



The Black Rock Vacancy Initiative:
An Analysis of Results and Obstacles

David Panepinto

November 23, 2009

University at Buffalo Law School

Executive Findings

This study focuses on the seventy-seven properties that were targeted by the Black Rock Vacancy Initiative. First, forty-nine (49) of those properties were successfully resolved through the Initiative, including properties that were either resolved through Housing Court or by the City. Second, fourteen (14) properties were not resolved through the Initiative at all. This group includes active Housing Court cases, properties that Housing Court has lost jurisdiction over, and publicly owned properties that have not been either ordered demolished or occupied. Finally, fourteen (14) properties were occupied before the Initiative took effect, and therefore were not affected by the Initiative.

After an analysis of these findings, a number of obstacles to the successful implementation of the Initiative became apparent. First, even though city-owned properties did not present a problem within the Black Rock target area, the situation will very likely be different in another Buffalo neighborhood. Because many Buffalo neighborhoods have higher rates of vacancy, and higher rates of city ownership, a future vacancy initiative should provide a process for efficiently divesting the City of title to property it owns. This potential problem could be solved by a small neighborhood-specific auction after the City's annual tax foreclosure auction takes place.

Second, it proved difficult and time consuming to get targeted properties into Housing Court. Under the current system, all properties need to be cited by city housing inspectors in order to come under Housing Court jurisdiction. In order to make the

process easier and quicker, a future initiative should allow neighborhood residents to bring private nuisance actions directly in Housing Court without relying on housing inspectors.

Finally, the Black Rock Initiative did not have sufficient follow through procedures to ensure the continued effectiveness of the program. As a result, new vacancies that have emerged during the life of the Initiative often go unidentified and are not brought into Housing Court in a timely manner. Therefore, any future initiative should require a new vacancy survey to be performed every six months in order to catch new vacancies as they arise. Also, these newly identified properties should be quickly placed under Housing Court jurisdiction, either through inspections or private nuisance complaints.

Background of the Black Rock Vacancy Initiative

Buffalo's Housing Court is faced with the problem of vacant housing on a daily basis. In the hopes that a more focused approach could yield more immediate results, Housing Court hired a Vacant Property Initiatives Evaluator in 2007 and began to develop the Black Rock Vacancy Initiative. It was hoped that a comprehensive approach could be developed that would attack all of the vacant properties within a single neighborhood simultaneously. The eventual goal would be the elimination all vacant properties.

Under Byron Brown's administration, the City has decided that the most appropriate way to get properties into Housing Court is to rely on local citizen complaints. In this way, the City hopes the properties that cause the most neighborhood

concern will be resolved more efficiently. Although the logic of the approach is obvious, in reality it often results in a scattershot approach to solving the local housing crisis. If there are ten houses on a block that are vacant, but only one that has an active complaint, the other nine properties may be ignored by the housing inspectors. Because the policy focuses on individual properties flung far across the city, it fails to appreciate the holistic nature of neighborhood revitalization.

The Initiative is based on the idea that the City and Housing Court might have more success eliminating vacancy if they focus resources on one neighborhood at a time. The Black Rock neighborhood was chosen as the focus of the Initiative for a variety of reasons. The neighborhood is a well-defined geographic unit, with strong natural borders and only six streets that enter or exit at any given point. Also, the neighborhood boasts strong community activism and involvement, and this has translated into widespread support for the Initiative on the grassroots level. This support has included Council Member Golombek, the Black Rock Neighborhood Housing Service, and various neighborhood groups such as the Dearborn Community Association. It has also included the financial and logistical support of HSBC bank, which has been involved through the Community Reinvestment Act requirements.

The first stage of the initiative was to compile a comprehensive list of all vacancies within the Black Rock neighborhood. The Evaluator worked together with several neighborhood associations in an effort to canvas the entire neighborhood, street by street. At the end of that endeavor, in the summer of 2007, eighty-seven (87) housing units were listed as vacant. This included both properties owned by private individuals or corporations and properties owned by the city or other public agencies such as HUD.

The second stage of the Initiative was to get these properties cited by a housing inspector so that Housing Court could obtain jurisdiction and begin to seek a resolution for each property. The housing inspector assigned to the Black Rock neighborhood expressed support for the Initiative and agreed to cite each of the original 87 properties. However, due to a long delay in getting the appropriate citations, the Evaluator decided to once again enlist the aid of neighborhood residents in order to file a complaint about each individual property. Eventually, the majority of relevant properties were either cited for Housing Court or resolved in another manner.

Original Statistics

The Evaluator and the group of community activists originally identified eighty-seven (87) vacant properties in the summer of 2007. *See Appendix A.* The properties can be broken down as follows:

- Fourteen (14) properties were owned by public entities. *See Appendix B.* The City of Buffalo was by far the largest non-private property owner in Black Rock at the time, with eleven (11) properties. The federal government owned two (2) properties, and the Black Rock- Riverside Neighborhood Association owned one (1) property.
- Private individuals owned the remaining seventy-three (73) vacant properties in Black Rock at the time.

The seventy-three (73) properties owned by private individuals in the Summer of 2008 can be further broken down into five smaller groups.

- Thirteen (13) properties had been cited for Housing Court before the summer of 2008. This group contains a wide variety of situations: the properties were either still under Housing Court jurisdiction at the time, had been discharged, or had transferred owners and therefore needed to be re-cited. *See Appendix C.*
- Twenty-five (25) properties were eventually cited and brought under Housing Court jurisdiction by August 2008. *See Appendix D.*
- Thirteen (13) properties were never cited for Housing Court because letters of violation triggered sufficient responses and/or repairs that the properties were no longer a concern. *See Appendix E.*
- Fourteen (14) properties were originally listed as vacant in the Summer 2008, but were no longer vacant by the time the housing inspector was ready to complete the citations. *See Appendix F.*
- Finally, there are eight (8) properties that were originally listed as vacant, but for which there is currently no reliable data. Unfortunately, these eight (8) properties cannot be considered a part of this analysis.

Results

Resolution of Individual Properties

Fourteen (14) of the original eighty-seven (87) properties were owned by a public agency, the vast majority being the City of Buffalo. Because the City of Buffalo is responsible for prosecuting housing code violations, it is illogical to assume that the City will prosecute itself as owner of a vacant property. As a result, these properties were not

cited in any way through the Initiative and Housing Court was forced to rely on the City to resolve these properties through either divestment or demolition.

As mentioned earlier, twenty-five (25) of the original properties were recognized as vacant and cited for Housing Court on August 2008. The results of these individual properties are as follows:

- **Twelve** (12) properties were brought under Housing Court jurisdiction and eventually granted a conditional discharge. This means that Housing Court conditionally dismissed the case because the owner of the property made all of the necessary improvements in order to get the house occupied.
- **Four** (4) properties have recently been transferred, and there is therefore no jurisdiction over the current owners. However, the previous litigation resulted in either monetary or criminal judgments against the original owners.
- **Three** (3) properties resulted in either a demolition order or a demolition agreement between the City and the owner.
- **Three** (3) properties are still under Housing Court jurisdiction but have not yet been resolved.
- **One** (1) property has been struck to the City as a result of the 2009 tax foreclosure auction.
- Unfortunately, there is no reliable information for the **two** (2) remaining properties at this time.

Thirteen (13) properties were already in Housing Court before the spring of 2008, with the following results:

- **Seven** (7) properties have been occupied, with no case against the current owners.
- **Five** (5) properties resulted in either a demolition order or a demolition agreement between the City and the owner.
- **One** (1) property is still under Housing Court Jurisdiction and has not yet been resolved.

Thirteen (13) of the original properties were resolved before they were formally cited for Housing Court. The housing inspectors often send a letter of violation to an owner before citing a particular property to give the owner notice of the City's concerns. In the case of these thirteen (13) properties, the letter of violation was a sufficient motivating factor for the owner to fix or begin to fix the violations. As a result, the housing inspectors deemed it unnecessary to proceed with a Housing Court citation for these properties.

Fourteen (14) of the original properties were no longer vacant when the housing inspector began his citation effort in the summer of 2008. Because there was never a letter of violation, and these properties were occupied before the first citation effort, these properties resolved themselves without any influence from the Initiative.

Eight (8) of the original properties, as mentioned above, have no reliable data. Therefore, it is currently impossible to track whether or not they were resolved through the Initiative.

Crime Statistics

It is important to remember that the Initiative was not aimed exclusively at eliminating vacant properties within a neighborhood. It is just as much aimed at eliminating the secondary effects that vacant properties can have on a neighborhood. One of the biggest concerns that community members often raise when confronted with the spectre of vacant housing is the fear that crime rates will rise as vacant properties within the neighborhood rise.

Although crime rates can fluctuate based on a number of interrelated factors, and an evaluation of a suspected crime rate decrease must necessarily be more long-term than is practical in this situation, a number of individual crimes have seen a significant decrease since the start of the Initiative within census tract 59, which is identical to the area the Initiative covered. The most appreciable decreases were in reports of the following crimes:

- Sex offenses (50% decrease)
- Burglary (27% decrease)
- Larceny (27% decrease)
- Prostitution (25% decrease)
- Weapons offenses (16% decrease)
- Simple assault (14% decrease)
- Possession/ sale of drugs (8% decrease)
- Criminal mischief (7% decrease)

These eight (8) crimes saw a steady decrease from 2008 through the first three-quarters of 2009, coinciding with the initiation and resolution of many Initiative properties. *See appendix G.*

It is difficult to hypothesize whether or not these specific crimes have commission rates that are directly related to a rise or fall in vacant properties. Further, some of these crimes also declined between 2007 and 2008, a year in which no concrete action was taken through the Initiative. However, it is promising that a recognizable decrease occurred and that the decrease coincided with the occupation of formerly vacant properties facilitated by the Initiative.

Analysis of the Results

Eighty-seven (87) properties were originally listed as vacant through the Initiative. However, this analysis will only be considering the results of seventy-seven (77) properties. There is currently no reliable data on ten (10) properties that were originally listed as vacant, and it is therefore impossible to determine whether or not they were resolved through Housing Court proceedings.

There are three major groups that were discovered after a thorough review of the data:

- 49 properties were resolved through the Initiative. This group includes properties that were either resolved or occupied through Housing Court. It also includes city-owned properties that have either been demolished or have current demolition orders.

- 14 properties were not resolved through the Initiative. This group includes active Housing Court cases, properties that Housing Court has lost jurisdiction over, and publicly owned properties that have not been ordered demolished or occupied.
- 14 properties were occupied before the Initiative took effect.

Resolved and Occupied Properties

Forty-nine (49) properties were successfully resolved as a direct result of the Initiative. This group includes owners that were given conditional discharges (19), properties that Housing Court ordered demolished (8), and properties that were either brought to code or began work after the original letter of violation (13). This group also includes the city-owned properties that have either been demolished or have current demolition orders (9).

This group of forty-nine (49) properties represents a total success for the Initiative. The goal of the Initiative was to completely eliminate vacancy within Black Rock through a comprehensive approach utilizing both Housing Court and City resources. The Initiative was not meant to be a single approach that attacked vacancy from one avenue only. The properties within this group represent successful strategies that all achieved the Initiative's goal, albeit in different ways.

The first group- the conditional discharges- represents the success that Housing Court can have when it brings a violator into court and is able to exert its influence over the violator with the goal of salvaging the property. By using a combination of threatened fines, funding assistance, and patience, Housing Court is able to work with the property owner to achieve occupancy and bring the house up to code.

The second group- the properties that have been ordered demolished- represent another way that Housing Court can eliminate vacancy. It is unrealistic to assume that every vacant structure within Black Rock is salvageable. Unfortunately, some houses are in such disrepair that they must be demolished. However, when Housing Court thoughtfully marks unsalvageable properties for demolition, the neighborhood is cleared of one more vacant property that had been a blight on the neighborhood. Even though wholesale demolition orders within a neighborhood could wreak as much havoc as vacant properties, an approach such as this that demolishes only the unsalvageable ones should be considered a success.

The third group- the properties that were resolved before Housing Court intervention was necessary- are a success for the Initiative even though Housing Court was never granted jurisdiction. The goal of the Initiative was not to bring as many cases into Housing Court as possible; it was simply to eliminate vacancy through a multi-faceted approach. These properties, that were occupied as a result of the subtle pressure that a letter of violation exerts, were as much a success of the Initiative as the conditional discharges. If the Initiative can get a house occupied without the intervention of Housing Court, it not only meets the goals of the Initiative it also saves limited Housing Court resources for the more difficult cases.

The final group- properties that are city-owned and have either been demolished or ordered demolished- also present a situation where Housing Court was never granted jurisdiction. However, these properties represent a success because the City recognized that demolition of these particular properties was necessary to meet the goals of the Initiative and focused its resources accordingly.

Unresolved Properties

The fourteen (14) properties that make up the unresolved category should be considered failures for the Initiative. The largest group within this category is the six (6) properties owned by either the City or the federal government. These properties were never sent letters of violations, they were never cited, and as a result were never brought into Housing Court. Further, suitable action was never taken by the entity that owned the properties. Therefore, because there was never an opportunity to take action within this group, these properties are considered a loss for the Initiative.

The remaining properties within this category are not complete losses, but cannot be considered successes either. The first four (4) of these properties are no longer under Housing Court jurisdiction because a transfer has taken place. Because Housing Court has jurisdiction over owners and not the property itself, every time a property is transferred Housing Court must renew its jurisdiction. In these four cases, jurisdiction was never re-asserted, and therefore no action was accomplished.

Further, there are four (4) properties within this category that still have active Housing Court cases. It must be recognized that Housing Court can sometimes take an extended time-period to resolve a particular case, especially when the court is using its problem-solving abilities to work with an owner. Even though these active cases cannot be considered successes until a resolution is reached, they should be monitored in order to follow their progress.

Unrelated Properties

The fourteen (14) properties that were cited as vacant in the spring of 2007, but had been occupied by the spring of 2008, do not represent a failure or a success for the Initiative. Because these properties were resolved before the Initiative's first letter of violation was sent out, these properties were not affected in any direct or indirect way by the Initiative. While it is encouraging that these fourteen properties became occupied during the life of the Initiative, they should not be considered part of the Initiative.

Problems

In order for the Black Rock Vacancy Initiative- or any future initiative in another neighborhood- to be successful, there must be an effective method for bringing properties under Housing Court jurisdiction. The eventual goal of the Initiative is to reach a suitable resolution for every vacant housing unit within the Black Rock neighborhood, and Housing Court must be able to get involved and apply the tools at its disposal. By far, the biggest obstacle that the Initiative faced was simply getting properties into Housing Court, and this problem has not been satisfactorily resolved at this point. Therefore, a future initiative should analyze the jurisdictional problems that the Black Rock Vacancy Initiative faced and build off of those experiences.

City-Owned Properties

As mentioned earlier, thirteen (13) of the original eighty-seven (87) properties were owned by public entities. An additional property was and is owned by the Black Rock Neighborhood Association. This property remains vacant. However, ownership by

a housing association should not be a concern because of the simple fact that such an organization is going to be driven solely by the goal of getting the property occupied, even if reaching that goal is time consuming.

The City of Buffalo or the federal government owned the other thirteen (13) properties. These organizations do not necessarily share the same motivation as a non-profit housing organization. Further, it is functionally impossible for Housing Court to gain jurisdiction over these properties. The City of Buffalo is the prosecutor for Housing Court violations, and it is extremely unlikely that the City would ever be willing to prosecute itself as owner in Housing Court. As a result, thirteen (13) properties in the Black Rock neighborhood were virtually untouchable through the Initiative.

In the case of the Black Rock Initiative, nine (9) of the eleven (11) city-owned properties were either demolished or ordered demolished by the time of this study. Based upon this record, city properties appear to have been dealt with very efficiently in Black Rock and do not present an obstacle to the Initiative. However, in other Buffalo neighborhoods, there are higher rates of vacancy and higher rates of city-owned properties. City ownership of vacant properties might present a major obstacle if a future Initiative's target area contained large tracts of city-owned properties. In that event, demolitions may proceed significantly slower than they have in Black Rock, frustrating the goal of timely vacancy elimination. In such a situation, the Initiative would have no effective control over those City-owned properties.

Another potential problem would be if the City is holding otherwise viable vacant properties for long periods of time without mothballing, which could result in the unnecessary demolition of some city-owned properties. There was not sufficient

information available at the time of this study to address the issue, but it is something that should be looked into further.

The Original Pushback

One goal of the Initiative was to get all of the vacant properties in Black Rock under Housing Court jurisdiction in order to use all of the tools of a problem-solving court in order to solve the vacancy problem in Black Rock. However, as mentioned above, getting the Black Rock properties cited for Housing Court was a challenge in itself. This created an obstacle because without a citation from a housing inspector, there is currently no other procedure that Housing Court can use in order to gain jurisdiction over a property.

In the case of the Black Rock Initiative, eighty-seven (87) properties were listed as vacant by the summer of 2007. However, the housing inspector assigned to the Black Rock neighborhood did not cite any of the properties for Housing Court until August 2008, a full one-year later.

The most identifiable reason why the properties were not cited earlier was because of the City's complaint driven inspection system. A property is generally not inspected unless the City receives a complaint from a private citizen. Even though this system may help to prioritize inspections so that the focus is placed on the properties generating the most concern within the community, it created a roadblock for the Initiative. Because most of the properties the Initiative focused on had not been processed through the complaint system, it appears that it was difficult for the inspection

unit to cite the Initiative's properties because doing so would require ignoring City Hall's clear directive.

Eventually, the issue was brought to the attention of Mayor Brown's officials. City Hall officials were invited to a meeting involving Housing Court officials, HSBC officials, and community leaders where all groups voiced their concern that the properties had not been cited for court. By the end of this meeting City Hall began to openly support the Initiative and promised that the inspections would take place without any more unnecessary delay. To ensure that the citations would proceed appropriately, the Evaluator and a group of community members decided to file complaints about each individual property in case the housing inspectors maintained a continued push back. In the end, the majority of properties were cited for Housing Court, excluding properties owned by the city and properties that were resolved without the need for a citation.

The Lack of Continued Inspections

Another major obstacle to the Initiative's effective operation is that there has been no significant follow-up within the neighborhood. As mentioned above, the Evaluator and local community members originally identified eighty-seven (87) vacant properties within the Black Rock neighborhood in the summer of 2007. Even though there were significant delays, a majority of these properties were brought under Housing Court jurisdiction through the housing inspectors' concerted citation effort.

Unfortunately, there were properties that had been identified as newly vacant that the housing inspectors did not include within the concerted citation effort. In the spring of 2008, the Evaluator and his group of community members identified another nineteen

(19) properties that had become vacant since the original list was created in the summer of 2008.

There was no concerted effort to bring these nineteen (19) properties under Housing Court jurisdiction directly through the housing inspectors, as was done with the properties listed in *Appendix D*. Instead, complaints were filed on these properties through the City's 311 system. Only one of these properties was cited for court by August 2008, and many are still either uncited or unresolved. Because these properties were not part of the original eighty-seven (87) targeted properties, they will not be focused on in this project. However, if the Initiative was to be a truly concerted effort to deal with *all* of the vacancies within a neighborhood at the same time, it makes no sense that Housing Court was unable to quickly and efficiently address nineteen (19) additional properties that were creating exactly the type of blight the Initiative was meant to fight.

General Recommended Changes

The following changes are a response to the obstacles the Black Rock Vacancy Initiative faced and would make further implementation of the Initiative more efficient and effective. However, these recommended changes would also benefit any future vacancy initiative regardless of which neighborhood was targeted.

City-Divestiture

The importance of resolving city-owned properties cannot be overstated. If a vacancy initiative's goal is to eliminate all vacant properties within a particular neighborhood, this goal can never be achieved if a significant portion of those properties

are not dealt with in any meaningful manner. In a situation where there is a large number of city-owned properties that are not being efficiently demolished, or where the city is demolishing viable properties that could be rehabilitated, a future initiative will need to develop a plan for city-divestiture. Without a plan for city-divestiture, a future vacancy initiative might not be able to succeed.

An extension of the City's annual tax foreclosure sale is one avenue that should be explored. Every October, the City holds a single citywide auction to dispose of any property that is delinquent in tax payments, in the hopes of recovering some of the money owed on those properties. Judge Nowak has proposed a smaller tax auction that would take place after the annual citywide auction and would focus on the remaining properties in individual neighborhoods.

A smaller, neighborhood-specific auction could be a great opportunity for vacant city-owned properties to be resolved. A major benefit of a tax foreclosure auction is that title to the property is cleaned at the point of sale. Therefore, any lien that has attached to a particular property is swept away. This clean title could provide sufficient motivation for investors to purchase abandoned properties in a neighborhood with the goal of rehabbing them in a timely fashion. Of course, potential buyers would need to be screened in order to ensure that they are ready and able to proceed with rehabilitation.

If this smaller tax auction is put into action, it could be used as a tool to divest the City of properties that it is financially unable or unwilling to rehabilitate. In this way, properties that have traditionally been held in limbo will be able to enter private hands and eventually come under Housing Court jurisdiction, if necessary. Such a procedure will allow a vacancy initiative to become a truly universal approach.

Gaining Jurisdiction Over Private Properties

Once the problem of city-owned properties is dealt with, an initiative will still face significant obstacles in simply gaining timely jurisdiction over private properties. As mentioned above, the Black Rock Initiative had a difficult time getting the vacant properties inspected without an individual complaint for each property. Although City Hall eventually supported the Initiative and helped ensure that all vacant properties would be cited without further delay, the fact remains that the City's current complaint-only policy is directly at odds with the Initiative's goal of combating every single vacant property within a neighborhood.

As a result, it would be beneficial if Housing Court explored alternative means of gaining jurisdiction over vacant properties. One possible solution would make it easier for a private citizen to bring a private nuisance action directly in Housing Court without relying on a housing inspector's citation.

In such a case, an individual that owns property adjacent or in the vicinity of the vacant property can seek a solution in Housing Court for harm the vacancy is causing her property. An alternative approach would be to modify state law to allow private nuisance claims to be initiated by a designated neighborhood association, such as a block club. In this situation, the neighborhood association would be able to act in some respects as a mediator, dispelling concerns that nuisance complaints would be used inappropriately. *See Ryan Parisi, A User's Guide to Bringing a Private Nuisance Action, University at Buffalo, 2009.*

Follow-Up Procedures

Lastly, it is imperative that a vacancy initiative is properly monitored and carried through past an initial survey and citation effort. Follow-up procedures are necessary not only to ensure that previously cited properties have not escaped jurisdiction through transfers but also to address the newly vacant properties that inevitably arise over time. If an initiative is unable to address these concerns, it cannot fulfill the goal of eradicating vacancy.

One disappointing aspect of the Black Rock Initiative is that there does not appear to have been any concerted follow-up after the original citation effort was made. For example, that citation effort focused exclusively on the original eighty-seven (87) vacant properties, ignoring the new vacancies that were discovered in 2008. Also, there does not appear to have been any effort in 2009 to compile a new list of vacant properties, and without such a list there can be no concerted citation effort.

Vacancy is a continuing problem and it is inevitable that new vacancies will emerge as old vacancies are resolved. This does not mean that a vacancy initiative is inevitably Sisyphean; it simply means that the battle to eradicate vacancy is long-term, and an initiative cannot simply attack one group of properties and consider the task complete.

As a result, it is recommended that any future vacancy initiative have clear follow-up procedures. First, a vacant housing survey should be completed every six months and compared with the previous survey. Second, any property that is not under Housing Court jurisdiction at that time needs to be immediately addressed. It should be brought into court by either a housing inspector's citation or a private nuisance action so

that Housing Court is dealing with an up-to-date pool of vacant properties. Third, this six-month review should continue until the vacancy rate has decreased to the point where the initiative can be considered a success. In this way, a vacancy initiative will become a truly holistic approach to solving neighborhood vacancy.

Conclusion

The changes that this study recommends should be applied both to the current Initiative in Black Rock as well as to any future initiative in a different Buffalo neighborhood. The Black Rock Initiative has proven very successful at getting properties resolved once they enter Housing Court. However, Housing Court has had a difficult time gaining jurisdiction over properties in the first place. If either a future initiative or the Black Rock Initiative implements the recommended changes, the process of getting difficult properties into Housing Court should be significantly less time consuming and frustrating. By doing so, an initiative will be one step closer to realizing its ultimate goal: the elimination of all vacant structures within a particular neighborhood.

Appendix A

Original Vacant Properties With Available Data

Property Address

1. 95 Amherst
2. 155 Austin
3. 22 Calumet
4. 181 Dearborn
5. 190 Dearborn
6. 213 Dearborn
7. 255 Dearborn
8. 261 Dearborn
9. 269 Dearborn
10. 315 Dearborn
11. 353 Dearborn
12. 372 Dearborn
13. 373 Dearborn
14. 386 Dearborn
15. 423 Dearborn
16. 94 East
17. 97 East
18. 103 East
19. 174 East
20. 182 East
21. 199 East
22. 204 East
23. 216 East
24. 249 East
25. 253 East
26. 301 East
27. 362 East
28. 477 East
29. 97 Farmer
30. 104 Farmer
31. 149 Farmer
32. 23 Garfield
33. 27 Garfield
34. 58 Gorton
35. 100 Gorton
36. 174 Grace
37. 181 Grace
38. 7 Guernsey
39. 103 Guernsey
40. 41 Hamilton

41. 69 Hamilton
42. 90 Hamilton
43. 116 Hamilton
44. 8 Harp
45. 9 Harp
46. 11 Harp
47. 13 Harp
48. 20 Harp
49. 24 Harp
50. 25 Harp
51. 13 Hartman
52. 46 Hartman
53. 42 Hoffman
54. 1875 Niagara
55. 1887 Niagara
56. 1891 Niagara
57. 1937 Niagara
58. 2103 Niagara
59. 2136 Niagara
60. 2144 Niagara
61. 18 Peoria
62. 53 Peoria
63. 56 Peoria
64. 60 Peoria
65. 11 St. Francis
66. 81 Thompson
67. 123 Thompson
68. 131 Thompson
69. 137 Thompson
70. 153 Thompson
71. 164 Thompson
72. 166 Thompson
73. 302 Tonawanda
74. 394 Tonawanda
75. 400 Tonawanda
76. 487 Tonawanda
77. 586 Tonawanda

Appendix B

Properties Owned by Public Entities

<u>Property Address</u>	<u>Owner</u>
1. 269 Dearborn	City of Buffalo
2. 386 Dearborn	City of Buffalo
3. 94 East	City of Buffalo
4. 249 East	U.S.A
5. 477 East	Black Rock-Riverside NHS
6. 97 Farmer	City of Buffalo
7. 104 Farmer	City of Buffalo
8. 41 Hamilton	H.U.D.
9. 69 Hamilton	City of Buffalo
10. 116 Hamilton	City of Buffalo
11. 24 Harp	City of Buffalo
12. 1887 Niagara	City of Buffalo
13. 137 Thompson	City of Buffalo
14. 153 Thompson	City of Buffalo

Appendix C

Properties Already in Housing Court Prior to August 2008

<u>Property Address</u>	<u>Status</u>
1. 95 Amherst	Vacant, Demo agreement
2. 22 Calumet	Occupied, No case against current owners
3. 353 Dearborn	Occupied, No case against current owners
4. 373 Dearborn	Occupied, No case against current owners
5. 7 Guernsey	Vacant, Active case
6. 25 Harp	Occupied, Conditional discharge
7. 2103 Niagara	Occupied, Conditional discharge
8. 2136 Niagara	Occupied, No case against current

	owners
9. 56 Peoria	Vacant, Demo order
10. 11 St. Francis	Vacant, Demo agreement
11. 166 Thompson	Vacant, Demo order
12. 394 Tonawanda	Vacant, Demo agreement
13. 400 Tonawanda	Occupied, No case against current owners

Appendix D

Properties Cited for Housing Court on 8/08

Property Address

Status

1. 155 Austin	Occupied, conditional discharge
2. 190 Dearborn	Vacant, active case.
3. 261 Dearborn	Vacant, demolition order
4. 103 East	Vacant, no jurisdiction over current owner
5. 174 East	Vacant, no jurisdiction over current owner
6. 182 East	Occupied, conditional discharge
7. 216 East	Occupied, conditional discharge
8. 253 East	Vacant, struck to city
9. 301 East	Occupied, active case
10. 362 East	Vacant, demolition order
11. 87 Gorton	No info available
12. 174 Grace	Vacant, demolition agreement
13. 181 Grace	Vacant, active case
14. 103 Guernsey	Occupied, conditional discharge
15. 8 Harp	Vacant, original owner obtained conditional discharge, no jurisdiction over current owner
16. 11 Harp	Occupied, unconditional discharge

17. 13 Harp	Vacant, no jurisdiction over current owner
18. 42 Hoffman	Occupied, conditional discharge
19. 1875 Niagara	Occupied, conditional discharge
20. 1891 Niagara	Occupied, conditional discharge
21. 2144 Niagara	Occupied, conditional discharge
22. 2170 Niagara	No info available
23. 60 Peoria	Occupied, conditional discharge
24. 164 Thompson	Occupied, conditional discharge
25. 586 Tonawanda	Occupied, conditional discharge

Appendix E

Properties That Were Resolved Before Citation

Property Address

1. 213 Dearborn
2. 255 Dearborn
3. 315 Dearborn
4. 372 Dearborn
5. 423 Dearborn
6. 97 East
7. 149 Farmer
8. 9 Harp
9. 13 Hartman
10. 1937 Niagara
11. 18 Peoria
12. 53 Peoria
13. 302 Tonawanda

Appendix F

Properties That Were No Longer Vacant in spring of 2008

Property Address

1. 181 Dearborn
2. 199 East
3. 204 East
4. 23 Garfield
5. 27 Garfield
6. 58 Gorton
7. 100 Gorton
8. 90 Hamilton
9. 20 Harp
10. 46 Hartman
11. 81 Thompson
12. 123 Thompson
13. 131 Thompson
14. 487 Tonawanda

Appendix G

Crime Statistics Obtained From the Buffalo Police Department- 09/09

Crime	2008	2009 to date
Homicide	0	0
Rape	3	1
Robbery	18	18
Assault	34	26
Burglary	90	49
Larceny	111	60
Vehicle Theft	32	25
Arson	2	1
Kidnapping	1	1
Possession/Sale of Drugs	45	31
Weapons	6	2
Sex Offenses	8	3
Forgery	1	1
Prostitution	4	1
Stolen Property	1	0
Coercion	0	1
Criminal Mischief	85	59
Fraud	6	5
Simple Assault	87	56
DWI	3	1
Unauth. Use of Vehicle	0	1

Poss. Of Burglar Tools	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	1	1
Loitering	0	1