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program, previously under the Department of Health and Human Services, was transferred to the Department of Development Services in 2013.

In 2015, City Council adopted an ordinance to codify this program into city code. The goal of the program is to maintain livability standards, protect against blight, and secure citywide compliance of existing rental housing over time by performing periodic inspections of residential rental properties with four or more units. Owners of these residential properties are required by code to register their property and pay an annual registration fee that is based on the type and size of their property. In calendar year (CY) 2018, approximately 7,300 properties within the City fell under the Multi-Unit Housing Division's purview. The Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program inspected about 716 properties in CY 2018, representing 10% of the residential rental housing stock in Long Beach. In CY 2018, Code Enforcement collected \$1.9M in annual registration fees for the program.

Violations in the Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program can be for:

- Windows and roofs that have holes allowing rain or wind to enter the property
- Floors, stairs, and railings that are deteriorated and need repair
- Water heaters that do not reach an acceptable temperature
- Evidence of rot or rodent infestation
- Excess trash and debris around premises

II. Findings & Recommendations

Finding #1: *Notification letters about Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program inspections meet ordinance requirements but should contain additional information to encourage participation from tenants.*






The Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program notification letters informing multi-unit landlords and property tenants of planned inspections meet ordinance timeline requirements, however the letters should contain additional information to support greater program participation and transparency. Per the program's City Ordinance, at least two weeks prior to an inspection, Code Enforcement is required to mail a notification letter to the property manager and each of the units selected for the inspection.

Inspection notification letters do not clearly state that the tenant must grant the inspector access to the unit and designate someone to be present to allow entry during the inspection.

The Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program notification letters are sent out fourteen calendar days prior to the date of inspection and include the following pieces of information: a brief description of the program, scheduled date and time of inspection, the inspector's name and contact information, and a link to the Code Enforcement webpage on tenant and landlord rights and responsibilities. The notification letter asks for the tenant to contact Code Enforcement if they want their unit inspected. However, for a unit to be inspected, the tenant must grant permission for the inspector to enter the unit and be present, or have a designee present, during the scheduled time of inspection. Both requirements are not clearly stated in the notice.

As the primary form of communication prior to the inspection, it is essential that the notification letter provides clear and sufficient instruction to maximize the participation of the tenant and landlord in the inspection process. Providing clear instruction to tenants could reduce the number of units that go uninspected due to premise access requirements, and the administrative cost of rescheduling and/or performing additional visits. Of a sample of approximately 1,900 rental units in CY 2018, 39% did not receive an inspection because the tenants were not present to grant access, as shown on Figure 1 on the next page.

Figure 1.
Outcomes of sampled inspections showed that 39% of rental units did not receive an inspection in 2018, because tenants were not present (no access)

OUTCOME	# OF RENTAL UNITS	% OF RENTAL UNITS
 No Access	756	39%
 Resolution - No Violation	551	29%
 Tenant Stated No Issues	305	16%
 Violation	280	15%
 Unclear	24	1%
Total	1,916	100%

The ‘Guide to Proactive Rental Inspection Programs’ issued by Change Lab Solutions¹ in 2014, states that by properly informing the tenant about the purpose and process of inspections, the notice serves three critical functions:

- (1) Alleviates tenant fears and prepares them for an inspector to arrive at their home;
- (2) Encourages tenants to participate in the inspection process and increases the likelihood that a tenant will be home and available to permit entry; and
- (3) Educates tenants and landlords about their rights and duties under the law.

Recommendations

1.1 Modify the Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program

¹ Change Lab Solutions is a non-profit organization that partners with communities across the nation to improve public health and opportunity by changing harmful laws, policies, and systems. The Guide to Proactive Rental Housing Inspections, written by Change Lab Solutions in 2014, examines the components of a successful Proactive Rental Housing Program.

inspection notification letters with the following improvements to promote education, transparency, and participation in the program:

- **Clearer outline of the inspection process and potential outcomes;**
- **Additional information regarding what the inspector will be looking for and common violations found during inspection; and,**
- **Clearly state that the tenant, or tenant designee, must be present and allow entry for an inspection to occur.**

Finding #2: *Information System configuration may limit Code Enforcement’s ability to respond to customer service requests in a timely and reliable manner.*

Data input irregularities are not regularly identified and resolved.

Property complaints, also known as Customer Service Requests, can be submitted to the Standard Code Enforcement Division through various methods including: phone, email, online portal, in person, or through a referral from another City department. Customer Service Requests submitted through the online portal are normally automatically transferred and assigned to a supervisory inspector in the “Infor” system. According to staff, if Customer Service Requests data errors are not regularly identified and reconciled, complaints can remain idle and unassigned in “Infor”, prolonging case closure.

Long Beach properties are divided into North, East, and West code enforcement areas. Customer Service Requests are referred to the supervisor assigned to the respective code enforcement area. Based on the inconsistent information provided, complaints do not always successfully transfer from the online portal to the appropriate area supervisor’s complaint list in “Infor” system. For example, if an address is input incorrectly or if the “Infor” system does not recognize the address, the complaint is not automatically assigned to an area supervisor. Consequentially, the complaint sits undetected in the system, potentially for a long period of time without further action. An application input control or a process control has not been developed with the help of the Technology and Innovation Department (TID) to regularly check for data irregularities like these unassigned cases, potentially allowing for cases of high priority or of an urgent nature to go unresolved or receive an untimely response. Code Enforcement would not be able to fix this issue in the system without help from TID. We were not able to generate an “Infor” system report to quantify the frequency in which these errors or irregularities occur, however, management stated that they do not occur often.

Complaints can sit undetected in the Infor system without action due to irregularities.

Customer Service Requests are not always recorded in a timely manner.

Urgent complaints, also known as life safety issues, received by phone, email, or in-person are not recorded in the “Infor” system prior to being referred to an area supervisor. This process is different than other types of complaints submitted outside of the online portal, which are entered into the “Infor” system manually by clerical staff. Non-life safety complaints are automatically assigned to an area supervisor based on the location provided.

Urgent life-safety complaints may not have the correct intake date and time recorded.

However, due to the urgent nature of life-safety complaints, such as unpermitted garage conversions, staff have a different process. Life-safety complaints received via telephone, email, or in-person, are hand-recorded and provided directly to the area supervisor. The complaint is not recorded in the system until after the inspection. While this practice may reduce having to enter the complaint twice, once for the initial complaint and again if a citation is necessary, it results in key information, such as the intake date and time, not being recorded right away. While we did not find instances that these cases were not recorded, there is potential that a complaint is not recorded since it is done later. To ensure cases are resolved in an appropriate and timely manner, urgent life-safety complaints should follow a process consistent with other complaint types to ensure all complaints are appropriately documented, inspected, and available for review.

Recommendations

- 2.1 Develop a proper internal control to identify and route Customer Service Request complaints that are unassigned in Infor to the appropriate area supervisor. Options for this are the following:**
 - **As part of normal operating procedures, a member of the clerical staff should check the system on a daily or weekly basis to identify Customer Service Requests sitting unassigned in the system and forward to the appropriate area supervisor.**
 - **Work with the Department of Technology and Innovation and/or Infor to implement an application input control that automatically transfers all unassigned Customer Service Requests to a designated area supervisor to ensure its timely review.**
- 2.2 Have Code Enforcement clerical staff enter life-safety Customer Service Requests into Infor when forwarding it to the respective area supervisor to be consistent with the process used on other complaint types. The clerical staff can still immediately notify the area supervisor of the complaint to assure it is responded to within the required 48-hour timeframe.**

Finding #3: *Underdeveloped parameters related to closing no-access complaints and granting extensions result in inconsistent processes.*

Procedures for closing no-access complaints are not clearly documented.

Code Enforcement's policy does not have clear guidelines for proceeding with and documenting complaint closures that result from no inspection due to lack of access to the property. Upon receiving a Customer Service Request, an inspector visits the property under review to corroborate the reported violation. While some violations are visible from the exterior of the property, others require entry into the property or unit for full inspection. Customer Service Requests are closed with an outcome of "No Violation" if the inspector cannot gain access to the property or unit to perform the initial inspection. In our review of the CY 2018 Customer Service Request data, we noted the following inconsistencies with the steps and documentation processes used for no-access complaints:

- The number of attempts to access the property or unit prior to closure varied.
- Documentation of attempts to contact property owner or tenant to gain property access and initiate inspection processes was lacking.
- Photos showing posting of notice stating the need for inspection were not consistently documented.

Extension processes for bringing properties into compliance are inconsistent.

The practices for granting extensions to property owners to resolve violations are inconsistent and not grounded in a robust policy. Per Code Enforcement's inspection policies and procedures, when a violation is discovered, the property owner needs to be provided a specific timeframe to resolve the identified violation.

Inspectors can grant extensions to resolve violations to certain property owners at their discretion.

The policy allows individual inspectors to grant extensions to the compliance period at their discretion if the property owner is making a "good faith effort" to resolve the violation. The inspector is required to document each extension and the reason for the extension in the "Infor" system; however, the current policy does not set parameters for what could be used to support the extensions or examples of "good faith efforts". Informally, inspectors are expected to gather some evidence to show that the landlord is working towards correcting the violation. Examples of acceptable evidence should be added to the policy, such as the landlord providing bids for the work from a contractor or that there is a permit from the City to perform the work.

Supervisory review of case files with such extensions is required and documented if and when a citation is issued. While there are various levels of supervisory review of citations and the length of time cases remain open are periodically evaluated, the development of parameters would help guide inspectors and supervisors when granting and approving extensions. According to Code Enforcement, there still needs to be some discretion used as each case has different circumstances and the goal of the program is to encourage compliance, not issue hefty fines to landlords.

While it may not be possible for the policy to cover all circumstances, additional information surrounding common situations could provide more guidance. Policies surrounding extensions, guidance on when extensions are allowed, the documentation process to support the extension, as well as documentation of supervisory review need improvement to support consistent inspections and monitoring of long-standing cases.

Recommendations

- 3.1 Develop standardized processes for documenting and following-up after initial inspections in which access was not provided. The following should be included to ensure all potential violations are consistently vetted prior to closure:**
 - The minimum number of attempts to access property or unit prior to closure;
 - Documentation requirements for attempts to contact property owner; and
 - Photo documentation showing posting of notice stating the need for inspection.
- 3.2 Further develop the policy surrounding when extensions can be granted to provide guidance to inspectors and supervisors for acceptable extensions. The policy should include examples of “good faith efforts” to set some expectations and consistency for when more time is allowed to correct violations.**

Finding #4: *Code Enforcement should review response time data to fully evaluate operational efficiency and effectiveness.*

The current performance metrics to evaluate Code Enforcement’s complaint-based inspection processes do not support a full assessment of its operations. Code Enforcement primarily uses two metrics to monitor and assess the performance of individual inspectors and the operation as a whole. Those metrics are as follows:

- Individual Inspectors – Open 50 cases and close 50 cases per month
- Bureau/Individual Inspectors – Close 80% of cases within 120 days

The current performance metrics help monitor the ongoing workload of each individual inspector and assess the timeliness of resolving individual violations, but they do not offer insight into the timeliness of responding to new complaints or what response times are for the overall operation. Code Enforcement’s policy establishes that Priority 1 complaints classified as a life-safety issue, such as illegal garage conversions, must be responded to within 48 hours of receipt. However, response time goals for other calls are not formally established, nor is data maintained in a manner that allows for management review.

While there is no official policy regarding case closure length of time for non-life safety cases, management does have an informal goal to close these types of cases within 2-3 weeks. Management explained that workload for the division can fluctuate throughout the year and each case can have unique circumstances, so establishing a singular rule for how long it should take to close a case can be difficult and impractical. Management and supervisors do monitor outstanding cases and speak to inspectors about why they are still open. However, this review is on a case-by-case basis.

Code Enforcement does not track response times systematically.

Monitoring response times for the division would provide management insight into the average time taken to respond to complaints by factors that are important to them, such as by level of priority or area. Assessing response times and tracking them over time, especially for higher priority complaints, could be utilized to inform decisions regarding necessary staffing and staff assignment to ensure that response times stay within known trends and acceptable levels.

Recommendations

- 4.1 **Track response times for all complaints and monitor trends over time. Ensure response times remain reasonable based on staffing and the competing demands and priorities of the Code Enforcement operation.**

Finding #5: *Improper and outdated information system access controls were identified that could have created security vulnerabilities, however management reported that access was corrected.*

System access controls or permissions did not consistently align with the position and duties of its users. Code Enforcement utilizes the three modules

in the “Infor” system to facilitate and track the intake of complaints, case assignments, and milestones of the inspection process, to record all relevant resources and documents, as well as to look up property information and track fee accrual and collections.

Based on the duties and responsibilities required of their position, inspectors, clerical, supervisory staff, and management are assigned to one or more of the eight system access groups created in the “Infor” system. Access controls or permissions specific to each group determine what actions and what data the authorized users within the group can perform and access. The access controls of each access group are defined, and in theory, an employee’s position title would align with the user group assigned (i.e., a Senior Inspector would be assigned to user group “CE Senior”), with exceptions determined by management.

When reviewing the “Infor” system access levels, we found that system permissions were outdated and did not consistently align with position and job responsibilities. Specifically, we found the following issues:

Terminated employees still have access to the Infor system and other employees have access exceeding that needed for their role.

- Forty-four (44) of the 85 (52%) active “Infor” users were retired, terminated, or no longer working for Code Enforcement and unnecessarily had access to the system.
- Four employees were in a user group that provided system capabilities exceeding what is necessary for their position.
- Clerical staff had access to add and recalculate fees; add, update, and delete violations; resolve customer service requests; and record inspection results. These capabilities are outside of the responsibilities required of the clerical staff.
- Inspectors have access to adjust and recalculate fees. These capabilities are outside of their responsibilities as the decision to adjust or waive fees is at the discretion of supervisory staff and management.

Based on the findings identified in our review, management worked with the Department of Technology and Innovation to reassess user access permissions and make the appropriate revisions.

Recommendations

- 5.1 Perform an annual review and adjustment of Infor system access levels to ensure user accessibility and capabilities are aligned with job responsibilities and the information contained in the system is properly safeguarded.**

III. Objective, Scope, and Methodology

The objective of this audit was to determine if Code Enforcement has reliable processes to effectively and efficiently bring properties under its purview into compliance. The focus of this review was on the inspection processes for complaint-based inspections and proactive inspections initiated through the Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program. We reviewed operations and case data from calendar years 2016 to 2018. The fieldwork for this audit was performed from February 2019 to February 2020, however the release of the report had unexpected delays due to the coronavirus pandemic. During our review, we performed the following procedures:


- Reviewed the Code Enforcement Policies and Procedures Manual and applicable Long Beach Municipal Code sections;
- Conducted interviews and site visits with Code Enforcement management, supervisors, field inspectors and clerical staff;
- Conducted walkthroughs of the inspection scheduling, inventory management, and billing practices related to the Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program;
- Observed how inspections are performed by participating in a ride-along with a field inspector performing standard complaint-based inspections and an inspector conducting scheduled Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program inspections;
- Obtained and reviewed “Infor” system access reports to determine if system credentials were appropriate for the respective job duties;
- Sampled and reviewed inspection files from calendar year 2018 against established inspection and documentation criteria for compliance; and,
- Reviewed and analyzed inspection data from calendar years 2016 to 2018.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives.

IV. Management Response

Date: June 29, 2022

To: Laura Doud, City Auditor

From: Thomas B. Modica, City Manager 

Subject: **Response to Code Enforcement Performance Audit**

The Management Team wishes to thank the City Auditor's Office for the opportunity to participate in the Code Enforcement Audit as well as the time afforded to respond to its findings. The Development Services' Code Enforcement Bureau (Bureau) appreciates your willingness to listen to and engage with staff to understand the Bureau's operations.

The acknowledgement of the Bureau's compliance with codes and related timelines is appreciated especially since the Bureau is resolute in its efforts to abate substandard or dangerous property conditions, stop the cause and source of visual and other blight, and safeguard the stock of decent, safe, and sanitary housing in Long Beach. The Bureau is also committed to providing timely responses and exceptional service as well as expedient complaint resolutions. The following response provides important information about the Bureau's actions and performance related to the audit findings.

Finding #1: Notification materials about Proactive Rental Housing Inspection Program (PRHIP) inspections meet Ordinance requirements but should contain additional information to encourage participation from tenants

Although the audit report finds the Bureau in full compliance with the Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC), Finding No. 1, indicates that the Bureau should modify the PRHIP inspection notification letters to promote education, transparency, and participation in the program. While the audit does not identify program participation thresholds, the Bureau strives to inspect all units since it began implementation of PRHIP despite the code requiring random inspection sampling of no less than ten percent of a property's dwelling units. Over the years, many actions have been taken to obtain greater participation including, but not limited to, providing door hangar notifications, checklists, and informational material. Despite the Bureau's efforts to gain greater participation, it is not always possible due to tenant concerns over landlord retribution and/or a distrust of government. Nevertheless, the Bureau simplified the inspection notification letters by including the Bureau's contact information as a way to provide tenants with direct assistance regarding questions about the program, inquiries regarding scheduling inspection appointments, and providing additional information for the program as a whole.

Finding #2: Information System configuration may limit Code Enforcement's ability to respond to customer service request in a timely and reliable manner.

Finding No. 2 indicates that the Bureau work with the Technology and Innovation Department (TID) to identify all unassigned Customer Service Request (CSR) and complaints that are unassigned in the Bureau's case management software, Infor. The finding further indicates that

the Bureau establish an internal control to identify the CSRs and route them to the appropriate area supervisor for a timely investigation.

Infor is utilized to capture, store and manage CSRs case investigations. The Bureau accepts CSRs by telephone, in-person visits, email, and via a web-based portal ([Dynamic Portal](#)) from the public directly into Infor. Despite the many efforts to capture CSRs, not all CSRs are captured due to data entry errors such as incorrect address data provided by the public. These entries are not recognized by Infor and are therefore suspended by the software resulting in no notification to the Bureau. Although the audit report did not identify a frequency or amount of suspended CSRs, the Bureau does acknowledge the need to identify and investigate them. The Bureau has worked with TID to resolve this finding and has implemented protocols to recover and assign the requests to area supervisors. Not only can the Bureau retrieve them, but it is now tracking the number and CSR type.

Finding No. 2 also concludes that the Bureau should establish a timely recording process for all CSR types. With the exception of the web-based portal, CSRs are manually entered into Infor by staff for all email, in-person and telephone requests. Infor then generates a CSR list for the area supervisor which are collected by end of day or the following business day for future staff assignment/investigation. Life/Safety CSR requests, for such things as a dwelling unit with no heat or a dwelling unit experiencing structural deficiencies or illegal garage conversions are the Bureau's top priority and are provided to the area supervisor directly after the CSR is received resulting in a same day investigation ensuring abatement measures begin immediately. Data entry for these CSRs is completed at a late date due to the urgency to immediately begin the investigation. The audit report did not identify instances of missing/incomplete data nor did the audit report provide instances where the CSR was not investigated. Nevertheless, the Bureau is now including the manual entry to life/safety CSRs in addition to the existing routing process to address the audit finding.

Finding #3: Underdeveloped parameters surrounding closing no-access complaints and granting extensions to resolve violations result in inconsistent processes.

Finding No. 3 prescribes standardizing the investigation and abatement process for CSRs; more specifically, for requests that involve limited or no physical access to the property as well as those requests involving extensions to the violator to cure the violation.

The audit report does not speak to the overall enforcement process, including the initial warning letter and citation process, but rather the guidelines/process specific to those CSR investigations that are closed because of limited or lack of access to the properties and/or structures, as well as those CSRs that are granted extensions to fully cure violations. Although the audit report does not identify or document the frequency of these occurrences or related impacts, it requests documentation/standardization of the number of attempts to gain property access, including photo documentation of notices posted as well as a policy for granting abatement extensions.

The LBMC identifies nuisance and building code requirements and provides some flexibility with enforcement. The Bureau's policies and procedures mirror the code's enforcement requirements and provide more specific enforcement protocols for inspections, citations and

appeals, including inspection timelines. The Bureau's policies and procedures also include requirements for gaining access to properties as well as granting extensions to cure violations. Neither the code nor policies provide a specific number of attempts to gain access to properties nor specific timelines.

As noted in the audit report, every violation is potentially unique and different which may include extenuating circumstances requiring a curated enforcement approach. The Bureau appreciates the acknowledgement that a one-size-fits-all enforcement approach is not practical. Furthermore, the Bureau recognizes the audit reports findings that would: 1) refine the existing standards and documentation for attempts to access property and 2) create language/examples to assist staff in granting abatement extensions. That said, the Bureau will amend its policy handbook to clarify protocols for property access attempts, including identifying a minimum number of attempts to access the property (based on the type of CSR) before closing a request, use of inspection warrants, and related fees charged for this effort. Photo documentation is required when posting notices, that will not change, but training will be provided to staff. Management will also create a reference guide to be used when granting abatement extensions that will include more milestones/deadlines/tracking for more consistent enforcement.

Finding #4: Code Enforcement should review response time data to fully evaluate operational efficiency and effectiveness.

Finding No. 4, recommends that the Bureau track response times for all CSRs and monitor trends to ensure response times remain reasonable based staffing and competing demands and proprieties. Currently, the Bureau tracks opened and closed case activity and has configured Infor to allow management the opportunity to review enforcement activities for all cases. Management can track when the case was created and assigned, identify the total number of citations for any given case, review inspection dates and results, time between inspections, related photographs and documents sent and received, and telephone logs. The Bureau policies have standardized the enforcement process as reflected in the Infor data configuration. Furthermore, staff receives training to ensure Infor is utilized for all enforcement activities. Staff will work with TID to generate summary reports for can be used to monitor trends and activities.

Finding #5: Improper and outdated information system access controls were identified that could have created security vulnerabilities, however management reported that access was corrected.

Although the audit report found no instances of inappropriate or illicit Infor use, a finding was made requesting changes to Infor and system controls to regulate access and improve security. As indicated in the audit report, Management has worked with TID to make the appropriate revisions to Infor. Management has also established a process to amend access/security when employee changes occur.

Response to Code Enforcement Performance Audit

June 29, 2022

Page 4

If you have any questions, please contact Oscar Orci, Director of Development Services, at (562) 570-6369.

ATTACHMENT

CC: OSCAR ORCI, DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
LINDA F. TATUM, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER
APRIL WALKER, ADMINISTRATIVE DEPUTY CITY MANAGER
ANDREW CHANG, ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER



Long Beach City Auditor's Office

411 W. Ocean Blvd., 8th Floor

Long Beach, CA 90802

Telephone: 562-570-6751

Fax: 562-570-6167

Email: Auditor@longbeach.gov

Website: CityAuditorLauraDoud.com

MyAuditor App available at the [App Store](#) or [Google Play](#)

Follow Us:

Facebook: [@LBCityAuditor](#)

Instagram: [@LBCityAuditor](#)

Twitter: [@LBCityAuditor](#)

CITY AUDITOR'S FRAUD HOTLINE: 1-888-FRAUD-07
