

Office of Legislative Oversight
MEMORANDUM REPORT 2008-12

June 18, 2008

TO: County Council

FROM: Kristen Latham, Legislative Analyst
Office of Legislative Oversight

SUBJECT: **Status Report: Follow-up Review of the Council's Recommendations Related to OLO's 2001 Evaluation of Landlord and Tenant Complaint Handling (OLO Report 2001-6)**

This report reviews the implementation status of OLO Report 2001-6, *An Evaluation of the Process of Handling Complaints from Landlords and Tenants in Montgomery County*. Specifically, this memo reviews how the County Government implemented the Council's four recommendations. It is organized as follows:

Part A, Introduction , describes the scope of this status report and OLO's methodology.	Page 2
Part B, Background , summarizes the key findings contained in OLO's 2001 evaluation of landlord and tenant complaint handling.	Page 2
Part C, Review of the Council's Recommendations and Current Implementation Status , summarizes the Council's recommendations for action taken on OLO Report 2001-6, and describes the current implementation status of those recommendations.	Page 5
Part D, Conclusion , summarizes the implementation of OLO Report 2001-6 and discusses future action.	Page 15

PART A: INTRODUCTION

Authority. Council Resolution 16-260, FY 2008 Work Program of the Office of Legislative Oversight, adopted July 31, 2007.

Scope of Assignment. This report reviews the implementation status of the Council's recommendations for action on a previous OLO report. This particular follow-up assignment was to track the implementation of recommendations that the Council endorsed as a result of a 2001 evaluation of the process of handling complaints from landlords and tenants in Montgomery County (OLO Report 2001-6).

Methodology and Acknowledgements. OLO gathered information for this follow-up project from document reviews and interviews with Department of Housing and Community Affairs' (DHCA) staff and Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs' Chairman Matthew Moore. OLO circulated a draft of the report to Executive Branch staff for review; this final report incorporates all of the technical edits OLO received.

OLO greatly appreciates the time and contributions made by the Department of Housing and Community Affairs staff. Special thanks are owed to Joe Giloley, Division Chief, Housing and Code Enforcement and Michael Denney, Administrator of Investigators for the Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs. OLO would also like to thank Chair of the Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs Matthew Moore.

PART B: ORIGINS AND SUMMARY OF OLO REPORT 2001-6

During FY00 and FY01, the Council reviewed two bills related to landlord-tenant issues. These are outlined below.

Bill 33-99. This bill addressed a variety of topics associated with landlord-tenant affairs. Specifically, the enacted bill made the following changes to the complaint handling process:

- Provided DHCA with the authority to issue a subpoena to compel a landlord or tenant to produce documents relevant to an investigation;
- Required the Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs (OLTA) to schedule a conciliation conference within 30 days after a complaint is filed, unless there is good cause for delay;
- Retained the Commission's independent authority to investigate and conciliate issues without receiving a formal complaint through OLTA; and
- Required an appellant, who seeks to stay enforcement of a Commission decision and order in which a monetary award is granted, to post a bond equal to the amount of the Commission award with the Circuit Court.

Emergency Bill 36-00. Emergency Bill 36-00, Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs – Membership, was enacted in July 2001 and was intended to ensure that the members of the Commission are impartial and unbiased decision-makers and to maintain the County's ability to recruit and appoint qualified Commission members.

The Bill:

- Allows attorneys, who primarily represent either landlords or tenants of rental housing, to serve as “landlord” or “tenant” members of the Commission without being nominated by a landlord or tenant;
- Restricts attorneys who primarily represent landlords or tenants from serving as “public” members; and
- Restricts persons who own more than 5% of a rental housing unit or an interest in a business that owns or manages rental property, or a person receiving more than \$10,000 per year compensation from an owner or manager of rental property from serving as “public” or “tenant” members.

During its review of Bill 33-99, the Council’s Planning, Housing, and Economic Development (PHED) Committee raised questions about the effectiveness of the landlord-tenant complaint handling process. The Committee recommended that the Council include an evaluation of the complaint handling process on OLO’s FY01 Work Program.

OLO’s subsequent report described and evaluated the County Government’s process for resolving complaints submitted by landlords and tenants. Report 2001-6 addressed:

- Administration of the Complaint Handling Process;
- Allocation of OLTA Staff Time;
- Complaint Intake and Disposition Data;
- Elapsed Time to Resolve Complaints;
- Customer Satisfaction.

Administration of the Complaint Handling Process. OLO Report 2001-6 found that the Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs (OLTA) administers a multi-step process to receive, investigate and resolve complaints from landlords and tenants. OLTA’s program responsibilities include the following activities:

- OLTA staff investigate the complaint.
- OLTA staff attempt to resolve the dispute through a conciliation conference.
- OLTA staff forwards disputes that are not resolved through a conciliation conference to the Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs, with a recommendation to dismiss the complaint or to hold a hearing.
- The Commission decides whether to dismiss a complaint or hold a hearing. If the Commission holds a hearing, it convenes a three-member panel to hear the complaint.
- Within 45 days after the hearing, the Commission issues a decision and order. OLTA staff or a Panel member prepares a written Decision and Order that reflects its findings of facts and conclusions of law. The Commission approves and issues the decision and order, which is signed by the Chair.

In addition to these steps, Sec. 29-49 of the County Code provides for an appeal of a Commission’s decision and order to the Circuit Court.

Allocation of OLTA Staff Time. In FY02, OLTA's staff complement was 6.8 workyears. OLTA staff reported to OLO that its staff time was allocated as follows:

- 50% of staff time was spent responding to general inquiries from the public;
- 45% of staff time was spent resolving complaints; and
- 5% was spent on other general public education activities.

At the PHED Committee worksession on the report, OLTA indicated the office would benefit from additional resources. At that time, OLTA stated its priorities for these resources would be to increase its capacity to respond to general inquiries, to resolve complaints more quickly, to systematically address rental housing issues, and to increase its marketing and outreach efforts.

Complaint Disposition. According to Report 2001-6, OLTA received 1,284 complaints from landlords and tenants in FY01. Of this total, OLTA staff:

- Resolved 1,243 (or about 97%) through informal discussions or formal conciliation conferences; and
- Referred 41 (or about 3%) to the Commission for review.
- Of the 41 complaints OLTA referred, the Commission held hearings on 21 of them.

Length of Time for Complaint Resolution or Disposition. In 2001, data from FY01 provided to OLO by OLTA indicated that the length of time to resolve a complaint varied from one to 378 days. Specifically, during FY01:

- 58% of complaints were resolved within 30 days;
- 29% were resolved in 31 to 90 days; and
- 2% were resolved in more than 181 days.

In 2001, OLO also indicated that "vacancies on the Commission can lengthen the time it takes to resolve complaints." OLO stated that OLTA staff reported that vacancies were problematic for reasons due to two separate provisions in County law:

- First, under County law, a quorum of the Commission is required to decide whether to dismiss a complaint or hold a hearing; and
- Second, under County law, the Commission must appoint a three member panel to hear each complaint that merits a hearing.

In 2001, OLTA staff reported these two requirements could make it more difficult to schedule hearing and could create delays in the complaint handling process. OLTA staff were unsure how the Emergency Bill would affect the vacancy levels on the Commission.

Customer Satisfaction. OLTA customer satisfaction surveys from July 2000 through March 2001 found over 85% of survey respondents reported satisfaction with the fairness and speed of the process, and with the courtesy and attitude of OLTA staff. OLO's interviews with OLTA staff and Commission members at that time also indicated overall satisfaction with the current process.

C. IMPLEMENTATION AND STATUS OF COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDATIONS

The section reviews the implementation status of the four recommendations the Council approved in October 2001, following its consideration of Report 2001-6. For each recommendation, OLO provides a summary of the recommendation, an explanation of the Council's intent, and actions to date to implement the recommendation.

In some cases, OLO was unable to determine or identify whether an explicit action was taken to implement a recommendation. In these cases, OLO solicited observations and data about the recommendation from the current OLTA Administrator, and these observations are provided as well.

In addition, during the years since the release of the report, the previous OLTA Administrator retired and the current OLTA Administrator was hired.

The recommendations endorsed by the Council in 2001 are in various stages of implementation as described below.

Council Recommendation #1:

The Council formally requests that the Department track and report how Emergency Bill 36-00, Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs – Membership, affects the Department's ability to fill vacancies on the Commission and to maintain timely resolution of complaints.

The Council's review of Emergency Bill 36-00 included a discussion of who may serve on the Commission and the problem of vacancies on the Commission. The enacted bill changed the membership requirements for Commission members.

In OLO's evaluation OLTA staff stated that vacancies on the Commission had delayed the Commission's ability to decide a complaint, or to appoint a panel to hear a complaint. Therefore, the Council recommended that DHCA monitor the impact of Emergency Bill 36-00 on the complaint handling process.

Actions to Implement this Recommendation. DHCA staff report that the bill has not effected either the Department's ability to fill Commission vacancies or its ability to resolve complaints in a timely manner. According to the Department, no report exists that examines the effect of Emergency Bill 36-00 on the Department's ability to fill Commission vacancies or to maintain a timely complaint resolution process.

The OLTA Administrator's Observations about the Effects of Bill 36-00. Since Report 2001-6 stated OLTA staff had voiced a concern about Commission vacancies contributing to a delay in processing complaint cases, OLO asked the current OLTA Administrator to comment on the two possible effects of the provisions in Bill 36-00 that were identified in the Council's recommendation. The results of OLO's follow-up work for each concern the Council identified are reported below.

(1) Department's ability to fill vacancies on the Commission.

The OLTA Administrator advises OLO that, in his opinion, the provisions contained in Emergency Bill 36-00 that changed the qualifications for Commission membership did not exacerbate the Department's ability to fill vacancies on the Commission. The OLTA Administrator does not maintain specific data about Commission vacancies; instead, he advised OLO to contact the Office of the County Executive (OCE) for more information about Commission vacancies.

Staff in OCE reported to OLO that the length of time to fill a Commission vacancy has not changed in the past five years. Staff in the OCE also report that about three months elapse between the date OCE advertises a vacancy and the date the County Council confirms an Executive appointment. Typically, this three month period includes:

- Three weeks for advertising;
- One week for initial review of applications by Executive staff;
- Four weeks for scheduling and conducting interviews by Commission and Commission staff;
- One or two weeks for review of the Commission's recommendations by Executive staff; and
- Three weeks for transmittal to and approval by County Council.

OLO also learned that OCE staff does not maintain a historic database of when vacancies on the Commission occurred, how frequently they occurred, or how long they lasted.

(2) Department's ability to process complaints referred to the Commission in a timely manner.

The OLTA Administrator advises OLO that, in his opinion, the provisions of Emergency Bill 36-00 have not affected OLTA's ability to resolve complaints referred to the Commission in a timely manner.

Current OLTA Data for Complaint Disposition and Processing Times. In the course of conducting this follow-up review, OLO identified two factors that make it difficult to assess the effect of Emergency Bill 36-00 on complaint processing times: the lack of baseline data in Report 2001-6 and a change in the categories OLTA uses to track how quickly it closes out its complaints. Specifically:

- OLO’s summary of complaint processing data in Report 2001-6 did not separately examine how long it took to process the 41 complaints referred to the Commission. As a result, no baseline data exists to assess how the provisions of Bill 36-00 affected the Department’s ability to process complaints referred to the Commission in a timely manner.
- Since Report 2001-6 was conducted, the OLTA Administrator reports he revised the categories OLTA uses to track complaint processing times. Previously, OLTA monitored the time it took to resolve complaints in three categories, i.e., less than 30 days, 30-90 days, and over 180 days. Now, OLTA reports the resolution of complaints in two categories: complaints resolved in less than 60 days, and those resolved in more than 60 days.

When OLO realized the data in Report 2001-6 was incomplete, OLO asked the OLTA Administrator to provide recent data about complaint volume, disposition, and length of time to close out complaints referred to the Commission. OLO requested these data so that baseline information about the processing of complaints referred to the Commission would exist, in the event this issue came up in a future review.

Table 1 displays OLTA data about case dispositions in FY06 and FY07. Over this two-year period, the data show the number of cases referred to the Commission declined, the number and share of cases dismissed by the Commission increased, and the number of cases that resulted in a Commission hearing. Specifically:

- 52 cases were referred to the Commission in FY06 compared to 39 in FY07;
- 23 cases or 44% were dismissed by the Commission in FY06 compared to 27 or 69% in FY07; and
- 40% of cases in FY06 resulted in a hearing, compared to 13% of the cases in FY07.

Table 1: Dispositions of Cases Referred to a Landlord-Tenant Panel, FY06 and FY07

Case Dispositions	FY06	FY07	% FY06	% FY07
Dismissed by Commission	23	27	44%	69%
Settled before Hearing	8	7	15%	18%
Conducted Hearing	21	5	40%	13%
Total	52	39	100%	100%

Source: Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs, FY07

OLTA also provided OLO with processing data for complaints referred to the Commission for review. Table 2 shows the elapsed time from intake to decision for two sets of complaints, cases where the Commission held a hearing and cases when a hearing was not held. The data show improvements in processing time between FY06 and FY07. For example:

- For the 31 cases in FY06 and 34 cases in FY07 that were resolved without a panel hearing, the elapsed time between complaint intake and referral to the Commission averaged 90.5 days in FY06 compared to 57.2 days in FY07.
- For the 21 cases in FY06 and 5 cases in FY07 that had a hearing, the average processing time from intake to decision was 217 days in FY06 compared to 147 days in FY07.

OLTA staff report that there are numerous reasons for the variations in elapsed time. Two of the most frequent explanations for a delay are that one or more of the parties requests that the hearing be postponed or that there is no quorum available to hear the cases.

Table 2: Elapsed Time for Complaints Referred to Landlord-Tenant Commission, FY06 and FY07

# of Average, Median and Range of Working Days for Disposition of Complaints referred for Hearing	Cases without a Panel Hearing		Cases with a Panel Hearing	
	FY06	FY07	FY06	FY07
	31 cases	34 cases	21 cases	5 cases
Days from OLTA Intake to Referral to Commission				
Average # Days	90.5	57.2	56.1	72.6
Median # Days	79	47	40	62
Range of Days	12-217	7-191	17-199	27-142
Days from Referral to Commission and Commission Panel Hearing Date				
Average # Days	Not Applicable		75.6	38.4
Median # Days	Not Applicable		85	40
Range of Days	Not Applicable		31-128	11-56
Days from Panel Hearing Date to Issuance of Commission Order				
Average # Days	Not Applicable		87.8	38.4
Median # of Days	Not Applicable		107	39
Range of Days	Not Applicable		20-170	3-71
Total Days to Process from Intake to Decision				
Average # of Days			217	147.7
Median # of Days			226	183
Range of Days			76-372	47-212

Source: Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs, FY07

Council Recommendation #2

The Council should encourage DHCA to increase awareness of the current policy that provides reimbursement to Commission members for transportation and child care expenses.

During the interviews OLO conducted in 2001, Commission members indicated, and OLTA staff agreed, that lack of compensation for expenses could be deterring people from serving on the Commission, despite the existence of a policy that provided compensation for transportation and child care expenses. OLO's interviews also indicated Commission members were not aware of the Council's reimbursement policies.

Actions to Implement this Recommendation. DCHA staff report that the Office has taken actions to increase the awareness among Commission members about the County's reimbursement policies.

DHCA's Current Practices for Informing Commissioner's of County Reimbursement Policies. OLO asked the OLTA Administrator and Division Chief of Housing to explain how it advises Commission members about the County's reimbursement policies. In response, DHCA stated that it currently uses three methods to inform Commission members about the County's reimbursement policy. Specifically, DHCA

- Advises Commissioners during orientation that they can file for reimbursement of their transportation and child care expenses;
- Emails a copy of the policy to all Commission members after they are appointed; and
- Distributes reimbursement forms to all new Commission members after they are appointed.

Notwithstanding these notification practices, OLTA staff report that they have not received any requests for reimbursements from any Commissioners since the OLO report identified this concern.

Council Recommendation #3

DHCA should keep Councilmembers informed about the implementation and results of its current plans to address concerns of the Commission members about how the decisions and orders the Commission issues are produced.

The interviews OLO conducted in 2001 identified concerns about whether Commissioners or OLTA staff should be responsible for producing the Commission's decisions and orders and the resources available to do this.

OLO's interviews indicated Commissioners expressed concerns about the time it took them to prepare and write the Commission's decisions and orders. Commissioners stated this amount of time was excessive, especially combined with their other duties. At the same time, OLTA staff also stated that it was not feasible for them to write decisions and orders, given their current workload.

Actions to Implement this Recommendation. The Office has modified its practices for producing decision and orders since the Council's review of OLO's original report.

OLTA's Current Practices for Drafting of Commission Orders. OLO asked the OLTA Administrator to describe current practices for drafting decisions and orders issued by the Commission, and OLO asked Commissioners whether this was still an issue.

OLTA Staff. OLTA staff reports that it has modified its practices for producing decisions and orders since Report 2001-6 identified this issue. Whereas previously the Commission had lead responsibility for decisions and orders, now OLTA staff primarily prepare draft decisions and orders, unless a Commissioner expresses an interest in a particular issue.

OLTA reports its current practices for producing a decision and order issued by the Commission consist of the following steps:

1. For most cases, when the Commission Panel hearing is held, the panel deliberates and comes to an agreement, often with an OLTA investigator in the room. More complicated cases may require additional sessions.
2. Following the meeting of the Commission panel, an OLTA investigator prepares a draft decision that reflects the consensus of the panel's findings of facts, its conclusions of law, and its proposed order.
3. The OLTA Investigator circulates this draft to the Chair of the Commission panel, the other panel members, and the County Attorney's Office for their review and approval.
4. The Chair of the Commission signs the decision and order, which is issued by OLTA.

OLTA reports that the Commission members and OLTA staff currently share the responsibility for the drafting of decisions and orders. According to the OLTA Administrator, a Commission member who is interested in a particular issue can decide to write a decision. If this happens, the Commissioner takes primarily responsibility for drafting the initial decision and order, with assistance from OLTA staff. The OLTA Administrator reports, in practice, Commissioners participate infrequently in this process; instead, OLTA staff currently draft almost all decisions.

The current Chair of the Commission states that this process has been effective and efficient for Commission members.

Council Recommendation #4

Council should provide feedback to DHCA on the potential for appropriating additional resources to the complaint handling process in order to:

- **Increase OLTA's capacity to respond to an increasing volume of general inquiries about landlord and tenant issues;**
- **Resolve complaints in a more timely manner as the number of general inquiries and formal complaints increases;**
- **Address systemic problems in the rental housing market; and**
- **Conduct more community outreach and education.**

OLO's interviews in 2001 indicated that the OLTA workload at that time limited the ability to take proactive efforts to address issues and resolve complaints.

Actions to Implement this Recommendation. In 2001 the Council recommended that OLTA investigate ways to get additional resources, and look specifically at options such as hiring part-time student interns; applying for an Americorps Volunteer; or hiring a full-time employee.

Subsequent Council Actions to Increase OLTA's Program Resources. OLO's research for this implementation review found that since Report 2001-6 identified OLTA's need for more resources, Council increased resources for OLTA's program in FY03, FY05 and FY06.

In May 2002, the FY03 Council approved budget included increased resources for OLTA. Specifically:

- During worksessions on DHCA's proposed budget for FY03, the PHED Committee recommended placing funding for a new Investigator III position (\$48,000 for 0.8 workyear) on the Council's reconciliation list; and
- The Committee further expressed concern about the Executive's recommendation to assume a lapse of 2.0 workyears (or \$99,000) in Consumer Protection staffing that supported the landlord-tenant function. In response, the PHED Committee recommended adding \$73,410 to the DHCA budget to reduce a lapse of 2.0 workyears (\$99,000) in Consumer Protection staffing support for landlord-tenant functions that had been assumed by the Executive.

The PHED Committee recommended increasing rental license fees for both single family and condominium units to cover the cost of the new landlord-tenant position.

The Council approved both PHED recommendations in the FY03 budget. The Council's approval of \$48,000 and 0.8 workyear for a new position increased OLTA's staff complement to 7.7 workyears, and approval of \$73,410 in Consumer Protection reduced the departmental lapse from \$99,000 to \$25,590.

The increase in workyears in FY05 was attributable to the transfer of a Principal Administrative Aide position from DHCA’s Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit Program (MPDU) to OLTA.

In FY06, OLTA’s staff complement increased by one workyear when a position was transferred to OLTA from the MPDU program. Since then, the workyears for the Office of Landlord-Tenant have remained relatively constant.

Table 3 shows OLTA’s workyears since FY02. In addition to the 8.8 approved workyears in FY08, OLTA staff report that the Office currently has an intern for four hours per week.

Table 3: Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs Workyears, FY03 – FY08

Fiscal Year	Approved Workyears
FY02	6.8
FY03	7.7
FY04	7.9
FY05	8.1
FY06	9.1
FY07	8.8
FY08	8.8

Source: Montgomery County Operating Budgets, FY03-FY08

Current Deployment of OLTA Resources. To assess the results OLTA has produced as a result of its additional resources, OLO asked OLTA to provide information about recent initiatives and accomplishments and current data about its complaint volume and processing times.

An Increase in OLTA’s Capacity to Respond to an Increase in General Inquiries. Report 2001-6 reported approximately 50% of OLTA’s staff resources were allocated to general inquiries; however, Report 2001-6 did not provide any details about the number of inquiries received annually, or how many OLTA staff were assigned to handle these inquiries.

Resolution of Complaints in a More Timely Manner as the Number of Inquiries and Complaints Increase. Table 4 displays complaint disposition data provided by the OLTA Administrator and summarized by OLO. The summary data show:

- The volume of complaints increased by 559 (77%) between FY00 and FY01; by comparison, it increased by 195 (17%) between FY06 and FY07;
- The share of unresolved complaints referred to the Commission has stayed at 5% or less since FY00. This share was 5% in FY06 and 3% in FY07.
- Of the cases referred to the Commission, over half (60%) were dismissed or settled in FY06 and 87% were dismissed or settled before a hearing was scheduled.

Table 4: Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs Complaint Processing and Disposition Data

Landlord-Tenant Complaint Data	FY00	FY01	FY06	FY07
Number of Landlord-Tenant Complaints Received	725	1284	1155	1350
Number of Unresolved Complaints Referred to the Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs	35	41	52	39
Number of Cases Dismissed by the Commission or Settled Prior to Hearing	Not Available	20	31	34
Number of Cases Referred to a Hearing Panel Convened by the Commission	Not Available	21	21	5

Source: Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs, FY07

Timely Resolution of Complaints. As reported earlier, since Report 2001-6 was conducted, the OLTA Administrator has revised the categories OLTA uses to track complaint processing times. Previously, OLTA monitored the time it took to resolve complaints in three categories, i.e., less than 30 days, 30-90 days, and over 180 days. Now, OLTA reports the resolution of complaints in two categories: complaints resolved in less than 60 days, and those resolved in more than 60 days.

Given this change, Table 5 presents data to show how the share of complaints closed in FY01 and FY07. The FY07 data show the majority of complaints are closed in two months or less. (Note - The earlier analysis of processing times for complaints referred to the Commission on page 8 shows an improvement in processing times between FY06 and FY07.)

Table 5: Share of All Complaints Closed by Time Period, FY01 and FY07

Time Periods Tracked in FY01	% Closed FY01	Time Periods Tracked in FY07	% Closed FY07
Under 30 days	58%	Under 60 days	81%
Between 31-90 days	29%		
Between 91-180 days	10%	Over 60 days	19%
Over 181 days	2%		

Source: Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs, FY07

Table 6 provides detailed monthly data for OLTA’s FY07 complaint statistics. OLTA data show that, with the exception of cases presented to the Commission, cases were open less than an average of 40 days.

Table 6: Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs Complaint Statistics, FY07

Month	Total Number of Cases Received	# Cases Referred to Commission	# of Cases Resolved without Referral to Commission	Average Days Open for Cases not Referred to Commission	% of Cases Not Referred to the Commission Closed Under 60 Days
July	69	19	50	39.5	70%
August	78	0	78	49.1	90%
September	93	3	90	74.4	48%
October	77	6	71	42.5	73%
November	55	3	52	49.5	65%
December	67	2	65	49.0	67%
January	76	3	73	37.3	82%
February	57	7	50	36.9	77%
March	60	4	56	33.2	82%
April	77	5	72	24.4	91%
May	207	3	204	28.6	100%
June	60	3	57	13.5	98%
Open	121	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total	1236	58	1178	39.2	81%

Source: Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs, FY07

In addition, nearly 90% of all customer surveys returned by landlords and tenants who were involved in an investigation by OLTA in FY07, regardless of the outcome of the investigation, were “satisfied” with the OLTA complaint handling process, the services provided by the investigator, and the outcome of the investigation.

OLTA’s Activities to Address Systematic Problems in Rental Housing. OLTA staff report that the Office is addressing a variety of systematic issues in the County. Some of the issues that OLTA has reviewed and begun to address include bed bugs, emergency assistance for residents, and code enforcement issues.

OLTA's Activities to Conduct More Community Outreach and Education. Since the release of the OLO report, OLTA has created numerous publications concerning various landlord-tenant issues. Many of the following publications are available in English and Spanish:

- What is Ordinary Wear and Tear?
- Condominium Conversion Handbook;
- Landlord-Tenant Handbook;
- Eviction Prevention; and
- Room Rentals.

PART D. CONCLUSION

The implementation of the Council-endorsed recommendations by the Department of Housing and Community Affairs's Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs meets the Council's goal of reforming the landlord-tenant complaint handling process. OLO does not recommend any follow-up action.