



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, June 23, 2026

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Remove/Repair Orders

- 1 [RLH RR 26-13](#) Second Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 947 FREMONT AVENUE in Council File RLH RR 25-34.

Sponsors: Johnson

Grant of additional 180 days pending recommendation; PO to submit updated work plan, financing and affidavit if necessary. Forfeit \$5,000 of \$15,000 PD posted, and then forfeit an additional \$2,500 each month (beginning in August) until project is complete and/or funds exhausted. (CPH July 8)

Jay Mitchell, contractor, appeared via phone

Staff update by Supervisor James Hoffman: lots of permits, all pulled within the last month. That's the only update I have.

Moermond: do we have any sort of progress inspection?

Hoffman: based on Clint Zane he hasn't been out there since May 18th. Nothing was done then.

Moermond: what is going on, Mr. Mitchell?

Mitchell: we at one point thought about turning this into a multiunit, but with the new system it took longer than we felt we had, so we changed directions and went back to a single-family home. During the winter we started to get ready and then operation metro surge broke us up because some of crews were affected. The CMU wall had collapsed so we couldn't do that in the winter. Clint will be here around 11 today to inspect that, then hopefully we can turn the burners on. We couldn't have electrical done or anything with a foundation wall collapsing.

With the timing of Paulie being introduced it had some delays. Before you could come in and submit things and walk through at the front desk. It just wasn't working, everyone was still learning.

Moermond: what's the plan on getting this done? You have \$15,000 on the line. Nothing

is done. It looks like you're losing some money today.

Mitchell: hopefully it will pass inspection today and we can go full blown on it since the foundation wall is fixed.

Moermond: we have zero progress. A collapsed wall that is hopefully fixed. Permits pulled but no progress. I have \$15,000 in Performance Deposit and a significant lack of performance. Let's see how it goes with Clint today. I think we're in the business of losing some money and posting more. I'd put together a plan to get that done quickly.

Mitchell: will do.

Referred to the City Council due back on 7/8/2026

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Making Finding on Nuisance Abatements

- 2 [RLH SAO 26-41](#) Second Making finding on the appealed nuisance abatement ordered for 399 BLAIR AVENUE in Council File RLH SAO 26-16. (July 7, 2026 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Bowie

Layover to LH Tuesday, July 7th at 11 am. If permit is issued, nuisance is abated, otherwise authorize DSI to take action to abate the nuisance.

*Mitch Hadler, attorney and friend of owner, appeared via phone
Nyar Pwo, owner, appeared via phone*

Moermond: we're following up on the June 1 deadline to have building permit pulled or construction materials removed. We squeaked out a little more time there.

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: still storage on the side of the garage. They were going to resubmit for the building permit and as of this time there is no permit.

Hadler: I uploaded the drawings today. They should be on there now. Bill just brought them to me yesterday. Everything was filled in except the drawings. I did all the work for Mr. Pwo on that.

Moermond: it was supposed to be done June 1.

Hadler: we've been waiting on the drawings. It is hard to get someone to draw things for an inexpensive rate. This was a retired journeyman who Mr. Pwo could afford. Hopefully the Department of Safety and Inspections likes it.

Moermond: I understand. In any event, you're benefiting from a mistake on our end. This should have had a Council Public Hearing tomorrow, but it was only referred back to my shop instead of theirs, as well. You benefit from that in that we can't put it on the Council agenda until July 8th.

Hadler: July 8th was the first day the Declaration of Independence was read publicly.

Moermond: let's take a look on July 7th and if we have the permit actually issued then

I won't recommend the Council authorize the Department of Safety and Inspections to clean things up. It is your job to work with the Department of Safety and Inspections to get things done.

Referred to the City Council due back on 7/8/2026

Staff Reports

- 3** [SR 26-127](#) Review Request for Appeal of Paris Getty to a Condemnation Unfit for Human Habitation and Order to Vacate and a Summary Abatement Order at 855 THIRD STREET EAST.
- Sponsors:** Johnson
- Grant additional extension to October 1, 2026.*
- Paris Getty, owner, appeared via phone*
- Moermond: you've made an extension request. We'll walk through where things are at since the last time we spoke and we'll see where we go from here. I understand you haven't been well and I'm very sorry to hear that.*
- Getty: I've had some pretty severe medical issues. I was in the hospital for over six weeks.*
- Martin: the inspector hasn't been back in due to the owner's hospitalization. There are some things done, some aren't. Opening staircase hasn't been done, open electrical still. We would be in favor of an extension.*
- Moermond: when was an inspector last in?*
- Martin: I'm not sure; I don't have that in front of me right now.*
- Getty: I spoke with him and he acknowledged I've done a lot of work. The staircase is open, I just need to penetrate the ceiling of the floor and put up the guard rails. Then the electrical I can probably have done in a week or two. Finances are an issue and then getting the wood. Would 3 months be too much? I'm in PT and OT rehab right now.*
- Moermond: what about October 1, does that sound ok?*
- Getty: that sounds perfect.*
- Received and Filed**

1:00 p.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate - Fire Certificate of Occupancy

- 4** [RLH VO 26-26](#) Appeal of Wyatt Partridge of Hellmuth & Johnson, Representing Brendon Smith, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice which includes Condemnation at 74 CONGRESS STREET WEST.

Sponsors: Noecker

Layover to LH July 21, 2026 at 1:30 pm for further discussion and update on sale of property.

Wyatt Partridge, attorney o/b/o owner Brendon Smith, appeared via phone
Michael Lundblad, Occupant, appeared via phone

Zimny: Mr. Lundblad, what is your relationship with the property.

Lundblad: a tenant and friend of Brendon, I've lived there about 20 years collectively.

[Zimny gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Keith Demarest: 74 Congress is a single-family home, recently the property owner had been listed as Thomas Smith. Over the last week Ramsey County ownership has updated to Wilmington Savings Fund Society. March 16, 2026 a complaint was received for this property stating the upper unit was being rented without a Certificate of Occupancy. Part of the complaint were tenants had been paying rent and trying to collect information for their taxes. March 2026 I followed up by contacting utilities. A Mailing address for St. Paul Regional Water Services show billing to Brendon Smith at 74 congress. Last payment to water was in 2024, with bills being certified tot axes. The property owner at that time, Thomas smith, doesn't live at the site. March 16, 2026 initial report to property owner and the property explained the need for the Certificate of Occupancy as the owner doesn't live there. No response. April 15, 2026 second notice sent to property owner and occupant stating the need for the Certificate of Occupancy. No response. June 15, 2026 third notice sent regarding need for Certificate of Occupancy along with the house being placarded as condemned with a 10 day vacate notice. June 17 2026 the attorney for the property owner reached out about an appeal.

Zimny: what was the condemnation based on?

Demarest: "structure unfit for occupancy. Shall be vacated by June 25th. Reinspection June 26 at 10 am." We call this 30-6-90 day project, where the property owner doesn't live on site. We are regimented on how we handle these with proper and lengthy notice. At the 90 day mark the structure is found to viewed as "unfit" since the owner is not onsite and we don't know conditions.

Zimny: theoretically you could have called it out for illegal occupancy.

Demarest: correct.

Zimny: but you didn't do that. Ok. Mr. Partridge I read through all your submitted paperwork and feel like I have a pretty good sense of what is going on, but why don't you speak first and tell me more.

Partridge: my office was originally contacted by Brandon Smith the occupant and owner of the property for an unrelated project. He wanted to get SSI benefits reinstated and negotiate a Medicaid lien so he could sell prior to it going through foreclosure. He doesn't have the money to redeem aside from selling and giving proceeds to the bank. They show up on title because they went to the foreclosure sale which means my client as 180 days to try and sell and hopefully the pay the lien attached and pay the utility bills on the taxes. Maybe with any luck walk away with a few bucks. The more important concern is he allowed to live there so he can find housing. What I submitted

tells the story pretty well. I will add is we have engaged REMAX and property has been cleaned, photos taken, and listed on the MLS. So you can look at those and see conditions of the property pretty well. I can certainly coordinate with the agent for access of condition is an issue, but I don't think it should be.

There was some kind of tenancy situation occurring prior to our office's involvement. That no longer exists. There are no tenants there. Mr. Smith's request is the city take no further action until at least December 10, which is his last day of legal occupancy prior to the redemption period expiring.

Zimny: does Mr. Smith have permission for a short sale from the bank? Looking into that?

Partridge: I don't think he will need permission. He has about \$195,000 on the lien, and we have the house listed for \$285,000 and our realtor thinks that is competitive. If we are able to get that it would cover mortgage and utilities.

Zimny: I thought I read somewhere the lien was \$330,000, did I make that up?

Partridge: I don't know where that number came from. When I contacted the lender's lawyer a month ago it was about \$194,00.

Zimny: your letter here says end of life care in the amount of \$390,000---oh total amount owed, now I see the \$190,000. I'm following.

Partridge: yes, that's the MA lien and we are negotiating with John Rominski with Ramsey County now to work a deal and have tentative approval to sell from the County and then put the proceeds towards the lien.

Zimny: I'm claiming ignorance here. If his name isn't on the title now, how does he sell it?

Partridge: it is complicated, but the short version is he has already been adjudicated to be the personal representative of the estate and 100 percent owner of all estates but he can't record a deed to himself because the lien has to be negotiated first, and Ramsey County wants to negotiate it second. He is the lawful owner, he just can't deed it to himself to correct the public record. We need to find a buyer, negotiate the Ramsey County lien, then go back to probate court and present the information for approval for Brendon to sign the deed over to the buyer.

Zimny: does the bank have to approve any of this?

Partridge: not as long as we have money to cover their lien. They're appearing on the title because their Sheriff's certificate was recorded. That is an odd condition of ownership. Ownership subject to divestment. MN law is very clear that the owner and borrower each have the right to redeem after 180 days after the foreclosure and in that bundle of rights is the ability to live there, refinance it, sell it. Do what they want until the bank takes absolute title.

Zimny: this is complicated. From previous cases that's not how we've seen this goes. Six months to redeem but the title in in the bank's name with the County as of June 9th.

Partridge: what evidence of this is there? The sheriff's certificate was recorded that

shows the bank has gone to sale on it. It is just a matter of no one redeeming in 180 days, they don't have an interest in the home at this point, they have the right to it if no one redeems. I can pull a title update.

Zimny: I'm looking at the Ramsey County website and it says the owner is Wilmington Fund Society in SLC. It just changed to this after the sheriff's sale.

Partridge: I don't know that's a legal description of the change in ownership. If that's the issue, whether my client is owner during redemption we can certainly order a title update. Then I can submit that to you the cases in MN says the owner continues to be the owner throughout the entire redemption period.

Zimny: I'm pondering here. We don't want to make anyone leave. I want to give time for things to happen. You're taking action. I want to acknowledge that. I'm under the understanding he has six months TO redeem, then he would be able to sell but that isn't your understanding.

Partridge: the bank has no right to possession or to sell the property at this moment. The only person who does is the owner for the entire 180 days. Bank doesn't own it until December 10th.

Zimny: while we ponder that I'd like to turn it over to Mr. Lundblad and see if there's any questions or comments he wanted to add to the record.

Lundblad: I don't have much to add. I wanted to be part of the conversation because I've known Brendon for over 25 years, known his parents. Just trying to help.

Zimny: I don't meant to interrupt, but Mr. Partridge indicated you've vacated, is that correct?

Lundblad: no, I still live there.

Partridge: to be clear, this had a rental unit on the top, and no one lives there. The occupants both live in the portion downstairs, traditionally occupied by the owners.

Lundblad that is correct. First floor, all working utilities.

Zimny: more like a roommate than a traditional tenant.

Lundblad: right. My interest is in getting Brendon moved where he needs to be, along with Wyatt. Personally, I'm fine but Brendon does worry me.

Zimny: it isn't a great situation for anyone it sounds like. I see limited income. We don't want anyone out on the street. I know you'd probably like a conclusion today, but would I would like to do is continue this and talk again in a month, see if there are any updates. In the meantime we'll allow occupancy. We'll see if there are any updates in a month and then we can make a final recommendation then and send to Council.

Partridge: that's great. I'm happy to submit an additional letter about title. Hopefully we'll have a buyer by then and have a more straightforward path by then.

Zimny: does July 21 work?

Both: yes.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 7/21/2026

- 5 [RLH VO 26-25](#) Appeal of Tobin Sauro to a Fire Inspection Report, including condemnation at 1655 MCAFEE STREET. (July 7, 2026 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Yang

Layover to LH Tuesday, July 7th at 1:30 pm to check on utility status. CPH July 8. Grant to have July 6th to have gas & electric restored or property must be vacated.

Tobin Sauro, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Keith Demarest: this is a duplex, May 27, 2026 our office received a complaint stating a tenant had no electric. June 15 notice was sent by Inspector Wirth explaining the unit is unfit. Appeal came in June 22. I asked Inspector Wirth to follow up with Xcel this morning who confirmed utilities are still off to the property. We didn't check water.

Sauro: we're good with water. I have a tenant responsible for gas and electric and didn't pay her bills all winter, so they shut her utilities off. I've been over to talk to her early in the month, when I got notice, from her father who lives upstairs. I gave her some numbers on where to get some help. I'm the one who reported it for no utilities hoping having something on the door would get her motivated to take care of herself.

Moermond: how is that going?

Sauro: I've gone the last 5 days in a row. She won't answer the door, she won't answer the phone or texts. I think she may be out on the street doing drugs. Her rent is paid by section 8. I gave her notice of non extension of the lease at the end of may stating the 30 day notice to vacate. I'm hoping she will be out by the end of the month so I don't have to go through a full eviction. I have called my attorneys. I have called Xcel and they won't let me turn anything on until she's out and they have proof. I don't want a Vacant Building fine, because it isn't really vacant. I just need to get the tenant out of the lower unit so I can get the power turned back on. Upstairs all the utilities work. It is just gas and electric for this unit, which she doesn't need the gas right now. If she still lives there I can't catch her there anymore. I just don't want fines while I go through this process of getting her out.

Moermond: that makes perfect sense. You have an email address, do you check it often?

Sauro: yes.

Moermond: we're going to send you an email with a link to the MN Attorney General's office where they have a tenant/landlord handbook that would be helpful to you that outlines the rules. I think you can access the unit with notice whether or not it is an emergency. I'm not your lawyer, but I would pull that manual and see if it is helpful navigating this. Next, whether or not it is condemned. I think we're all in agreement you need gas and electric to live someplace. It isn't quite as serious as water shut off, but still serious.

Demarest: it looks like it was sent with a deadline of the same day. Typically there's a 10-day gap between the placard going up and a unit vacated.

Moermond: so the tenant is paying the price of you not posting it right away. It doesn't matter in this case since it was appealed and here we are. Let's give this a bit of time to get the electric restored, and if it isn't done by then we have an effective vacate date. The next Council Public Hearing is July 8th. If the electric isn't restored by July 6, I'll recommend the appeal is denied and the property does need to be vacated. Mr. Sauro the practical impact of that, if they aren't out by the first of the month, we'll order it vacated. This is electric and gas shut off, I don't believe there's any other code violations. Mr. Demarest do you have a sense?

Demarest: we were last in there six years ago, with an A rating.

Moermond: we won't worry about getting an inspector in then to get a length of time. Mr. Demarest will then say you can't have anyone live in that unit until gas and electric is restored. He'll take the Certificate of Occupancy for that one unit, and it can't be reoccupied until it is restored.

Sauro: I don't have to keep her stuff, she signed it over to me. I'm more worried about her refusing to leave and becoming a squatter and having to go through the formal eviction process.

Moermond: Mr. Demarest?

Demarest: July 6 I'll have the inspector check on utility status. If they are still off, we will placard the house immediately as condemned and vacated that same day.

Sauro: that has been done correct?

Demarest: likely, but with appeals we pause or restart some things. Then from there if progress is being made, tenant is gone, the inspector can "sit on the property" with open orders until the they're turned back on. If there is someone still in there without utilities, worst case scenario is we look at boarding. That's a drastic measure. My best advice is seek counsel during the next few weeks and what guidance they give you because our options are solely dependent on what happens on those dates. We cannot remove the tenant.

Sauro: I have to have the sheriff physically remove them, which takes about a month, which makes it past July.

Moermond: Mr. Demarest you said it depends on the "totality of circumstances". What does that mean for you?

Demarest: it has water, which is a big deal-breaker for us. I would prefer to slow walk this, it won't go into the Vacant Building program because it is partially occupied. It will stay in our office and our inspector would follow up and worst case, placard it again.

Sauro: over my dead body will that be lived in. I have to spend some money to go through the court, so be it. I want to assure you that I have no problem reporting my progress.

Referred to the City Council due back on 7/8/2026

1:30 p.m. Hearings**Orders To Vacate - Fire Certificate of Occupancy**

- 6 [RLH VO 26-24](#) Appeal of Jay Mitchell, on behalf of Quality Residences LLC, to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice, which includes Condemnation, at 65 ROSE AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Kim

Grant to July 10 to have all repairs done under permit.

Jay Mitchell, contractor, appeared via phone

Staff report by Supervisor Keith Demarest: single-family home owned by Quality Residences. May 6 our office received a referral from the St. Paul Fire Department about this property. They stated both Xcel and St. Paul Fire Department were called for a carbon monoxide alarm. They stated the owner replaced the CO detector, but it was still going off. Furnace has been red tagged and all gas service discontinued. Xcel found previous red tags on furnace that weren't addressed. Residents were informed of the Form 4 and Department of Safety and Inspections referral. May 6 I made my initial inspection at the site and found 2 red tags hung by Xcel in the basement. The gas meter was tampered with; a pin had been put in place previously for gas issues and that part of the meter was broken. Orders were sent May 6 calling for several repairs under permit. May 12 a second inspection was done by me. No changes, updates or permits. A second report was sent. June 15 a third inspection was made with no changes. Property was placarded with a 10 day vacate notice. June 23, today, I do not see any permits yet applied for.

Moermond: so three visits, but no order to vacate until June 15?

Demarest: yes, I was giving time to repair. I called for the condemnation due to the risk.

Mitchell: up until I got this referral, less than 10 days ago, I have since hired a HVAC contractor for the furnace repair. We're just looking to get it done and up and running. I just received that call, so everything before that wasn't me.

Moermond: but it was your employer. QR was receiving the notices.

Mitchell: correct, yeah.

Moermond: you're looking for time. Your tenant doesn't have hot water?

Mitchell: the water heater works. It was just the furnace. The CO was coming from the furnace, which is shut off.

Moermond: it does look like item 3 in the orders talks about water heating Mr. Demarest.

Demarest: everything in the house needs to be done under permit. When I was checking water temp, it needs to be between 100 and 120 degrees and it wasn't

successful. Everything needs to be done under permit and addressed.

Moermond: Mr. Mitchell, sounds like there is at least warm water, but needs someone to look at. I'll recommend you get your extension to July 10th. This will have a Council Public Hearing July 8th.

Referred to the City Council due back on 7/8/2026

2:00 p.m. Hearings

Fire Certificates of Occupancy

- 7 [RLH FCO 26-48](#) Appeal of Robert Jennrich to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 873 FRONT AVENUE.

Sponsors: Kim

Grant the appeal.

Heather Mendiola, SMRLS attorney, appeared via phone
Robbert Jennrich, occupant, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Keith Demarest: orders were sent May 28th with an inspection date of June 5th after a complaint about illegal auto repair at the property. June 5th I arrived at the property and met with 2 brothers on site. One brother I don't believe lived there, the other brother had some medical history so I wasn't comfortable asking permission to do an inspection without Robert on site. At that point I asked one of the brothers if they were living in the camper, they said no. I didn't continue my inspection of garage or back yard.

Moermond: you wanted to schedule the appointment because a neighbor or someone complained about this use. You sent an appointment letter and weren't granted access.

Demarest: correct. It appears that there is 2 stalls to the garage and either the photo or video shows a vehicle being placed in the garage.

Mendiola: the May 28th notice I see it says cease auto repairs and then inspection to allow access. I don't see anything about a camper. There continues to be issues with the neighbors. I know these referrals have to be kept anonymous, but we suspect the neighbor keeps calling and reporting inaccurate things. To my knowledge there is no one living in the camper.

Moermond: that is my understanding too. He's just referencing the history.

Mendiola: there is a probate case filed and a hearing July 15th. Hearing notice was sent out to Robert and his siblings as decedents. Notice does say if no objections are filed or made at hearing they will issue the decree. So we expect ownership to be transferred here in the next few weeks.

Moermond: that sounds great. What are you looking for today?

Mendiola: to put this to bed. If Mr. Demarest wants to come out I think Mr. Jennrich would be happy to coordinate it. Mr. Jennrich can't do anything about the complaints.

Moermond: what the facts are in front of me today, we have 2 videos, one shows inside of a stall of garage that has a white SUV and some tires on a rack, another with a tow truck on the street with a SUV hooked up. I don't know if it is connected with the property but it is in the public street regardless. The garage video doesn't prove one thing or another. I'm not convinced access needs to be provided based on this information of a concern from the neighbor about the auto repair garage. I don't know the City should put itself in a position of insisting on access.

Mendiola: I know there were previous reports of repair at the home and those were unfounded. I think this would make sense.

Moermond: we have orders to cease home occupation that we don't know that occupation actually exists. If licensing or someone else wants to pursue it, ok, but I can't see it here. I'm going to recommend Council grant the appeal.

Referred to the City Council due back on 7/8/2026

- 8 [RLH FCO 26-51](#) Appeal of Ambe McKenzie, tenant of unit 5, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 683 KANSAS AVENUE. (July 7, 2026 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Noecker

Layover to LH July 7, 2026 at 2 pm (unable to reach appellant).

Voicemail left at 3:12 pm: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling you about your appeal of 683 Kansas unit 5. We are handling another case and then we'll try you back.

Voicemail left at 3:46 pm: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling again about your appeal for 683 Kansas. We've been unable to reach you today so I will continue this to July 7th at which point I need this resolved. Council Public Hearing will be on July 8th.

Referred to the City Council due back on 7/8/2026

- 9 [RLH FCO 26-50](#) Appeal of Adam Kado to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1609 SAINT ANTHONY AVENUE.

Sponsors: Coleman

Grant to October 16th, 2026 for compliance.

Adam Kado, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Der Vue: this is a 5 unit dwelling. This was previously appealed the correction orders dated March 26 that were appealed and heard April 21, was granted to have full compliance by June 15. The orders dated June 4 attached to this appeal are not accurate in format, during a recent and scheduled inspection May 19, 2026, the inspector noted several new deficiencies. What was remaining from the

original appeal, 3 items, were combined with new deficiencies. One is dated April 29 with compliance date of June 15 and then a separate set of orders dated June 4 which notes the new deficiencies. Orders have since been separated and mailed to Mr. Kado. The new orders for June 4 have a July 7th reinspection are what are being appealed today.

Kado: the original items from April 29, the three remaining items were multiple open permits and a building permit requirement for replacement of rear stairs—

Moermond: you are going back to the old orders, which isn't in front of me. We're discussing the June 4 orders. Those previous orders had their own deadlines.

Vue: correct, 3 remaining items with a compliance date of June 15, 2026.

Moermond: What do you want to discuss in terms of these orders, which were appealed, Mr. Kado?

Kado: there seems to be some confusion. In my discussion with the City and Mai Vang these 3 items were postponed and they were the ones I had concerns over. I never got notice from that original appeal. Then this was verified by Mai Vang who confirmed this. I guess I'm confused. I wasn't confused before because the orders sent out had the wrong inspection date, and when I notified Mai Vang she brought everyone on the same page and added the other ones to this. Joe Koehler did not do an inspection and said it was postponed.

Moermond: that's not what we are talking about. The deadline in place for June 15th is still the deadline for having the previous orders compliance. The Council granted the appeal of the order to vacate, and granted to June 15th for compliance with the balance of the orders from April 29. The original orders had a deadline of May 29 and through that previous appeal the condemnation part of the appeal was granted and everything else got an extra 2 weeks. There has been no other extension. I think they combined the follow up in section because this second appeal was filed. Ms. Vue?

Vue: due to the confusion, the orders and combining the original orders with the new deficiencies, the June 15th date hasn't occurred for the remaining items. Due to the fact the new items were appealed we have yet to conduct the reinspection for what remains from the original appeal (3 items from the April 29 document).

Kado: when will the next reinspection be then? On those remaining 3?

Moermond: we can talk about that today.

Kado: those are the pressing ones, can I talk about those?

Moermond: the June 4 orders?

Kado: no, April 29.

Moermond: that's done. Those orders are what they are.

Vue: Inspector Koehler will reach out directly to reinspect on those 3 items. The appeal you submitted today are the new orders and new deficiencies dated June 4. Are the remaining 3 items completed?

Kado: I haven't completed because I'm confused on the process. I was told these would be grouped together since they were all on the new orders.

Vue: and again I apologize for the error. Those items had a June 15th deadline from Council, which has come and gone. A reinspection does need to be coordinated and that will be done in the next few days.

Kado: ok, because I was in touch with Mai Vang earlier this month and that was the email chain that we discussed so....

Vue: Ms. Vang works for the Legislative Hearing officer, I was included in that email. She also just received clarification on that you were appealing the new orders.

Kado: no, I was appealing the previous order. I think that's where the confusion is. I never got the notice that came out with the June 15th deadline. I didn't know about it until the email from Joel Koehler on June 10th. I never saw notification about that.

Vue: will you confirm your mailing address?

Kado confirms]

Vue: there was also a letter from City Council which includes the summary of the compliance date.

Kado: I didn't get a copy of that letter until June 9 or 10th.

Vue: those 3 items aren't up for discussion today. Mr. Koehler will reach out for a reinspection. Once a recommendation has been made by Ms. Moermond and gone to Council it is up to us for further enforcement. Today is specific to the new set of orders.

Moermond: if there is noncompliance there may be an opportunity to appeal in the future. This is a Correction Order. The next order, if there isn't compliance, they take further enhanced action and that we can talk about more if it happens. In the meantime we have just a couple of things to talk about today. Do you want to do that?

Kado: yeah, I have that list as well. A lot of this is removed, like the construction debris, there is a keybox on site on the back door. It has been there. The stored materials are all gone. The paint is on a window on the upper level of the front second floor and we are planning to replace those windows. There is probably chipping paint but we are replacing those four windows. Because it was already in plans, can we just move forward to replace.

Moermond: stored materials you are saying are gone. The keybox you think you have it right and we need to confirm. Stored materials are gone. Foundation I didn't hear any questions on. Window replacement you are going to be taking care of it. Will you also be dealing with soffits and fascia at that time?

Kado: yes, that is in the plans as well. We completed it on the lower floors, and will be doing it on the upper floors.

Moermond: what is your timeline on these improvements?

Kado: I was hoping later in the summer. We have some HVAC work to finish inside

first.

Moermond: so extensions on soffits and fascia and other things are under control and just need confirmation. I'm comfortable going to end of this season to deal with that. I'll put that mid-October. Let's say October 16th.

Referred to the City Council due back on 7/8/2026