Dornfeld, Matt (CI-StPaul)

From:

Magner, Steve (CI-StPaul)

Sent:

Monday, August 20, 2018 8:59 AM

To:

Dornfeld, Matt (CI-StPaul)

Subject:

FW: 134 Elizabeth - Retaining Wall

???????



Steve Magner

Code Enforcement Manager Department of Safety and Inspections 375 Jackson St Suite 220 Saint Paul, MN 55101 P: 651-266-1928 F: 651-266-1919

The Most Livable City in America

From: Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)

Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 10:11 AM

To: Ubl, Stephen (CI-StPaul) <stephen.ubl@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; Seeger, Jim (CI-StPaul) <jim.seeger@ci.stpaul.mn.us> Cc: Magner, Steve (CI-StPaul) <steve.magner@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; Soley, Reid (CI-StPaul) <reid.soley@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: FW: 134 Elizabeth - Retaining Wall

Hi Guys,

My recommendation on the appealed vacate order for this property is denial. If the Council goes with that next week at the public hearing, this would become a Cat 2 and need a code compliance inspection report. The information from Brian Karpen below may need to be captured in that report.

Thank you, Marcia

From: Shaff, Leanna (CI-StPaul)

Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 10:54 AM

To: Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul) < marcia.moermond@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: FW: 134 Elizabeth - Retaining Wall

I think this could be an added requirement in the code compliance inspection?

From: Karpen, Brian (CI-StPaul)

Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 8:37 AM

To: Schmidt, Brian (CI-StPaul) <bri>hrian.schmidt@ci.stpaul.mn.us> Cc: Shaff, Leanna (CI-StPaul) < leanna.shaff@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Subject: 134 Elizabeth - Retaining Wall

Brian:

I was able to get out to 134 Elizabeth and take a look at the retaining wall in the rear yard yesterday afternoon. A large portion of the wall appears to be in acceptable shape, does not show any signs of excessive deflection, etc. There is also evidence that the wall was "stabilized" at some point with tie backs into the upper slope. Due to the coating that has been applied over some of the wall it is difficult to determine the overall condition of the wall, though in some areas there are signs of distress, cracking in the coating, and possible deterioration of the underlying masonry. There are two areas of concern that are evident with a visual inspection of the wall.

- 1) Closest to the primary structure at the base, under the stairs and attached deck there is masonry that is exposed and appears to be deteriorating. This creates the possibility of undermining of the wall through water infiltration and can be exasperated by freeze/thaw cycles.
- 2) Further from the primary structure adjacent to the area mentioned in item one the wall coating is cracked and the wall shows signs of some deflection (though not overall rotation of the wall). This may be damage caused by further progression of the deterioration evident in item one or may be caused by some interaction with the mature tree directly above the wall.

In both cases there does not appear to be any immediate danger of collapse. However, due to the proximity of structures both above and below the wall, as well as the danger of continued deterioration of the wall, an assessment and repair plan should be put in place. Due to site constraints, as well as the height of the wall, this assessment should be performed by an engineer registered in the State of Minnesota, and plans developed for repair should also be provided by an engineer registered in the State of Minnesota. All work performed should be done under a building permit issued by DSI.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need further clarification.



Brian Karpen, PE (MN)

Structural Engineer

Department of Safety and Inspections
375 Jackson Street, Suite 220

Saint Paul, MN 55102

P: 651-266-9072
F: 651-266-9124

brian.karpen@ci.stpaul.mn.us

The Most Livable

Making Saint Paul the Most Livable City in America