

Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)

From: Reinsberg, Gary (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2015 3:32 PM
To: Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: 1982 Hawthorne

Hello Marcia,

I will try to do my best to explain what has happen or what may have happened here.

1. Yes, I did inspect a dryer duct and approved it. I was only there to inspect a dryer duct. Was the flex duct connector there at the time? I don't know. It is very possible. When inspecting something I can only look at that particular item that is stated on the permit. If I do notice something and if it is a life safety issue. Then and only then, I am obligated to make the unsafe conditioned known to the property owner/ occupant and contractor and have them fix what is wrong.
2. Yes, I did inspect an installation of a new furnace and approved it. Again what I stated above is the same here. I can only look at the installation of the furnace. The approval card was filled out by Maureen Hanson gas mechanical inspector in which at that time shared the same inspection area. I typically sign the card and leave notes. In this cases it could have been that I was onsite before Maureen and I didn't have card to fill out and she filled it out after me. I am not sure.

If the flex duct was there when did do the inspection I have no legal authority to have them correct it. The flex duct connector was not installed under permit and the installation was not legal as per code wise. Flex duct connectors can only be installed in lengths of 14 feet or less. It must be support by 2 inch wide metal straps and 5 feet intervals. When attaching the connector to the duct or fittings draw bands are required along with duct tape. This product is very specific on the installation requirements. The product has been tested and listed for a use and how it must be installed. UL is the testing agency and they have a test standards UL181 for the duct sealing and attachments. Also this product cannot be installed in locations where it can be subjected to tears and punctures. This installation is hanging below the floor joist where it can easily be damaged. NOTE: I did show Mr. Veit that this product did already have a slight tear and it should have a piece of duct tape applied to stop it from tearing more. I am not sure you or if Mr. Veit are aware but the back porch was removed and new additions was built without the permits and the city records do not reflect what has been done. I would assume and only assume that is when the duct could have been installed and no inspections had been done to certify the installation of such work.

It is my opinion that this is not a life safety issue but the installation is a code violation. Fire inspector Laura H. was only doing her job by calling out a code correction and not knowing at the time if the proper permits where obtain for such work. I would strongly advised that Mr. Veit get a Licensed heating contractor to make such repairs to ensure a proper operating system.

Again If I would have noticed this non-compliant installation and it was under permit I would not have approved it.

I do think Mr. Veit was led to believe that this property was in compliance with all codes especially the addition. It is unfortunate that he is stuck with this problem and that is why we have code and inspections. Please feel free to contact me if you have more questions.

Thank you!

 **Gary Reinsberg**
Senior Mechanical Inspector-Sheet Metal

Department of Safety & Inspections
375 Jackson Street
Saint Paul, MN 55101
P: 651-266-9064
F: 651-266-9099
gary.reinsberg@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Making Saint Paul the Most Livable City in America

From: Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 9:22 PM
To: Ubl, Stephen (CI-StPaul); Reinsberg, Gary (CI-StPaul)
Subject: 1982 Hawthorne

Good Morning Guys, I heard this case last Tuesday and meant to talk to you sooner, but I go swamped, So, here's the issue, we have these items mentioned in Fire Orders from July 16, 2015:

#4. Interior - Duct Work on Addition - UMC 1002 - Repair, replace or install duct work in compliance with the mechanical code per 603.6.2.1 Connector Length. Flexible air connectors shall be limited in length to 14 feet. The work will require a licensed contractor and permits. Contact DSI at 651-266-8989 to obtain permits.-Flexible duct work installed improperly for addition.

And

#5. Interior - Furnace Condensate Line Leak - UMC 1005 - Repair, maintain or install proper insulation and duct sealant in compliance with the mechanical code. This work may require a permit(s). Call DSI at (651) 266-8989.-The sealant used on the condensate line for the furnace has released and is dripping condensate onto the furnace just above the control board, repair this

I was inclined to grant the appeal -- if there were no red flags for you. Please look this over and let me know what you think. Note, in the hearing I didn't have the benefit of knowing what was going on with the ductwork and other mechanicals.

Thanks for taking a look at this. Let me know what you think.

~Marcia

Legislative Hearing Notes 8/4/15:

David and Karen Veit, owners, appeared.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

-Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice by Fire Inspector Laura Huseby

-items #4 & #5 are being appealed - about a flexible duct that was allegedly improperly installed for an addition out back

-condensation is dripping onto the furnace

-challenge: the Veit's had a furnace and warm air ventilation permit pulled in Apr 2014 for the installation of this furnace; everything was finalized and approved by the mechanical inspector, in addition to the plumbing inspector

-the work did not look right to Fire Inspector Huseby; she brought another mechanical inspector, James Lichtblau, to look at it with her at the time of inspection;

he determined that the installation was improper

-Inspector Huseby also spoke with the Sr. mechanical inspector, Gary Reinsberg, who actually finalized the permit; he, too, said that it was not properly installed;

-Maureen Hanson was the inspector who finalized everything

-the only conclusion that they can come up with is that the vent work was installed after the furnace had been put into place because it shouldn't have passed inspection the way that it was

-a building warning was put into the computer by Inspector Lichtblau - to the best of his knowledge, the duct work was installed to an addition without the permit

-the Appellants say that it was there and finalized; the inspectors say that they would not have finalized it that way

Mr. Veit:

-the duct work was there in 2006 when he purchased the house

-the city inspected it; there was one fire inspection; have had CO inspections; Tom Henning with Henning & Co went out to look at it; he said it was fine and another contractor who said that he's using the same application in a house in Stillwater; he said to call Inspector Randy, city of St. Paul

-it was there when he bought it; Tom said that if there were problems with it, they should have said something when they put in the furnace in 2014

-he had photos of what it looks like

Mr. Neis:

-it's not in his expertise; he'd revert back to the mechanical inspectors

-the addition was there, too, when the Veit's purchased the property

-no permit for this addition

-the house whole house re-roofed in 2003

-Ms. Huseby looked at the file and noticed mention of a rear porch in 2001, which is now gone and this addition was added

-can assume this addition was put on some time between 2001 and 2006

-recommends that Inspector Gary Reinsberg or the building official go out and look at it

-flexible ducting can only be used up to 14 feet

Mr. Veit:

-all that this venting does is carry cold air into the furnace and hot air out of the furnace; no CO - just moving air to and from the furnace

-the dripping condensation has been taken care of

-Tom Henning told him that if he were forced to make this change, it would cost \$2200

-he spent \$3200 on the furnace last year

-this isn't a major issue

Ms. Moermond:

-tends to agree with the Veits

-she wants to send an email to the building official who's out until next week and also to Gary Reinsberg; wants to send them the photos and have them discuss this; wants to ask them how it happened that this was finalized and approved if this is a problem

-she doesn't think that this is a problem; she just needs an answer back from them

Mr. Neis:

-re-inspection date Aug 14; if the Veit's would like to keep it on Aug 14, he will encourage Ms. Huseby to do her best to get Inspectors Ubl and Reinsberg out there with her; there will be no additional fees

-if Ms. Huseby can't get Ubl or Reinsberg out then, we could set it up for a different time

Ms. Moermond:

Legislative Hearing Officer is leaning towards granting the appeal; however, she would like to have the building official and the mechanical inspector look at the flexible duct work (Item #4).