



City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Minutes - Final

Legislative Hearings

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

Tuesday, July 28, 2026

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

Hearing starts at 10:00 am

10:00 a.m. Hearings

Special Tax Assessments

- 1 **RLH TA 26-155** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 565 ALDINE STREET (AKA 571 ALDINE STREET). (File No. J2611B, Assessment No. 268116)

Sponsors: Coleman

Approve the assessment.

Laura Schroeder, property manager, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor James Hoffman: St. Paul Police Department arrived and found a broken window March 5 at 11:11 pm. Based on their report, someone tried to break into the laundry room. Residents heard window break. Attempted to call building management, left a Voicemail. Then called for the boarding.

Schroeder: I have no call, no record of a call, I didn't find out until the next day. I've tried for the last week to find out what number they called, and I haven't received it. Records told me to call St. Paul West, left multiple messages, finally talked to someone.

Moermond: there is a database they use in the emergency call center. It is updated mostly from the Fire Certificate of Occupancy program, so whatever contact information they have there. Almost always property management. What I can tell you is it isn't a requirement they call ownership or management at all. Maybe one fourth of cases I see they try to call. A lot depends on their schedule and other calls coming in. I can take into account they tried to reach you but that will be in their favor they tried, not that they were unable to.

Schroeder: we would have come out and boarded it. It hasn't been an issue before because we DO have after hours maintenance. I know the police have my personal cell

number due to issues with residents in the past. I didn't get a call there, and even if you Google Sheraton Apartments, the number that comes up are all tracked. We never got any calls.

Moermond: I don't know what to tell you about that. But I can tell you they aren't out there Googling for a contact person. What I CAN say is it is an emergency to secure the building. They have to secure the scene before they leave. They have to move quickly. I'm assuming someone isn't on site?

Schroeder: no, but we have someone within 15 minutes.

Moermond: looks

like there was communication with the tenants as well, but a language barrier at least with one of them. It is unfortunate but it is an emergency and they need to close it up and move on. They do have to make judgments in the field and this follows that protocol. I'm sorry it isn't good news for you.

Schroeder: I'd REALLY like to know the number they dialed. The guy I talked to yesterday said they just Google it. You're saying differently.

Moermond: I'm not in the squad with them. Maybe some do, but I am still left with an emergency situation. Safety conditions they can't ignore.

Schroeder: I just know in the past they have called and we've handled it in the past when they've called.

Moermond: no matter what that answer is it isn't going to change the outcome.

Schroeder: we can still argue before Council?

Moermond: absolutely.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2026

**2 RLH TA 26-145 Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 2012
COMO AVENUE. (File No. J2611B, Assessment No. 268116)**

Sponsors: Coleman

Delete the assessment.

Ranjit Bhagyam, owner, appeared via phone

Staff report by Supervisor James Hoffman: March 28 police responded to an assault, had to breach the door to deal with that situation. Police had to secure the door before they could leave.

Bhagyam: I was in communication with Mai Vang this am, I had asked her for before and after pictures. I don't want to throw her under the bus. I am the landlord, the following morning, Mr. Hoffman claims it was secured. The following morning I went there and I have sent photos of the door that Mr. Hoffman's office was secured. Unfortunately, there is no plywood on it. I took over at that time. We already purchased new doors and installed. If you have an opportunity to send the photos to Mai Vang this am, I was there the following morning and found no plywood on the door. I requested of

Mai Vang to send me photos of the repairs/boarding.

Moermond: Mr. Hoffman does the follow up on these things. What were you able to see Mr. Hoffman?

Hoffman: in this case, I didn't receive the invoice from the contractor until 2 days later. Ultimately, it was an interior door so short of gaining access myself I wouldn't be able to verify. Typically, when they do interior securing they send a picture but in this case I didn't get that.

Moermond: what I'm looking at is that the work would have taken place at 12:30 am, and the photos you shared with me the sun is shining. I get that, and I don't see any work was done, doesn't appear breached again after secured. So, I'm going to recommend this is deleted. I don't see the work was actually done myself. That is something the City should reach out to the contractor and if they billed us on something they didn't do, we need to follow up on that. This will be deleted.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2026

Special Tax Assessments-Rolls

- 3 RLH AR 26-50** Ratifying the assessment for Demolition of Vacant, Nuisance and/or Hazardous Structure from the month of May 2026. (File No. J2607C, Assessment No. 262006)

Sponsors: Noecker

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2026

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Correction Orders

- 4 RLH CO 26-4** Appeal of Kinnell Tackett to a Notice to Cut Tall Grass and/or Weeds at 444 JOHNSON PARKWAY.

Sponsors: Johnson

Recommendation forthcoming pending more detailed work plan.

Kinnell Tackett, owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: got your plan for intentions with the yard. I think it got us part of the way where we need to go, not all the way.

Tackett: I was hoping you'd have some feedback.

Moermond: the grasses that remain is my concern. It is kind of a mix of introducing plants without the removal of the grass and planning more native grasses. This is turf lawn grass. There needs to be a way to deal with that in the conversion. Right now the statute says over grown turf lawn isn't a native planting. I'm hoping maybe to stage this for a different kind of conversion happening. I'm thinking there's got to be a way to come at this. I pulled up old pictures of the yard, and in Google the house is blurred

out. Some years has decent views of the yard, some don't. What I'm thinking is it looks to me like none of it was tilled. A more staged approach. Section by section.

Tackett: you are meaning more—kill off everything in the area. The classic way to do it is using contractor plastic for 8 weeks to kill everything there and then come along after with the plants you want to put in. What I've done in the past with farmland is kind of what I'm doing here. Mix oats in with native seeds which come up first and prevent the noxious weeds from taking over with a bare patch of soil. Areas with no plugs you have the seed bed of noxious weeds to pop up. Oats pop up before the second year grasses come in so other weeds don't have to. That was my approach with the turf grass. There's a generational seed bank here, so other weeds won't be able to grow. The wildflowers will overtake the turf lawn over time. I can look outside and see the little blue stem taking over in those areas. That was my approach. I don't want to remove the turf lawn because then I open it up to the plants I don't want there. That was my plan with the grass. I fear if I kill off everything I'll be fighting the bigger problem of natural noxious weeds. I can mow it all down and do it in smaller sections.

Moermond: what I have is clearly an overgrown turf lawn with some lovely flowers in it. Looking at the statute does it meet that requirement? Not yet. You're not in native, you're still in turf. I'd like to figure out a way it would be obvious for someone looking at it that there is a plan. Someone can see some intentionality, staging, looking at the entire set up. I don't know we know for a fact the turf lawn will go away with this approach. How to manage that lawn away is where I'm coming from on it. I'm happy to work with you to do it in smaller sections, I'm just not sure the best approach for this. Doing the whole yard like this you see a lot more overgrown turf lawn than the flowers. I love the oat seed idea, it sounds lovely. I think it would be great to have signage about restoring to native prairie or whatever your goal is. Maybe some signage about your goal of native prairie restoration.

Tackett: I can take that approach.

Moermond: that would be great.

Tackett: I've done the cardboard in the past and found it doesn't work.

Moermond: I look at the diagram and have a good sense of where you're going with it. If neighbors could see what the plan is, and ask me about my yard, something like that you know? An education opportunity for the neighbors.

Tackett: one of my neighbors works for an ecological farm so he gets it. I assume it was the renter on the other side who called the City, because it was right after they moved in when I got the notice.

Moermond: and I have no idea who. It could be anyone. Maybe some more information on when you plan on taking these steps. Having the phases more clear.

Tackett: ok.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/12/2026

Summary & Vehicle Abatement Orders

- 5 [RLH SAO 26-54](#) Appeal of Jane Foster to a Summary Abatement Order at 1312 SCHEFFER AVENUE.

Sponsors: Jost

Grant to August 14, 2026 for compliance.

Voicemail left at 11:55 am: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling Ms. Foster about the front yard and boulevard at your property. We did send you a letter with a couple of follow up questions clarifying current state and what that means exactly and long term plans for boulevard. We really should talk about this, but you weren't available last week or this week so I'm going to say plants in boulevard need to be reduced to 36", and no infringement into sidewalk or right-of-way. I'd really like to see an updated plan. I'll ask for them to give an extension to August 14th at the Council Public Hearing August 5.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2026

6 [RLH SAO 26-61](#) Appeal of Liam Magistad to a Summary Abatement Order at 1597 CHARLES AVENUE.

Sponsors: Coleman

Grant to August 14, 2026 for compliance with tree removal, and grant to September 4, 2026 for removal (or approval) of raised bed in boulevard and restoring ground cover).

Voicemail left at 12:01 pm: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling about your appeal for 1597 Charles and orders on the boulevard and your appeal on the raised bed in the boulevard. You should reach out to Public Works staff, Jim Brown at 266-6175, and hopefully he will be able to help you get a raised bed permit for the right-of-way. Let's put together a timeline to make sure the trees are cleared or you have a permit or have removed the raised bed. Let's do the tree removal August 14 deadline and September 4th for raised bed and restoring ground cover.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2026

7 [RLH SAO 26-62](#) Appeal of Lucky Tiger Jack Rosenbloom to a Summary Abatement Order at 369 DALE STREET NORTH.

Sponsors: Bowie

Recommendation forthcoming.

Lucky Rosenbloom appeared

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: July 10 2026 was issued to this property, under 34.08 this is an accessory fence, likely hit by something, we asked to remove/repair/replace it. Permit may be required. Also only 4' height in front of the property. It is still not in a good state of repair as you can see from the photos.

Moermond: what is the zoning at this property?

Martin: its commercial.

Moermond: yeah, he gets to have 8 feet for the fence.

Rosenbloom: when they put it in it they did a site plan. It is structurally sound, I think

we're into a matter of opinion. I think I've satisfied the ordinance. If he submitted all the photos instead of 2, you would have seen the poles are straight and sound. The one photo he sent is straight, now I put a pole in the ground about 3' high because I want to put dirt inside of it or maybe a flag. I think his concern is I have the caution tape up. That's only to keep the panhandlers out, there's nothing unsafe about it. That works well. It is just to keep people from walking on my property.

Martin: Mr. Kedrowski took photos yesterday.

Rosenbloom: let me point out: this pole here is gone. This pole here has a clamp on it. This picture is misleading. This here at one point was bent all the way to the ground. We pushed that up. My argument is this isn't as bad as it may look in the picture. If you look at that pole it is structurally sound, the one on the corner, we pushed it up, put a pole on [sic] it, and that pole goes into cement. It hasn't been moved, doesn't move at all. We took this one here, if he took a photo and submitted it. You can see the pole was laying all the way down, so we pushed it up and we have support behind it and support behind [this one] that is now straightened out. There's also a clamp on the other side which he didn't get a photo of. My question is: this has a clamp. That pole is now straight. If this was taken yesterday why didn't he get a photo of it?

Moermond: this was from July 10th. Yesterday was this one.

Rosenbloom: where's the one yesterday showing this part here? Where the yellow tape is?

Moermond: that was yesterday. So that section has been dealt with. We have questions about bends in the other ones.

Martin: and the [muffled] pole is down.

Rosenbloom: now, I'm not going to worry about the vegetation.

Moermond: but the City is. Please mow it.

Rosenbloom: I'm not being vitriolic. We've been there a long time. I cut the grass. If I don't cut the grass within 2 days and it grows after it rains, I have to cut it when I get to it. You can see the other grass is cut. I cut it when I can. We keep that property up.

Moermond: why don't you cut it when you do the grass on the other side of the fence?

Rosenbloom: I do. But that stuff grows quick. If I mow it today and you go back Thursday—

Moermond: Mr. Rosenbloom, it doesn't grow a foot and a half in 2 days.

Rosenbloom: that isn't that long. It may look that long, but it isn't. I was just up there yesterday.

Moermond: and you mowed it?

Rosenbloom: I didn't because it was just mowed in the yard. Around the fence is high but it isn't 2 feet.

Moermond: the rule is 8 inches.

Rosenbloom: I didn't know that. I just keep it cut.

Moermond: maximum.

Rosenbloom: now I know. Otherwise my grass is cut. I'm not going to argue about the grass. I shovel snow. I got the time I shoveled.

Moermond: I get it, it's the corner of Dale—

Rosenbloom: are you talking about the grass here or here? [points at photo]

Martin: all the long grass, right around the sign there.

Rosenbloom: the one way sign?

Martin: yes, all that.

Rosenbloom: I argue that isn't my property.

Moermond: between the sidewalk and the street? It is.

Martin: and on the other side also.

Moermond: it is your maintenance issue just like the sidewalk.

Rosenbloom: ok.

Moermond: your orders today are about the fence. You're saying it is structurally sound but maybe not aesthetically what we'd be looking for. It is hard for me to determine soundness sitting here, as well as not being a building inspector. Let's have a building official swing by and make a determination on this. We don't legislate ugly, but soundness and good repair.

Rosenbloom: I'd still like a Council date.

Moermond: once I have a recommendation you'll receive a letter with a time and date of the Council date you're set for.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/12/2026

- 8** [RLH SAO 26-67](#) Appeal of Julia Bindler to a Summary Abatement Order at 2098 PINEHURST AVENUE.

Sponsors: Jost

Withdrawn

- 9** [RLH SAO 26-60](#) Appeal of Erin Metz Verdeja to a Summary Abatement Order at 1518 SELBY AVENUE.

Sponsors: Bowie

Layover to LH August 4, 2026 for further discussion after site visit.

Erin Metz Verdeja, owner, appeared via phone

Metz Verdeja: I'm sorry if I get emotional about this. I've been gardening here for 12 years, and I've never received complaints, only compliments. When I received the letter I was really saddened.

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: orders were issued July 9 to cut and remove any overgrown vegetation impeding the right-of-way, sidewalk, boulevard and alley. Sidewalks must be cleared edge to edge. Compliance date of July 16. They didn't address the fencing on the boulevard. I have driven by myself over many years, it is gorgeous and as the years go on the plants get larger and we come from a safety standpoint.

Metz Verdeja: I do always cut back immediately when things are done flowering, especially the front boulevard. When they're in their tallest state I'm always aware of the safety piece. The 18" is tough, I will say, because there isn't really a perennial on the planet that doesn't go above that. I cut them all back right after they bloom. The main ones someone maybe would have had an issue with is that front bump out boulevard with the goldenrod. I've been trying to figure out why this year, racking my brain. I've noticed with the extreme heat and with no rain they definitely look a little shabbier this year.

Moermond: we do need to get that metal fencing out of the boulevard.

Metz Verdeja: we live in an area with incredible foot traffic and lots of parties with college kids who don't respect sidewalks. They throw up in the yard. They are just for decoration, not permanent in any way.

Moermond: I think what I'd like to do is come take a look at it. Get a better look so I can figure out a solution particular to where you are at.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/4/2026

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate - Fire Certificate of Occupancy

- 10 [RLH VO 26-32](#) Appeal of Jamie Rasmussen to a Fire Inspection Notice of Condemnation and Order to Remain Vacant at 1875 NEBRASKA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Yang

Grant the appeal.

Jamie Rasmussen, daughter of owner, appeared
Trent Gibbons appeared

Moermond: an appeal from Jamie Rasmussen scheduled for today at 1:30. Subsequently, yesterday late in the day we had an appeal come in from Jamie's brother, Justin Rasmussen. He listed the owner as Brooke?
Jamie Rasmussen: my mom.

Moermond: they were scheduled for a hearing NEXT Tuesday, but were told to come today because I'd be making one decision for the property, not two different ones. I'm going to go ahead today and hear your appeal. Continue the conversation we had in late March. More importantly, where you're at with ownership and all of those things.

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Keith Demarest: 40.01 highlights the Certificate of Occupancy program for St. Paul. (A) requires all non owner occupied buildings to have a Fire Certificate of Occupancy. (B) a provisional Certificate of Occupancy when it changes from owner-occupied to rental. Owner must submit that application. 40.02 gives the exemption regarding owner-occupied is the owner's principle residence. This is a single-family home, Ramsey County says it owned by Brooke Rasmussen. February 13 our Department received a referral from Code Enforcement about it no longer being owner-occupied and the Power of Attorney is invalid upon death. Daughter Jamie may need assistance vacating property until probate is settled. Spoke to a gentleman at the property who said he was cleaning it. The same day, February 13, I sent my first notice re: 40.01 and the need for Certificate of Occupancy. March 23 same notice. April 30 a complete inspection was done. A need for a Certificate of Occupancy is still pending and on that report. May 20, a provisional Certificate of Occupancy was received however it wasn't completed by the property owner, it was done by Justin Rasmussen, tenant. May 21, 2026 another set of orders, calling for the need for the Certificate of Occupancy. June 23, 2026 5th set of orders calling for the same. July 23, 2026---

Moermond: can you pause a second. I want to review the older record. What were the orders sent on after April 15?

Demarest: April 30th orders 40.01 and in the middle of it the inspection was done, which did have some repairs, that was the odd duck report in the middle of spring. The repairs were all completed.

Moermond: I'm wondering, is this the first time, the July 23 order, that we've seen the condemnation pop up again?

Demarest: yes, the first time the condemnation has come up.

Moermond: SINCE. Have any conditions changed substantively since we spoke in late March?

Demarest: no change of ownership, no valid Certificate of Occupancy.

Moermond: the Council granted the appeal on the condemnation, and there's been no change?

Demarest: understood. And during the last few months I've received several phone calls about the status of the property from other family members.

Moermond: but that doesn't change the material situation with the structure itself. Condemnation is being for structural issues as opposed to administrative ones.

Demarest: with the lack of Certificate of Occupancy we do not have the ability to use a

revocation as a tool because there is nothing to revoke, so the only option is to post the property as condemned.

Moermond: which---ok, keep going.

Demarest: July 23 a new set of orders due to long-term noncompliance. Notice of condemnation was sent to owner and occupant along with being posted on front door. July 24 I received a voicemail saying "my name is Aaron Jones, I'm calling about a property at 1875 Nebraska, I am the buyer for the property and want to check the status of the property, if it is condemned or if we have to vacate. Can you please give me a call back?" and that is where we stand today.

Moermond: so you had written "going through eviction court and also have interested purchaser."

Jamie Rasmussen: yes, with that Aaron. I have a purchase agreement right here. It is signed by him, I'm still waiting to find out about eviction court on Friday.

Moermond: how did that go?

Jamie Rasmussen: my brother wants to stay in the house and my mother and I want to sell it. They didn't say, they said it would be a week before we got a judgment. We're waiting on that because they've done so much damage to the property that they're willing to give me \$165,000 with the people still in it, so my mom is taking a \$100,000 loss. They said it was about \$30,000 worth of damage and my issue is they are still there. They're still running up fines, as Keith can attest, they get orders, clean things up, and then it comes back again. My mom lives on a set social security income of \$1,200 a month. She can't afford lawyers doing evictions over because Justin's attorney is trying to get it dismissed. All these fines on the property itself, so money coming out towards that already. When Keith sent me the email with the condemnation I spoke to Aaron and he told me if that were to stand I'm going to lose another \$10,000.

Moermond: so a loss if it remains condemned.

Jamie Rasmussen: yes, because it would go to Vacant Building with subsequent fees. I was hear to ask if we can get rid of that so I can sign this and get rid of this home and solve everyone's problems. The City, the St. Paul Police Department, and my mom's problems at least.

Moermond: from what I am able to discern the conditions themselves do not stack up to meet criteria in chapter 34.23 which outlines what can lead to a condemnation. The code requires the Certificate of Occupancy for non-owner occupied dwellings. This would have to have one, and how does the City enforce that? It was written as a condemnation because they don't have any other tools to do enforcement on this. In some months the city will have administrative citations to be issued for allowing occupancy. What I'm thinking now is that you know people can't be living there, that's understood. I'm going to recommend your appeal on the condemnation is granted and it is really we don't have another tool to force the situation and get it resolved. It is a private property manner.

Gibbons: what if it is next of kin or son of owner? The father passed away and the son lives there and he is occupant of the property. He would be next of kin I think.

Moermond: mom owns the property.

Gibbons: mom and dad haven't been together in many years.

Jamie Rasmussen: they're still married.

Moermond: the property is in mom's name.

Gibbons: oh, ok.

Moermond: next of kin isn't the owner. His name isn't on the property. There's a lot of things going on at the property. Are you an occupant?

Gibbons: no, I'm not. Just listening to what is going on. I'm a licensed general contractor with the state so I was curious how the fire marshal can come in and condemn the property without it having serious violations. Was just curious.

Moermond: the code could be manipulated in the way so it could be used for violations in the code in other sections, but I'm not thrilled about that which is why I'm calling it the way I am. Can it be written that way? Yes. Is my cup of tea? No. They weren't wrong. It just isn't the way I would advise the Council on that.

Gibbons: is the mother actually on the deed? Or is it still in probate?

Jamie Rasmussen: she is on the deed. It was over in April.

Gibbons: I didn't know that information so...

Moermond: the only owner listed with Ramsey County is Brook Rasmussen. So you have my recommendation to the Council. That's the same thing I'd say next week to Mr. Justin Rasmussen. I'm not sure what he's looking for but in terms of appealing the condemnation, the first part of the order: you need to have a Certificate of Occupancy if it's not owner-occupied? True. Condemned? Not true. How do we enforce the first part? That is what you are doing in eviction court. You're doing what the City would want you to be doing to come into compliance.

Jamie Rasmussen: I'm just waiting to hear back from court and we will be selling with or without the tenants in it.

Moermond: we'll send you a letter confirming the appeal is granted and the house is not condemned. We'll send it to Council next week, August 5. If I talk to Justin on August 4, the finding will be the same in either case.

Demarest: I do want to make it clear over the last couple of months I've received several queries from relatives asking why we haven't emptied it out. I want to make sure that is clear with all family members is about status of the property now. Does the 40.01 section still stand as pending with 34.23 being granted?

Moermond: does it need a fire Certificate of Occupancy? Yes, but what the enforcement tool is obviously we can't bring action on a non-existing Fire Certificate of Occupancy and we don't yet have administrative citations to help spur action. And that action is what Ms. Rasmussen is already taking. We're all doing the best we can with the tools we have. I don't think anyone is arguing that City code says it has to be owner-occupied OR have a Fire Certificate of Occupancy, those are the 2 choices. Is it

unfit for habitation? Not from what I've seen. You will get a letter from Joanna Zimny, you can reply and ask for a copy of the Council resolution if you need it after next Wednesday. Maybe the letter will suffice.

Jamie Rasmussen: thank you VERY much. Hopefully we won't be back here again.

Moermond: we are here for you. Good luck and best wishes to your Mom as she navigates this.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2026

11 [RLH VO 26-34](#)

Appeal of Justin Rasmussen to a Fire Inspection Notice of Condemnation and Order to Remain Vacant at 1875 NEBRASKA AVENUE EAST. (August 4, 2026 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Yang

Laid over to August 4, 2026 (Recommendation is forthcoming)

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2026