



City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Minutes - Final

Legislative Hearings

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer
Mai Vang, Hearing Coordinator
Joanna Zimny, Executive Assistant
legislativehearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us
651-266-8585

Tuesday, July 19, 2022

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

5 [SR 22-129](#)

Review Request of Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 859 GALTIER STREET adopted by Council on June 22, 2022 under File RLH AR 22-48. (File No. J2222A, Assessment No. 228524)

Sponsors: Thao

Delete the assessment.

Tyler Moo, Interpreter, appeared

Ka Nyit, owner, appeared

Toe Toe, owner, appeared

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: Summary Abatement Order was issued December 20, 2021 to remove mattresses and debris from driveway of property. Total assessment of \$506. Summary Abatement Order issued to occupant and owner. Compliance date was December 27, 2021. January 4, 2022 an extension was given, and it was rechecked January 10, January 12, and January 31 before we sent a work order. Work was done February 3, 2022. No mail returned. Mail was sent to owner and occupant.

Moermond: who asked for the extension? Did someone call?

Martin: I assume someone contacted us because it is noted in the file. It was rechecked several times.

Toe: we called for the extension.

Moermond: why are you appealing?

Nyit: we received a bill but we don't understand why because we didn't get a call about it and we threw the stuff away ourselves.

Moermond: you didn't get a call about it?

Nyit: we got a bill we didn't understand and called the number on the bill asking what it was for.

Moermond: so back in December an order was issued to deal with the mattress and frame. Since it wasn't done we have the bill now. This is the charge for picking it up the end of February.

Nyit: when did the City pick it up?

Moermond: February 3, 2022.

Nyit: I spoke the truth. I threw it away myself.

Moermond: you wanted to do that. Did you call the City for an extension because you wanted to do it on your own? But you didn't do it fast enough. That's how it looks, can you confirm that?

Nyit: when I got this statement, I called. I didn't get any letter before. Then the City gave an extension.

Moermond: the second page in the packet in front of you is the original orders that went to the owner and previous owners.

Nyit: we never got that. If we had received that, my daughter would have read it for me.

Moermond: how old is your daughter?

Nyit: 14. We didn't receive a letter.

Moermond: and two letters went to the house, one addressed to you and one to the occupant.

Nyit: we didn't get any letter like that.

Moermond: it is confusing because it looks like someone called to ask for an extension to deal with the mattress. Are you saying you didn't ask for an extension?

Nyit: we didn't receive the paper and we didn't call and ask for an extension. When we got this paper we called the City to ask about it.

Moermond: I understand. A lot of people may ignore and not see it until they get a bill. Then it becomes something they want to deal with. It is my job to sort out what happened with correspondence before the bill was sent. If the owners were to get a Summary Abatement Order again Ms. Martin, would they call the 266-8989 number and ask for an interpreter?

Martin: yes.

Moermond: when did you buy the property?

Nyit: June 2020.

Moermond: I don't know if there was a problem with the mail. 2 letters were sent, so it is less likely, but maybe it was a problem of it getting lost. It isn't clear. What is clear is that you haven't had any problems since you bought the house. I'm concerned that your daughter is a minor and has the responsibility of interpreting the mail. That is a big responsibility when her knowledge as a 14 year old doesn't necessarily cover

something as bureaucratic as this is.

Nyit: we don't speak any English, but she understands the bills that come.

Moermond: right now the once concern I have is there isn't a note that says the owner specifically contacted the City asking for one. It simply says the inspector gave one.

Martin: usually it is a request, but if they forgot to note that then it isn't in the record.

Mai Vang: I did ask the inspector. I reached out to Otis Warner and Richard Kedrowski. They said the extensions granted were not at the request of the property owner but were after messages were left for the owner to allow for response. This occurred over Christmas and New Year's so Inspector Warner wanted to make sure there was adequate time for compliance.

Moermond: so he called and left messages for you about it, but he didn't hear back. I wish that we knew the right number was called and we had a conversation, but the documentation is thin on that. I want to encourage you to reach out to the City in the future if you get orders like this. If you promise you'll do that, let them know you need an interpreter, I'll delete this assessment because of the language difficulties and the communication and back and forth.

Received and Filed