

PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

This zoning/rezoning request will be reviewed and acted upon at two public hearings: before the Land Use Commission and the City Council. Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed development or change. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During its public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or may evaluate the City staff's recommendation and public input forwarding its own recommendation to the City Council. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice is required.

During its public hearing, the City Council may grant or deny a zoning request, or rezone the land to a less intensive zoning than requested but in no case will it grant a more intensive zoning.

However, in order to allow for mixed use development, the Council may add the MIXED USE (MU) COMBINING DISTRICT to certain commercial districts. The MU Combining District simply allows residential uses in addition to those uses already allowed in the seven commercial zoning districts. As a result, the MU Combining District allows the combination of office, retail, commercial, and residential uses within a single development.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our website:

www.austintexas.gov

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the board or commission's name, the scheduled date of the public hearing, and the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice.

Case Number: C14-2013-0020

Contact: Lee Heckman, 512-974-7604

Public Hearing: May 14, 2013, Planning Commission

May 23, 2013, City Council

Olivia A. Guerrero

Your Name (please print)

23/30.1st

Your address(es) affected by this application

Olivia A. Guerrero

Signature

Date

5-29-13

Daytime Telephone: (512) 442-8437

Comments: Re-zoning would create large amount of traffic next to my business. We were under the impression renovating was going to take place instead reconstruction is in the plan. The planned bridge off of S1st will be a welcoming problem for drug transaction to take place; that we don't need.

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned to:

City of Austin

Planning & Development Review Department

Lee Heckman

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-8810

PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

This zoning/rezoning request will be reviewed and acted upon at two public hearings: before the Land Use Commission and the City Council. Although applicants and/or their agent(s) are expected to attend a public hearing, you are not required to attend. However, if you do attend, you have the opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the proposed development or change. You may also contact a neighborhood or environmental organization that has expressed an interest in an application affecting your neighborhood.

During its public hearing, the board or commission may postpone or continue an application's hearing to a later date, or may evaluate the City staff's recommendation and public input forwarding its own recommendation to the City Council. If the board or commission announces a specific date and time for a postponement or continuation that is not later than 60 days from the announcement, no further notice is required.

During its public hearing, the City Council may grant or deny a zoning request, or rezone the land to a less intensive zoning than requested but in no case will it grant a more intensive zoning.

However, in order to allow for mixed use development, the Council may add the MIXED USE (MU) COMBINING DISTRICT to certain commercial districts. The MU Combining District simply allows residential uses in addition to those uses already allowed in the seven commercial zoning districts. As a result, the MU Combining District allows the combination of office, retail, commercial, and residential uses within a single development.

For additional information on the City of Austin's land development process, visit our website:

www.austintexas.gov

Just moving in to this house.

Written comments must be submitted to the board or commission (or the contact person listed on the notice) before or at a public hearing. Your comments should include the board or commission's name, the scheduled date of the public hearing, and the Case Number and the contact person listed on the notice.

Case Number: C14-2013-0020

Contact: Lee Heckman, 512-974-7604

Public Hearing: May 14, 2013, Planning Commission

May 23, 2013, City Council

Your Name (please print)

☐ I am in favor
☐ I object

405 West Live Oak

Your address(es) affected by this application

Signature

Daytime Telephone: 214 893 0135

5/29/13
Date

Comments:

I would like to know more about the development plans and mixed income (Fixed income?) housing.

I will support or not support at a later time

If you use this form to comment, it may be returned to:

City of Austin

Planning & Development Review Department

Lee Heckman

P. O. Box 1088

Austin, TX 78767-8810

From: Linda Yost

Sent: Friday, May 31, 2013 10:45 AM

To: Heckman, Lee

Cc: "Dave.Anderson\\""@austintexas.gov; Sheryl.Cole; Riley, Chris; Alfonso.Hernandez@austintexas.gov; Jean.Stevens@austintexas.gov; Danette.Chimenti@austintexas.gov; Jeff.Jack@austintexas.gov; James.Nortey@austintexas.gov; Stephen.Oliver@austintexas.gov; Brian.Roark@austintexas.gov; Myron.Smith@austintexas.gov; Lee.Lefingwell@austintexas.gov; Martinez, Mike [Council Member]; Tovo, Kathie; Spelman, William; Laura.Morrison@austin.gov; edonahue@kut.org

Subject: Coop efforts RE: Oak Creek Redevelopment, Case # C14-2013-0020

Good Morning,

I am gathering information to and from direct property-owner/neighbors to the Oak Creek Village zoning/planning proposal. Please find attached, my rather lengthy concerns. My apologies for being ill prepared at the Zoning Commission meeting on May 28th, who knew I would actually be heard. The 3 minute time restraint in fairness to all, is not enough.

In an attempt to be clear and concise, I hope you find the information helpful in your decision making process before the June 6th Planning Commission hearing starts at 2PM and will likely go to 10PM, there are over 70 issues to be heard.

Grateful,

Linda Yost

Property Owner on Fletcher/Wilson Street(s)

FYI provided by Lee Heckman, who works with Planning/Zoning Commission:

Video of May 28th Zoning hearings: <http://austintx.swagit.com/play/05282013-657> We were #11. The result were: To grant MF-6-CO district zoning with Conditions as Staff Recommended, with strong suggestion that Agreements between the Applicant and the Oak Creek Village Tenants' Association, and between the Applicant and Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association, be finalized prior to Third Reading (D. Chimenti, R. Hatfield – 2nd); 8-0, A. Hernandez – Absent.

Staff recommendation was: to grant MF-6-CO-NP with conditions.

Conditions to MF-6 district zoning recommendation are:

- 1) The maximum building height shall be limited to 60;
- 2) The maximum building coverage shall be limited to 60%;
- 3) The maximum impervious cover shall be limited to 70%;
- 4) The maximum number of units shall be limited to 486; and
- 5) Primary vehicular access to the site shall be from W Oltorf Street and/or S 1st Street.

A public restrictive covenant, executed in tandem with Council consideration of the ordinance, will incorporate the owner's responsibilities related to traffic improvements or design requirements as listed on the attached, or subsequent, TIA memo (see Exhibit T). Additionally, the owner is required to post fiscal surety and meet other requirements prior to Council consideration and/or adoption of a zoning ordinance.

Date: 5/31/2013

To: Whom it may concern

From: Linda Yost
218 Fletcher Street
Austin, Texas 78704

Note: my property is on the corner of Wilson and Fletcher, directly across from Oak Creek Village
Subject: Zoning/Planning of Oak Creek Village Case C14-2013-0020

I was afforded a surprise opportunity to speak at last night's Austin Zoning Commission regarding Oak Creek Village Apartments redevelopment for Owner, Rene Campos taking place at 2324 Wilson Street, Austin, 78704 (Case # C14-2013-0020).

I have been in contact with Lee Heckman, a Staff Member of the Planning and Development Review Department and have been cc'd on E-mails regarding my going concerns to Bouldin Creek Neighborhood Association (BCNA) board members, developers of the project, as well as John Donisi and Steven Rye of Winstead, the Developers who represent the owners of the nearly 9 acres, Eureka out of Dallas, Texas.

Over the past 18 months, I have lodged concerns and complaints to the Oak Creek Village Apartment Management Company at (512) 444-3581 and the City of Austin Police Department (APD). I found the management to be unresponsive to my calls and messages. At one time I was working with Rita Guerrero who lived on site and was seeing some progress. She was later replaced by Cindy who was newly hired in March 2013 and had only one call returned letting me know she would be responsive but was not.

APD has proven to be absolutely ineffective. My latest example in the early hours of Sunday, 5/26/2013 is a good example. As I called "311" and was referred to APD for what I described as an ongoing roving party through-out the complex, two cars pulled up and parked in the no parking/tow zone on the west side of Wilson street in front of 2308 Wilson. Two males leapt from their cars, yelling, swearing at each other and slapping/hitting each other. The dispatcher soon said APD was on scene. I advised I did not see an officer, but that the two men and one woman were getting into their cars and leaving. That's when I noticed that the APD Officer had approached from the west on foot and evidently told everyone to leave. No ticket was issued and certainly there was no "field identification" of the participants. This "Police contact" cannot be considered effective in that no information was gathered and there was no consequence. This also applies for any past noise complaints, the ongoing illegal parking in the no parking tow away zones and in regards to any fights. Somehow, arriving with flashing lights has been accepted as "defusing the situation". Clearly the message sent is no big deal; no surprise the behaviors have not changed. In addition, my calls/messages to the narcotics unit regarding the illegally parked cars and hand-to-hand drug transactions were not returned. Weds and Thurs nights seem to be the week-end buy days.

Simply put, there are a few bad apples ruining the neighborhood experience for all. The Oak Creek residents are intimidated, even afraid to report issues to the management and or the police. Most of the homes on Forest Ave. that back up to Wilson have their living space on Forest and do not hear or see most of the activity we see. The homes that back into the complex on the north end, on Live Oak for the

most part, butt up against the parking lot. On the South end, homes are separated by another parking lot. To the west, the creek separates the homes and businesses on that side of the complex.

I am an active "dues paying member" of BCNA. I was aghast that a "BCNA vote" taken at the last BCNA meeting on May 20th at St. Ignatius Church included a majority of un-named, un-identified voting mass. Some in attendance claiming to represent the Oak Creek residents are not residents of Bouldin Creek. In previous meetings, BCNA members are identified (named) as current members prior to casting votes in BCNA meetings. There was no indication on the flier distributed by BCNA that there would be issues that would require a vote, it merely stated ..."join us in a discussion of the zoning applications..."

I would consider myself "neutral" on the project as I have both "pro" and "con" thoughts and ideas. I am PRO the redo for the existing low income (173 apartments), Austin needs it with "158 people moving here every day" (according to Realty Austin in 2013). An onsite manager, the tenant association representing ALL residents in the complex and true oversight by APD can maintain stability and order. A question was asked by a Commissioner last night asking "are the units segregated". Several answers skirted the issue, YES THEY WILL BE SEGREGATED from the "market rate" apartments; not mixed. There was concern expressed by the current residents that this plan may exasperate the "us versus them" concept. I am a proponent that mixing it up would be best, and likely unreasonable financially. I too worry that they may be "managed/treated" differently.

I was one of the initial BCNA members backing the addition of Speed Bumps on Wilson (to slow traffic that is amazingly too fast in a 1 ½ block from the intersection of Oltorf and Live Oak) and additional sidewalks. After learning how much sidewalks cost, it is prohibitive and a waste of the City and developers money. Wilson has an existing sidewalk running south to Oltorf and North to Live Oak. The Live Oak and Oltorf sidewalk runs east and west to 1st Street and South Congress. My street, Fletcher ostensibly butts into Wilson to the west and Euclid Ave to the east. This short street has a mere six homes that face Fletcher. For all of those "worried of a few children that opt to access Fletcher" might consider that the children could just as easily utilize the existing sidewalks. I moved to South Congress (78704) aka SoCo, BECAUSE of its "walkability and charm of the old neighborhood". If I wanted the urban concrete, party atmosphere, I would live downtown. NUMEROUS short streets between the main streets of South Congress Ave and 1st Streets have no sidewalks—why? This is money better served elsewhere for the masses not the few. The BCNA President informed me that the thought was to have the sidewalk on the North side of Fletcher (my landscaped front yard) for 3 houses then cross to Forest Ave (note that misses TWO of the Bouldin Creek Board Members homes)---odd zig-zag design for a sidewalk to go ½ of a ½ block and for what purpose?

All in all, my property value has been impaired by the deteriorating conditions at Oak Creek, and will continue until the project completion. The physical building is in disrepair and is tired. The physical appeal is further depressed by: laundry hanging over fences surrounding the patios, windows that are broken, have cardboard in them or colored sheets, litter up and down the streets (although picked up daily on their site via a paid crew), cars illegally parked on Wilson blasting music, people working on their cars on the street creating traffic hazards with cars on ramps or open doors into traffic, residents and their visitors consuming most of the on-street parking along both Wilson and Fletcher streets while the 330 current parking spaces inside of the complex (ample parking) is not utilized. These conditions are not being addressed now and if not now, when? This would not be tolerated at any apartment complex and fines assessed by any Home Owners Assoc. (HOA). I do not know of anyone else receiving 18 million Federal AND 2 million City to "update their buildings". This deal is a total win for the owner.

The upcoming project will likely take five years from start to finish. That is a huge amount of construction traffic that will enter where? The answer is Wilson! Imagine large-slow moving trucks going in and out of the not yet constructed Durwood/Oltorf Street. NOTE that the 1st street break-through from the complex will NOT be completed until the "market rate" apartments are completed. It is hard for me to believe that any more traffic could be dumped onto 1st Street. The large complex under construction on South 1st, near Ben White will add more as well. I suggest that you try to get onto 1st between 7am-9am Monday through Friday now, not easy now. Not sure if that is included in "our" Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) report.

We cannot provide Eureka a 20 million dollar funding for the project and hope for the best. Unlike some who use the phrase "hold their feet to the fire and hold them accountable"; you really cannot AFTER THE FACT. I would point to a recently shared article about Eureka/Mr. Campos right out of their headquartered town of Dallas, Texas.

These are a list of my latest concerns that I believe the Zoning, Planning, Funding, and City Council Member should be aware of PRIOR to singing off on what looks good on paper. I would close with an article found by a neighbor about an eerily similar offer from Eureka that is not going well. I believe in looking at what people do; not what they say. Should Mr. Campos (Eureka) and Jon Donini (Winstead) finalize the project as presented, I would gleefully support the City Council endorsing any future affordable housing project they may desire.

<http://katysexposure.wordpress.com/2010/03/14/stimulus-funds-flow-to-troubled-oak-cliff-apartment-complex-ridgecrest-terrace-rene-campos-jr-eureka-holdings/>

Stimulus funds flow to troubled Oak Cliff apartment complex – Ridgecrest Terrace – Rene Campos Jr – Eureka Holdings
<http://katysexposure.wordpress.com/2010/03/14/stimulus-funds-flow-to-troubled-oak-cliff-apartment-complex-ridgecrest-terrace-rene-campos-jr-eureka-holdings/>

March 13, 2010

By STEVE MCGONIGLE – The Dallas Morning News

Ridgecrest Terrace, a sprawling, low-income apartment complex in west Oak Cliff, has an infamous history as a crime-infested blight on a hillside.

Drug dealers once lined its streets like carnival barkers. Gunfire and assaults were a constant. Housing code inspectors came with police escorts, if they came at all. Twice, the city of Dallas sued to have Ridgecrest declared a public nuisance and closed.

Yet federal housing officials have kept the money flowing. Last year, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development sent the owner \$1.5 million in stimulus funds – the largest allocation to any subsidized housing project in Dallas County.

HUD has funneled millions in rent subsidies to Ridgecrest's owner despite multiple failed inspections, repeated late filing of spending reports and a city lawsuit alleging dangerous living conditions such as sewage spills, exposed wiring and rotting floors.

Rene Campos Jr., president of the Dallas investment company that owns Ridgecrest, insisted it has made considerable improvements since it bought the complex in 2004. Accusations that Ridgecrest remains a decaying slum are untrue and stem from a bitter feud with police, he said.

"I'm actually very pleased with what we've done here," Campos said.

The stimulus award went to Ridgecrest, and other HUD landlords nationally, to cover a shortfall in federal rental assistance.

But U.S. Rep. Kenny Marchant, R-Coppell, said the public should be furious that HUD gave stimulus funds to Ridgecrest without more rigorous scrutiny.

"It's just a prime example of government waste and lack of oversight and throwing money at a problem without knowing anything about the situation," said Marchant, a member of the House subcommittee that oversees HUD.

The grant to Ridgecrest was one small piece of the \$787 billion federal stimulus plan, which was intended to save jobs and spur economic recovery. The initiative has come under relentless attacks by critics who allege fraud and waste.

Beyond that, the award also raises questions about the quality of HUD's enforcement effort. The agency has paid almost \$12 million in rent subsidies to Ridgecrest's owner despite repeated incidents of potential contract violations.

Jerry Brown, a HUD spokesman in Washington, said the stimulus award to Ridgecrest and 6,300 other subsidized properties fulfilled a contractual obligation, and was meant to preserve housing for low-income tenants during the economic downturn.

"We were trying to take the worry out of it for the families," he said.

While he conceded that HUD's enforcement effort at Ridgecrest could have been better, Brown deflected questions about whether the stimulus award was a mistake.

HUD, the spokesman said, must weigh the country's need to retain a limited stock of low-income housing against the requirement that conditions be livable.

"It's a delicate balance," he said. "It's not always going to be the perfect solution."

'Absolutely horrible'

The stimulus award to Ridgecrest was part of \$2 billion Congress appropriated last year to ensure HUD landlords received a full 12 months of rent subsidy payments. Fourteen projects in Dallas County benefited.

Ridgecrest was set to run out of such payments in April 2009. The stimulus award was calculated to cover the final seven months of the fiscal year.

The subsidy program allows residents to cap their rent payment at 30 percent of their income. HUD pays the landlord the remainder of the fair market rental rate.

The agency requires landlords to maintain their property in a "safe, decent and sanitary" condition.

Even if standards are not met, HUD is slow to cut off funding because residents could lose their housing. The number of subsidized apartments around the country has been declining for years. More than 2,000 have been lost in Dallas County over the past decade, according to HUD.

The stimulus law required recipients to file quarterly spending reports, but a landlord lobbying group later persuaded the government to waive the transparency rule because the money was the equivalent of a regular subsidy payment.

Ridgecrest Terrace, which has 246 subsidized apartments, collects approximately \$210,000 each month from HUD, or just over \$850 per unit.

The complex occupies 16 rolling acres along the 500 block of South Walton Walker Boulevard. Mountain Creek Lake is about a mile to the west.

Built in 1969, Ridgecrest is described as garden apartments. Its lawns are broad, but landscaping is sparse. The drab gray exterior gives the 19 buildings an institutional look. One resident derisively dubbed it “the projects.”

Whether the stimulus award to Ridgecrest has improved living conditions is in debate. Some residents contended they have seen little change. “They ain’t done nothing with it,” Ruby Fannin said.

A resident for four years, Fannin pointed out rust-colored streaks on her bathroom wall from a water leak. She also noted the absence of outside security lights that she said would make her feel safe about leaving her apartment.

A neighbor, Priscilla Henderson, showed a reporter mismatched splotches of white paint around the air vents in her apartment. Maintenance staff had spray painted over mold or mildew that was growing from the vents in long strands, she said.

Her carpeting is so filthy, Henderson said, it gives her small children rashes and turns bare feet to black. The manager told her she will have to pay for cleaning, she said. “I’m glad I’m paying \$25 [a month for rent] because that’s all it’s worth,” she said.

Shannon Behan, who has been doing outreach work at Ridgecrest for two years on behalf of a nearby church, called conditions at the complex “absolutely horrible.”

The management, he said, is slow to fix appliances or problems with the heating and air conditioning systems. Residents complain they have trouble sleeping because of constant noise from gunshots and drug activity around their units, he said.

“We can walk around the back side of the apartments, and you will see the needles and the condoms and the baggies [for drugs] just laying on the ground everywhere,” he said. “And these children actually live in these conditions.”

Owner Campos said he has invested heavily in renovating Ridgecrest. “Our mantra is we provide clean, safe, affordable housing for people,” he said.

Crime problem

Campos, a Harvard-educated investor, made a fortune in the 1990s buying, rehabilitating and reselling distressed private apartment properties around Texas.

He and his two former business partners were known in Dallas real estate circles as “the Hartex Boys,” after their property company’s name.

Campos, 46, lives in a \$1 million home in University Park. He owns a \$4 million vacation property in Hawaii. He plays polo, rides a custom motorcycle and drives a Land Rover.

He said his current business holdings consist of 11 fully and two partially subsidized apartment complexes in Texas and Louisiana with an appraised value topping \$45 million.

Eureka Holdings, Campos’ principal enterprise, owns a \$4 million office plaza near the Dallas medical district where its headquarters is located.

Campos formerly co-owned boutique hotels in University Park and downtown Dallas. Eureka spent more than \$32 million to buy and remodel them.

In 2003 Eureka was hired to manage another federally subsidized apartment complex in Oak Cliff called Mesa Ridge.

The relationship ended after the owner was sued by the city in 2006 for multiple code violations and filed for bankruptcy.

Campos said he bought Ridgecrest out of an unanticipated need to protect his investment in an adjacent apartment complex, Mountain View.

Crime in the area was so bad, Campos said, that he decided to apply a formula that had worked in rehabilitating other problem properties: a combination of capital improvements and the aggressive use of court-ordered evictions.

Campos conceded that his plan for Ridgecrest did not go smoothly.

The property was in “very poor” condition, he said, and the crime problem made major repair work unsafe. The quick evictions he had used on his private properties were almost impossible under HUD rules.

Campos said the city of Dallas, which had welcomed his purchase of Ridgecrest, was understanding for the first couple of years. Then, he said, a rift developed.

Police ‘vendetta’

Off-duty police officers that Campos said he had hired to provide security were monitoring drug dealers rather than arresting them. So Campos told the dealers that they were going to be evicted, he said, and they left.

Police, he said, were furious that he had ruined their investigations. As revenge, he said, police complained to HUD and the city attorney's office about substandard living conditions at Ridgecrest.

He provided The Dallas Morning News with e-mail messages from police Lt. Kimberly Stratman urging his brother, David Campos, not to disturb any ongoing investigations and reporting that a recent undercover operation produced "dismal" results.

"It appears that many of the identified, targeted dealers moved out or left during the investigation," Stratman wrote on Sept. 11, 2006. "It was very odd."

Stratman, whom Campos identified as the architect of a "vendetta" against him, said her complaints about conditions at Ridgecrest were made to protect her officers and the complex's residents. She also maintained that she had not acted unilaterally.

"I was in a partnership with the west Oak Cliff community prosecutor," she said. "We were both aware of multiple code violations at the property and the related crime and quality-of-life issues."

Stratman said she and Assistant City Attorney Whitney Sanderlin met with several HUD representatives in August 2007. Both said they could not understand how a complex with raw sewage spills could repeatedly pass HUD inspection.

Federal officials offered little in the way of an explanation, Stratman said. "I don't understand that myself," she said.

Subsidized housing supervisors in the Fort Worth regional HUD office did not respond to interview requests from The News. Their superiors at HUD's national office in Washington declined to be interviewed, agency spokesman Brown said.

The visit from city officials did prompt HUD to order a special inspection of Ridgecrest in October 2007. The complex received a score of 45 out of a possible 100 points. Sixty is considered the minimum passing score.

It was at least the fourth time in six years that Ridgecrest had failed an inspection, and the second time since Campos took control of the property.

Campos appealed the results to Washington. After reviewing documents from Campos showing that repairs had been made or were under way, HUD officials increased the score to a passing 68, according to records released under a Freedom of Information Act request.

Dallas officials had a more alarming view of Ridgecrest's condition.

On May 8, 2008, the city filed suit against Ridgecrest, citing more than two dozen categories of code violations and seeking an injunction to compel repairs.

The alleged violations included water leaks, sewage spills, deficient air conditioning and heating, holes in walls, broken windows, no hot water, lack of security devices and smoke alarms, rotting sub-floors, and malfunctioning toilets.

Between January 2005 and May 2008, inspectors recorded 169 code complaints about Ridgecrest and issued 92 notices of violations, city records showed.

Assistant city attorney Sanderlin said the lawsuit was filed after she showed Campos pictures of alleged violations and tried for several months to negotiate a repair agreement.

She said she also notified Trini Rodriguez, the HUD official who monitored Ridgecrest, of the lawsuit. She said she was unaware of any HUD response.

Campos said his talks with Rodriguez gave him the impression the HUD supervisor shared his suspicions about the city's allegations against Ridgecrest.

"He was apologetic," Campos said. "He didn't like the smell of this."

Rodriguez did not respond to interview requests made to HUD.

Blue tarps

Campos said the first he heard of code problems at Ridgecrest came when Sanderlin pressured him to sign a repair agreement without a list of specific violations.

Four months after the city sued his company, Campos filed a counterclaim accusing the city of violating his civil rights.

The suit was pending for 18 months. During that time, several buildings at Ridgecrest were draped in blue tarps to cover holes in the roof. One building caught fire because of an electrical problem and was uninhabitable for more than a year.

Chris Bowers, the first assistant city attorney, said Campos blamed the repair delays on reluctant insurance carriers and his lack of financial resources.

"There were more problems with this complex than most that we file suit on, and the owners were more resistant to dealing with the problems than most," Bowers said.

While acknowledging there had been missteps, Campos said he was committed to complying with the terms of his HUD contract as well as his personal standards.

Campos said his company has paid for more than \$1 million in capital improvements to Ridgecrest and spent the rest of the subsidy money on bills and maintenance. Eureka has not turned a profit on the property, he said.

Eureka would not release Ridgecrest's financial records to The News . HUD denied a public records request. Both cited proprietary information.

Some work is visible at the complex. There are sections of newly repaved sidewalks. Excavations for plumbing or drainage work have been made. The blue tarps are gone, and the fire-damaged building has eight freshly remodeled apartments.

Some of that repair work came on the heels of a HUD inspection in January 2009 that assessed Ridgecrest a failing score of 47. The score was raised to a barely passing mark of 62 on March 5, 2009, after another appeal to HUD in Washington.

HUD awarded Ridgecrest its first stimulus payment of \$862,184 on March 16. The second installment, totaling \$651,644 was disbursed on July 13, HUD said.

In August, Eureka agreed to pay HUD a \$3,000 fine for failing to file three consecutive years of audited financial statements on time. Campos blamed the lapses on inattentiveness by his accountants.

Brown, the deputy assistant HUD secretary for public affairs, said additional enforcement proceedings against Ridgecrest remain an option.

"We can and will do more to force management to improve the complex and be more responsive to the needs of its tenants," he wrote in an e-mail.

In November, Eureka and the city settled their lawsuit, with the company agreeing to make requested repairs without either side admitting fault.

Campos said the lengthy conflict with the city has made him question whether he should keep Ridgecrest in his portfolio.

"This isn't an asset we'd want to own long term," he said.

Grateful,
Linda Yost
218 Fletcher Street
Austin, Texas 78704