



# 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, February 16, 2021

8:45 AM

Remote Hearing

---

#### Special Tax Assessments

#### 8:45 a.m. Hearings

- 1 [RLH TA 21-111](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1670 SEVENTH STREET EAST. (File No. VB2104, Assessment No. 218803)

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Delete the assessment.*

*Cory Johnson, Renova Properties, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we are going to go through these one by one. I did have a chance to review the videos for any that have them. You have the packages from Mai Vang?*

*Johnson: yes, I do.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is a category 2 vacant building. Opened August 6, 2020, closed it shortly after on October 13 per your instructions as permits were finalized. Total pending assessment of \$2,284.*

*Moermond: it went into the program August 6, 2020 and 2 months later they had taken care of everything, right?*

*Yannarely: yes.*

*Moermond: for 2 months I will recommend deleting the assessment. Next we have a cleanup, occurred August 6, 2020, TA 21-108.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is for a summary abatement order issued July 10, compliance date of July 16. Ordered to remove rubbish in yard, driveway, and pickup truck bed. Rechecked July 16 and found in noncompliance. Parks did the work August 6. Total pending assessment of \$562.*

*Moermond: two summary abatement orders were sent?*

*Yannarely: there's a notation indicating that, but I don't see that.*

*Moermond: it was rechecked two dates, the 21 and 28. Why are you appealing Mr. Johnson?*

*Johnson: maybe I can save us all some time. For all of the abatements my ask is the same. There are occupants, they aren't tenants, they haven't paid a dime ever. I took this over with the intention of paying them to leave to flip the property and resell. They wanted \$12,000 to leave, so it wasn't doable. Finally I got fed up because the eviction moratorium kept being extended. They are leaving on the 28th one way or the other. They were ignoring me, they didn't care. They didn't pay rent or take care of the place. I told them to clean up the premises. They ignored me because they knew I couldn't get rid of them. My hands were tied. I guess my ask is that if there's some way we can get rid of them or reduce, it would be helpful. I was put into a bad spot with the moratorium.*

*Moermond: why didn't you go clean up the property?*

*Johnson: I'm not their maid. They have a lease agreement. I am not the trash man. I went over there constantly telling them to do it. I just kept eating these citations.*

*Moermond: and now you'd like the rest of the taxpayers to eat the cost of the property you invested in?*

*Johnson: I feel like the inspector kind of made this her pet project since it was such a problem house. She was going over there constantly, or the neighbors were calling. You know, it was constant. Sometimes I'd go over there and it didn't seem like what was being cited was what was going on.*

*Moermond: I looked at the video. There was a ton of stuff in the yard, plus a fair bit of children's toys. Those items were left. The garbage and tires and other items were removed and from what I can tell that was legitimate. Orders were issued and it took nearly four weeks for them to do the cleanup. You had tons of times to resolve this, either through your lease or on your own. For this assessment I'm recommending approval. Next, we have a cleanup September 16, 2020, TA 21-109.*

*Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is a summary abatement order to abate overflowing garbage into alley, loose trash, broken glass, a mattress, basketball hoops on side, and two trucks in back driveway with bags full of bagged and loose trash and yard full of trunk. Orders were sent September 16, with a compliance date of September 23, 2021. Work was done by Parks September 29 for a total proposed assessment of \$600.*

*Moermond: this looks very much like the previous case from the month before, except the time between orders and cleanup was 2 weeks. Is your appeal on the same grounds or do you have additional information?*

*Johnson: same.*

*Moermond: I did review the video; it was consistent with what was orders and what was taken. I'll recommend approval.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: orders were written to remove broken furniture from yard, metal shelving against tree and trash piled behind the shed. October 13 orders were sent, work order was issued with the vacant building file and since was closed.*

*Moermond: the summary abatement order wasn't issued. There was a computer glitch so it wasn't mailed. Is that what you have?*

*Yannarely: yes.*

*Moermond: so for this one, the work was done but not properly noticed, so recommend its deletion of \$498 total. Next we have item 5, TA 21-205.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is an excessive consumption issued regarding the rubbish in yard, driveway, and truck bed for the July 10 orders. Total assessment is \$279.*

*Moermond: the excessive consumption letters, the one issued on July 10 was because of multiple violations and another listed July 21 which was for noncompliance by date of the deadline?*

*Yannarely: yes.*

*Moermond: why are you appealing this one?*

*Johnson: same thing kid of. This one occurred before I even owned the property.*

*Moermond: when?*

*Johnson: we closed July 31, 2020.*

*Moermond: the problem is that the first letter. It was issued July 10, so the seller knew this was a bill on the property and would become a pending assessment. Evidently they didn't disclose this to you as legally required. Similarly, July 21 there was another letter to Mr. Francisco. He had the information prior to closing and there was a bill attached to it. Normally, if someone is forthright in this transaction they disclose this to the purchaser. Can you tell me what happened?*

*Johnson: I did know there was some assessments. I knew what the situation was going into the purchase and had a plan of action. But as far as these two, I don't have the file in front of me. He did give me some letters with abatement orders before purchase, but I don't know if this was among that bunch. I'm not sure if he disclosed or not I guess.*

*Moermond: I will cut you a little break on this one. We had just talked about the cleanup occurring August 6, from July 10th orders. It looks to me like the inspector billed you for the first one and then not for the second one. Basically that de facto extension cost \$122. The City did end up cleaning it up, so I'm going to delete this resinspection. So that goes down \$122. The other was related to multiple visits, I might be more sympathetic except that this trip was the fifth violation in a 12-month time period. That's pretty bad. That's a lot of City resources. So for this one, I will recommend reducing \$279 to \$157. I'm deleting one of those \$122 bills.*

*Johnson: every bit helps, I guess.*

*Moermond: Well, we're doing what we can here. Next is TA 21-107.*

*Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is another excessive consumption, for inspections*

during August 26 to September 21, 2020. Date of the orders was September 3, with a compliance date of September 8. It was rechecked Sept 8, but per your ruling on September 1, issuing EC fine for failing to finalize permits and vacate house. The cost is a total assessment of \$279.

Moermond: so we have a revoked C of O. They didn't empty the house, per instruction, but rather than forcing the vacate the office issued an excessive consumption fine. Because of Covid it couldn't be emptied by the City because it is an administrative matter rather than being condemned for unfit for human habitation. The City is similarly situated to a landlord in that case. Mr. Johnson, tell me about this one?

Johnson: I've been trying to get these people out since I bought end the place at the end of July. I was offering to pay them to leave, they wouldn't leave. The moratorium prevented me from evicting them. There was nothing I could do to comply to this one.

Moermond: right. That is the only tool in the City's toolbox to get compliance with the Council's decision. There were extensions given to the best of my recollection, as well as a Herculean effort to get this taken care of by the previous owner. I'm going to recommend this is approved for that reason.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 2/24/2021**

**2 RLH TA 21-108** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1670 SEVENTH STREET EAST. (File No. J2105A, Assessment No. 218504)

Sponsors: Prince

Approve the assessment.

Cory Johnson, Renova Properties, appeared via phone

Moermond: we are going to go through these one by one. I did have a chance to review the videos for any that have them. You have the packages from Mai Vang?

Johnson: yes, I do.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is a category 2 vacant building. Opened August 6, 2020, closed it shortly after on October 13 per your instructions as permits were finalized. Total pending assessment of \$2,284.

Moermond: it went into the program August 6, 2020 and 2 months later they had taken care of everything, right?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: for 2 months I will recommend deleting the assessment. Next we have a cleanup, occurred August 6, 2020, TA 21-108.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is for a summary abatement order issued July 10, compliance date of July 16. Ordered to remove rubbish in yard, driveway, and pickup truck bed. Rechecked July 16 and found in noncompliance. Parks did the work August 6. Total pending assessment of \$562.

Moermond: two summary abatement orders were sent?

*Yannarely: there's a notation indicating that, but I don't see that.*

*Moermond: it was rechecked two dates, the 21 and 28. Why are you appealing Mr. Johnson?*

*Johnson: maybe I can save us all some time. For all of the abatements my ask is the same. There are occupants, they aren't tenants, they haven't paid a dime ever. I took this over with the intention of paying them to leave to flip the property and resell. They wanted \$12,000 to leave, so it wasn't doable. Finally I got fed up because the eviction moratorium kept being extended. They are leaving on the 28th one way or the other. They were ignoring me, they didn't care. They didn't pay rent or take care of the place. I told them to clean up the premises. They ignored me because they knew I couldn't get rid of them. My hands were tied. I guess my ask is that if there's some way we can get rid of them or reduce, it would be helpful. I was put into a bad spot with the moratorium.*

*Moermond: why didn't you go clean up the property?*

*Johnson: I'm not their maid. They have a lease agreement. I am not the trash man. I went over there constantly telling them to do it. I just kept eating these citations.*

*Moermond: and now you'd like the rest of the taxpayers to eat the cost of the property you invested in?*

*Johnson: I feel like the inspector kind of made this her pet project since it was such a problem house. She was going over there constantly, or the neighbors were calling. You know, it was constant. Sometimes I'd go over there and it didn't seem like what was being cited was what was going on.*

*Moermond: I looked at the video. There was a ton of stuff in the yard, plus a fair bit of children's toys. Those items were left. The garbage and tires and other items were removed and from what I can tell that was legitimate. Orders were issued and it took nearly four weeks for them to do the cleanup. You had tons of times to resolve this, either through your lease or on your own. For this assessment I'm recommending approval. Next, we have a cleanup September 16, 2020, TA 21-109.*

*Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is a summary abatement order to abate overflowing garbage into alley, loose trash, broken glass, a mattress, basketball hoops on side, and two trucks in back driveway with bags full of bagged and loose trash and yard full of trunk. Orders were sent September 16, with a compliance date of September 23, 2021. Work was done by Parks September 29 for a total proposed assessment of \$600.*

*Moermond: this looks very much like the previous case from the month before, except the time between orders and cleanup was 2 weeks. Is your appeal on the same grounds or do you have additional information?*

*Johnson: same.*

*Moermond: I did review the video; it was consistent with what was orders and what was taken. I'll recommend approval.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: orders were written to remove broken furniture from yard, metal shelving against tree and trash piled behind the shed.*

October 13 orders were sent, work order was issued with the vacant building file and since was closed.

Moermond: the summary abatement order wasn't issued. There was a computer glitch so it wasn't mailed. Is that what you have?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: so for this one, the work was done but not properly noticed, so recommend its deletion of \$498 total. Next we have item 5, TA 21-205.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is an excessive consumption issued regarding the rubbish in yard, driveway, and truck bed for the July 10 orders. Total assessment is \$279.

Moermond: the excessive consumption letters, the one issued on July 10 was because of multiple violations and another listed July 21 which was for noncompliance by date of the deadline?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: why are you appealing this one?

Johnson: same thing kid of. This one occurred before I even owned the property.

Moermond: when?

Johnson: we closed July 31, 2020.

Moermond: the problem is that the first letter. It was issued July 10, so the seller knew this was a bill on the property and would become a pending assessment. Evidently they didn't disclose this to you as legally required. Similarly, July 21 there was another letter to Mr. Francisco. He had the information prior to closing and there was a bill attached to it. Normally, if someone is forthright in this transaction they disclose this to the purchaser. Can you tell me what happened?

Johnson: I did know there was some assessments. I knew what the situation was going into the purchase and had a plan of action. But as far as these two, I don't have the file in front of me. He did give me some letters with abatement orders before purchase, but I don't know if this was among that bunch. I'm not sure if he disclosed or not I guess.

Moermond: I will cut you a little break on this one. We had just talked about the cleanup occurring August 6, from July 10th orders. It looks to me like the inspector billed you for the first one and then not for the second one. Basically that de facto extension cost \$122. The City did end up cleaning it up, so I'm going to delete this resinspection. So that goes down \$122. The other was related to multiple visits, I might be more sympathetic except that this trip was the fifth violation in a 12-month time period. That's pretty bad. That's a lot of City resources. So for this one, I will recommend reducing \$279 to \$157. I'm deleting one of those \$122 bills.

Johnson: every bit helps, I guess.

Moermond: Well, we're doing what we can here. Next is TA 21-107.

Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is another excessive consumption, for inspections during August 26 to September 21, 2020. Date of the orders was September 3, with a compliance date of September 8. It was rechecked Sept 8, but per your ruling on September 1, issuing EC fine for failing to finalize permits and vacate house. The cost is a total assessment of \$279.

Moermond: so we have a revoked C of O. They didn't empty the house, per instruction, but rather than forcing the vacate the office issued an excessive consumption fine. Because of Covid it couldn't be emptied by the City because it is an administrative matter rather than being condemned for unfit for human habitation. The City is similarly situated to a landlord in that case. Mr. Johnson, tell me about this one?

Johnson: I've been trying to get these people out since I bought end the place at the end of July. I was offering to pay them to leave, they wouldn't leave. The moratorium prevented me from evicting them. There was nothing I could do to comply to this one.

Moermond: right. That is the only tool in the City's toolbox to get compliance with the Council's decision. There were extensions given to the best of my recollection, as well as a Herculean effort to get this taken care of by the previous owner. I'm going to recommend this is approved for that reason.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

**3**      [RLH TA 21-109](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1670 SEVENTH STREET EAST. (File No. J2108A, Assessment No. 218507) (Legislative Hearing on February 16, 2021)

**Sponsors:**      Prince

Approve the assessment.

Cory Johnson, Renova Properties, appeared via phone

Moermond: we are going to go through these one by one. I did have a chance to review the videos for any that have them. You have the packages from Mai Vang?

Johnson: yes, I do.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is a category 2 vacant building. Opened August 6, 2020, closed it shortly after on October 13 per your instructions as permits were finalized. Total pending assessment of \$2,284.

Moermond: it went into the program August 6, 2020 and 2 months later they had taken care of everything, right?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: for 2 months I will recommend deleting the assessment. Next we have a cleanup, occurred August 6, 2020, TA 21-108.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is for a summary abatement order issued July 10, compliance date of July 16. Ordered to remove rubbish in yard, driveway, and pickup truck bed. Rechecked July 16 and found in noncompliance. Parks did the work August 6. Total pending assessment of \$562.

*Moermond: two summary abatement orders were sent?*

*Yannarely: there's a notation indicating that, but I don't see that.*

*Moermond: it was rechecked two dates, the 21 and 28. Why are you appealing Mr. Johnson?*

*Johnson: maybe I can save us all some time. For all of the abatements my ask is the same. There are occupants, they aren't tenants, they haven't paid a dime ever. I took this over with the intention of paying them to leave to flip the property and resell. They wanted \$12,000 to leave, so it wasn't doable. Finally I got fed up because the eviction moratorium kept being extended. They are leaving on the 28th one way or the other. They were ignoring me, they didn't care. They didn't pay rent or take care of the place. I told them to clean up the premises. They ignored me because they knew I couldn't get rid of them. My hands were tied. I guess my ask is that if there's some way we can get rid of them or reduce, it would be helpful. I was put into a bad spot with the moratorium.*

*Moermond: why didn't you go clean up the property?*

*Johnson: I'm not their maid. They have a lease agreement. I am not the trash man. I went over there constantly telling them to do it. I just kept eating these citations.*

*Moermond: and now you'd like the rest of the taxpayers to eat the cost of the property you invested in?*

*Johnson: I feel like the inspector kind of made this her pet project since it was such a problem house. She was going over there constantly, or the neighbors were calling. You know, it was constant. Sometimes I'd go over there and it didn't seem like what was being cited was what was going on.*

*Moermond: I looked at the video. There was a ton of stuff in the yard, plus a fair bit of children's toys. Those items were left. The garbage and tires and other items were removed and from what I can tell that was legitimate. Orders were issued and it took nearly four weeks for them to do the cleanup. You had tons of times to resolve this, either through your lease or on your own. For this assessment I'm recommending approval. Next, we have a cleanup September 16, 2020, TA 21-109.*

*Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is a summary abatement order to abate overflowing garbage into alley, loose trash, broken glass, a mattress, basketball hoops on side, and two trucks in back driveway with bags full of bagged and loose trash and yard full of trunk. Orders were sent September 16, with a compliance date of September 23, 2021. Work was done by Parks September 29 for a total proposed assessment of \$600.*

*Moermond: this looks very much like the previous case from the month before, except the time between orders and cleanup was 2 weeks. Is your appeal on the same grounds or do you have additional information?*

*Johnson: same.*

*Moermond: I did review the video; it was consistent with what was orders and what was taken. I'll recommend approval.*



*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: orders were written to remove broken furniture from yard, metal shelving against tree and trash piled behind the shed. October 13 orders were sent, work order was issued with the vacant building file and since was closed.*

*Moermond: the summary abatement order wasn't issued. There was a computer glitch so it wasn't mailed. Is that what you have?*

*Yannarely: yes.*

*Moermond: so for this one, the work was done but not properly noticed, so recommend its deletion of \$498 total. Next we have item 5, TA 21-205.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is an excessive consumption issued regarding the rubbish in yard, driveway, and truck bed for the July 10 orders. Total assessment is \$279.*

*Moermond: the excessive consumption letters, the one issued on July 10 was because of multiple violations and another listed July 21 which was for noncompliance by date of the deadline?*

*Yannarely: yes.*

*Moermond: why are you appealing this one?*

*Johnson: same thing kid of. This one occurred before I even owned the property.*

*Moermond: when?*

*Johnson: we closed July 31, 2020.*

*Moermond: the problem is that the first letter. It was issued July 10, so the seller knew this was a bill on the property and would become a pending assessment. Evidently they didn't disclose this to you as legally required. Similarly, July 21 there was another letter to Mr. Francisco. He had the information prior to closing and there was a bill attached to it. Normally, if someone is forthright in this transaction they disclose this to the purchaser. Can you tell me what happened?*

*Johnson: I did know there was some assessments. I knew what the situation was going into the purchase and had a plan of action. But as far as these two, I don't have the file in front of me. He did give me some letters with abatement orders before purchase, but I don't know if this was among that bunch. I'm not sure if he disclosed or not I guess.*

*Moermond: I will cut you a little break on this one. We had just talked about the cleanup occurring August 6, from July 10th orders. It looks to me like the inspector billed you for the first one and then not for the second one. Basically that de facto extension cost \$122. The City did end up cleaning it up, so I'm going to delete this resinspection. So that goes down \$122. The other was related to multiple visits, I might be more sympathetic except that this trip was the fifth violation in a 12-month time period. That's pretty bad. That's a lot of City resources. So for this one, I will recommend reducing \$279 to \$157. I'm deleting one of those \$122 bills.*

Johnson: every bit helps, I guess.

Moermond: Well, we're doing what we can here. Next is TA 21-107.

Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is another excessive consumption, for inspections during August 26 to September 21, 2020. Date of the orders was September 3, with a compliance date of September 8. It was rechecked Sept 8, but per your ruling on September 1, issuing EC fine for failing to finalize permits and vacate house. The cost is a total assessment of \$279.

Moermond: so we have a revoked C of O. They didn't empty the house, per instruction, but rather than forcing the vacate the office issued an excessive consumption fine. Because of Covid it couldn't be emptied by the City because it is an administrative matter rather than being condemned for unfit for human habitation. The City is similarly situated to a landlord in that case. Mr. Johnson, tell me about this one?

Johnson: I've been trying to get these people out since I bought end the place at the end of July. I was offering to pay them to leave, they wouldn't leave. The moratorium prevented me from evicting them. There was nothing I could do to comply to this one.

Moermond: right. That is the only tool in the City's toolbox to get compliance with the Council's decision. There were extensions given to the best of my recollection, as well as a Herculean effort to get this taken care of by the previous owner. I'm going to recommend this is approved for that reason.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2021**

**4 RLH TA 21-110** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1670 SEVENTH STREET. (File No. J2110A, Assessment No. 218509)

Sponsors: Prince

Delete the assessment.

Cory Johnson, Renova Properties, appeared via phone

Moermond: we are going to go through these one by one. I did have a chance to review the videos for any that have them. You have the packages from Mai Vang?

Johnson: yes, I do.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is a category 2 vacant building. Opened August 6, 2020, closed it shortly after on October 13 per your instructions as permits were finalized. Total pending assessment of \$2,284.

Moermond: it went into the program August 6, 2020 and 2 months later they had taken care of everything, right?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: for 2 months I will recommend deleting the assessment. Next we have a cleanup, occurred August 6, 2020, TA 21-108.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is for a summary abatement order issued July 10, compliance date of July 16. Ordered to remove rubbish in yard,

driveway, and pickup truck bed. Rechecked July 16 and found in noncompliance. Parks did the work August 6. Total pending assessment of \$562.

Moermond: two summary abatement orders were sent?

Yannarely: there's a notation indicating that, but I don't see that.

Moermond: it was rechecked two dates, the 21 and 28. Why are you appealing Mr. Johnson?

Johnson: maybe I can save us all some time. For all of the abatements my ask is the same. There are occupants, they aren't tenants, they haven't paid a dime ever. I took this over with the intention of paying them to leave to flip the property and resell. They wanted \$12,000 to leave, so it wasn't doable. Finally I got fed up because the eviction moratorium kept being extended. They are leaving on the 28th one way or the other. They were ignoring me, they didn't care. They didn't pay rent or take care of the place. I told them to clean up the premises. They ignored me because they knew I couldn't get rid of them. My hands were tied. I guess my ask is that if there's some way we can get rid of them or reduce, it would be helpful. I was put into a bad spot with the moratorium.

Moermond: why didn't you go clean up the property?

Johnson: I'm not their maid. They have a lease agreement. I am not the trash man. I went over there constantly telling them to do it. I just kept eating these citations.

Moermond: and now you'd like the rest of the taxpayers to eat the cost of the property you invested in?

Johnson: I feel like the inspector kind of made this her pet project since it was such a problem house. She was going over there constantly, or the neighbors were calling. You know, it was constant. Sometimes I'd go over there and it didn't seem like what was being cited was what was going on.

Moermond: I looked at the video. There was a ton of stuff in the yard, plus a fair bit of children's toys. Those items were left. The garbage and tires and other items were removed and from what I can tell that was legitimate. Orders were issued and it took nearly four weeks for them to do the cleanup. You had tons of times to resolve this, either through your lease or on your own. For this assessment I'm recommending approval. Next, we have a cleanup September 16, 2020, TA 21-109.

Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is a summary abatement order to abate overflowing garbage into alley, loose trash, broken glass, a mattress, basketball hoops on side, and two trucks in back driveway with bags full of bagged and loose trash and yard full of trunk. Orders were sent September 16, with a compliance date of September 23, 2021. Work was done by Parks September 29 for a total proposed assessment of \$600.

Moermond: this looks very much like the previous case from the month before, except the time between orders and cleanup was 2 weeks. Is your appeal on the same grounds or do you have additional information?

Johnson: same.

Moermond: I did review the video; it was consistent with what was orders and what was taken. I'll recommend approval.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: orders were written to remove broken furniture from yard, metal shelving against tree and trash piled behind the shed. October 13 orders were sent, work order was issued with the vacant building file and since was closed.

Moermond: the summary abatement order wasn't issued. There was a computer glitch so it wasn't mailed. Is that what you have?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: so for this one, the work was done but not properly noticed, so recommend its deletion of \$498 total. Next we have item 5, TA 21-205.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is an excessive consumption issued regarding the rubbish in yard, driveway, and truck bed for the July 10 orders. Total assessment is \$279.

Moermond: the excessive consumption letters, the one issued on July 10 was because of multiple violations and another listed July 21 which was for noncompliance by date of the deadline?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: why are you appealing this one?

Johnson: same thing kid of. This one occurred before I even owned the property.

Moermond: when?

Johnson: we closed July 31, 2020.

Moermond: the problem is that the first letter. It was issued July 10, so the seller knew this was a bill on the property and would become a pending assessment. Evidently they didn't disclose this to you as legally required. Similarly, July 21 there was another letter to Mr. Francisco. He had the information prior to closing and there was a bill attached to it. Normally, if someone is forthright in this transaction they disclose this to the purchaser. Can you tell me what happened?

Johnson: I did know there was some assessments. I knew what the situation was going into the purchase and had a plan of action. But as far as these two, I don't have the file in front of me. He did give me some letters with abatement orders before purchase, but I don't know if this was among that bunch. I'm not sure if he disclosed or not I guess.

Moermond: I will cut you a little break on this one. We had just talked about the cleanup occurring August 6, from July 10th orders. It looks to me like the inspector billed you for the first one and then not for the second one. Basically that de facto extension cost \$122. The City did end up cleaning it up, so I'm going to delete this resinspection. So that goes down \$122. The other was related to multiple visits, I might be more sympathetic except that this trip was the fifth violation in a 12-month time period. That's pretty bad. That's a lot of City resources. So for this one, I will

recommend reducing \$279 to \$157. I'm deleting one of those \$122 bills.

Johnson: every bit helps, I guess.

Moermond: Well, we're doing what we can here. Next is TA 21-107.

Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is another excessive consumption, for inspections during August 26 to September 21, 2020. Date of the orders was September 3, with a compliance date of September 8. It was rechecked Sept 8, but per your ruling on September 1, issuing EC fine for failing to finalize permits and vacate house. The cost is a total assessment of \$279.

Moermond: so we have a revoked C of O. They didn't empty the house, per instruction, but rather than forcing the vacate the office issued an excessive consumption fine. Because of Covid it couldn't be emptied by the City because it is an administrative matter rather than being condemned for unfit for human habitation. The City is similarly situated to a landlord in that case. Mr. Johnson, tell me about this one?

Johnson: I've been trying to get these people out since I bought end the place at the end of July. I was offering to pay them to leave, they wouldn't leave. The moratorium prevented me from evicting them. There was nothing I could do to comply to this one.

Moermond: right. That is the only tool in the City's toolbox to get compliance with the Council's decision. There were extensions given to the best of my recollection, as well as a Herculean effort to get this taken care of by the previous owner. I'm going to recommend this is approved for that reason.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

- 5 RLH TA 21-105** Amending the previously ratified assessment to reduce the assessment for Excessive Use of Inspection or Abatement services billed during June 22 to July 22, 2020 at 1670 SEVENTH STREET EAST. (File No. J2103E, Assessment No. 218302)

**Sponsors:** Prince

Reduce assessment from \$279 to \$157.

Cory Johnson, Renova Properties, appeared via phone

Moermond: we are going to go through these one by one. I did have a chance to review the videos for any that have them. You have the packages from Mai Vang?

Johnson: yes, I do.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is a category 2 vacant building. Opened August 6, 2020, closed it shortly after on October 13 per your instructions as permits were finalized. Total pending assessment of \$2,284.

Moermond: it went into the program August 6, 2020 and 2 months later they had taken care of everything, right?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: for 2 months I will recommend deleting the assessment. Next we have a

*cleanup, occurred August 6, 2020, TA 21-108.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is for a summary abatement order issued July 10, compliance date of July 16. Ordered to remove rubbish in yard, driveway, and pickup truck bed. Rechecked July 16 and found in noncompliance. Parks did the work August 6. Total pending assessment of \$562.*

*Moermond: two summary abatement orders were sent?*

*Yannarely: there's a notation indicating that, but I don't see that.*

*Moermond: it was rechecked two dates, the 21 and 28. Why are you appealing Mr. Johnson?*

*Johnson: maybe I can save us all some time. For all of the abatements my ask is the same. There are occupants, they aren't tenants, they haven't paid a dime ever. I took this over with the intention of paying them to leave to flip the property and resell. They wanted \$12,000 to leave, so it wasn't doable. Finally I got fed up because the eviction moratorium kept being extended. They are leaving on the 28th one way or the other. They were ignoring me, they didn't care. They didn't pay rent or take care of the place. I told them to clean up the premises. They ignored me because they knew I couldn't get rid of them. My hands were tied. I guess my ask is that if there's some way we can get rid of them or reduce, it would be helpful. I was put into a bad spot with the moratorium.*

*Moermond: why didn't you go clean up the property?*

*Johnson: I'm not their maid. They have a lease agreement. I am not the trash man. I went over there constantly telling them to do it. I just kept eating these citations.*

*Moermond: and now you'd like the rest of the taxpayers to eat the cost of the property you invested in?*

*Johnson: I feel like the inspector kind of made this her pet project since it was such a problem house. She was going over there constantly, or the neighbors were calling. You know, it was constant. Sometimes I'd go over there and it didn't seem like what was being cited was what was going on.*

*Moermond: I looked at the video. There was a ton of stuff in the yard, plus a fair bit of children's toys. Those items were left. The garbage and tires and other items were removed and from what I can tell that was legitimate. Orders were issued and it took nearly four weeks for them to do the cleanup. You had tons of times to resolve this, either through your lease or on your own. For this assessment I'm recommending approval. Next, we have a cleanup September 16, 2020, TA 21-109.*

*Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is a summary abatement order to abate overflowing garbage into alley, loose trash, broken glass, a mattress, basketball hoops on side, and two trucks in back driveway with bags full of bagged and loose trash and yard full of trunk. Orders were sent September 16, with a compliance date of September 23, 2021. Work was done by Parks September 29 for a total proposed assessment of \$600.*

*Moermond: this looks very much like the previous case from the month before, except the time between orders and cleanup was 2 weeks. Is your appeal on the same*

grounds or do you have additional information?

Johnson: same.

Moermond: I did review the video; it was consistent with what was orders and what was taken. I'll recommend approval.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: orders were written to remove broken furniture from yard, metal shelving against tree and trash piled behind the shed. October 13 orders were sent, work order was issued with the vacant building file and since was closed.

Moermond: the summary abatement order wasn't issued. There was a computer glitch so it wasn't mailed. Is that what you have?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: so for this one, the work was done but not properly noticed, so recommend its deletion of \$498 total. Next we have item 5, TA 21-205.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is an excessive consumption issued regarding the rubbish in yard, driveway, and truck bed for the July 10 orders. Total assessment is \$279.

Moermond: the excessive consumption letters, the one issued on July 10 was because of multiple violations and another listed July 21 which was for noncompliance by date of the deadline?

Yannarely: yes.

Moermond: why are you appealing this one?

Johnson: same thing kid of. This one occurred before I even owned the property.

Moermond: when?

Johnson: we closed July 31, 2020.

Moermond: the problem is that the first letter. It was issued July 10, so the seller knew this was a bill on the property and would become a pending assessment. Evidently they didn't disclose this to you as legally required. Similarly, July 21 there was another letter to Mr. Francisco. He had the information prior to closing and there was a bill attached to it. Normally, if someone is forthright in this transaction they disclose this to the purchaser. Can you tell me what happened?

Johnson: I did know there was some assessments. I knew what the situation was going into the purchase and had a plan of action. But as far as these two, I don't have the file in front of me. He did give me some letters with abatement orders before purchase, but I don't know if this was among that bunch. I'm not sure if he disclosed or not I guess.

Moermond: I will cut you a little break on this one. We had just talked about the cleanup occurring August 6, from July 10th orders. It looks to me like the inspector billed you for the first one and then not for the second one. Basically that de facto

extension cost \$122. The City did end up cleaning it up, so I'm going to delete this resinspection. So that goes down \$122. The other was related to multiple visits, I might be more sympathetic except that this trip was the fifth violation in a 12-month time period. That's pretty bad. That's a lot of City resources. So for this one, I will recommend reducing \$279 to \$157. I'm deleting one of those \$122 bills.

Johnson: every bit helps, I guess.

Moermond: Well, we're doing what we can here. Next is TA 21-107.

Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is another excessive consumption, for inspections during August 26 to September 21, 2020. Date of the orders was September 3, with a compliance date of September 8. It was rechecked Sept 8, but per your ruling on September 1, issuing EC fine for failing to finalize permits and vacate house. The cost is a total assessment of \$279.

Moermond: so we have a revoked C of O. They didn't empty the house, per instruction, but rather than forcing the vacate the office issued an excessive consumption fine. Because of Covid it couldn't be emptied by the City because it is an administrative matter rather than being condemned for unfit for human habitation. The City is similarly situated to a landlord in that case. Mr. Johnson, tell me about this one?

Johnson: I've been trying to get these people out since I bought end the place at the end of July. I was offering to pay them to leave, they wouldn't leave. The moratorium prevented me from evicting them. There was nothing I could do to comply to this one.

Moermond: right. That is the only tool in the City's toolbox to get compliance with the Council's decision. There were extensions given to the best of my recollection, as well as a Herculean effort to get this taken care of by the previous owner. I'm going to recommend this is approved for that reason.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

**6 RLH TA 21-107** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1670 SEVENTH STREET EAST. (File No. J2105E, Assessment No. 218304)

Sponsors: Prince

Approve the assessment.

Cory Johnson, Renova Properties, appeared via phone

Moermond: we are going to go through these one by one. I did have a chance to review the videos for any that have them. You have the packages from Mai Vang?

Johnson: yes, I do.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is a category 2 vacant building. Opened August 6, 2020, closed it shortly after on October 13 per your instructions as permits were finalized. Total pending assessment of \$2,284.

Moermond: it went into the program August 6, 2020 and 2 months later they had taken care of everything, right?

Yannarely: yes.



*Moermond: for 2 months I will recommend deleting the assessment. Next we have a cleanup, occurred August 6, 2020, TA 21-108.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is for a summary abatement order issued July 10, compliance date of July 16. Ordered to remove rubbish in yard, driveway, and pickup truck bed. Rechecked July 16 and found in noncompliance. Parks did the work August 6. Total pending assessment of \$562.*

*Moermond: two summary abatement orders were sent?*

*Yannarely: there's a notation indicating that, but I don't see that.*

*Moermond: it was rechecked two dates, the 21 and 28. Why are you appealing Mr. Johnson?*

*Johnson: maybe I can save us all some time. For all of the abatements my ask is the same. There are occupants, they aren't tenants, they haven't paid a dime ever. I took this over with the intention of paying them to leave to flip the property and resell. They wanted \$12,000 to leave, so it wasn't doable. Finally I got fed up because the eviction moratorium kept being extended. They are leaving on the 28th one way or the other. They were ignoring me, they didn't care. They didn't pay rent or take care of the place. I told them to clean up the premises. They ignored me because they knew I couldn't get rid of them. My hands were tied. I guess my ask is that if there's some way we can get rid of them or reduce, it would be helpful. I was put into a bad spot with the moratorium.*

*Moermond: why didn't you go clean up the property?*

*Johnson: I'm not their maid. They have a lease agreement. I am not the trash man. I went over there constantly telling them to do it. I just kept eating these citations.*

*Moermond: and now you'd like the rest of the taxpayers to eat the cost of the property you invested in?*

*Johnson: I feel like the inspector kind of made this her pet project since it was such a problem house. She was going over there constantly, or the neighbors were calling. You know, it was constant. Sometimes I'd go over there and it didn't seem like what was being cited was what was going on.*

*Moermond: I looked at the video. There was a ton of stuff in the yard, plus a fair bit of children's toys. Those items were left. The garbage and tires and other items were removed and from what I can tell that was legitimate. Orders were issued and it took nearly four weeks for them to do the cleanup. You had tons of times to resolve this, either through your lease or on your own. For this assessment I'm recommending approval. Next, we have a cleanup September 16, 2020, TA 21-109.*

*Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is a summary abatement order to abate overflowing garbage into alley, loose trash, broken glass, a mattress, basketball hoops on side, and two trucks in back driveway with bags full of bagged and loose trash and yard full of trunk. Orders were sent September 16, with a compliance date of September 23, 2021. Work was done by Parks September 29 for a total proposed assessment of \$600.*

*Moermond: this looks very much like the previous case from the month before, except the time between orders and cleanup was 2 weeks. Is your appeal on the same grounds or do you have additional information?*

*Johnson: same.*

*Moermond: I did review the video; it was consistent with what was orders and what was taken. I'll recommend approval.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: orders were written to remove broken furniture from yard, metal shelving against tree and trash piled behind the shed. October 13 orders were sent, work order was issued with the vacant building file and since was closed.*

*Moermond: the summary abatement order wasn't issued. There was a computer glitch so it wasn't mailed. Is that what you have?*

*Yannarely: yes.*

*Moermond: so for this one, the work was done but not properly noticed, so recommend its deletion of \$498 total. Next we have item 5, TA 21-205.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is an excessive consumption issued regarding the rubbish in yard, driveway, and truck bed for the July 10 orders. Total assessment is \$279.*

*Moermond: the excessive consumption letters, the one issued on July 10 was because of multiple violations and another listed July 21 which was for noncompliance by date of the deadline?*

*Yannarely: yes.*

*Moermond: why are you appealing this one?*

*Johnson: same thing kid of. This one occurred before I even owned the property.*

*Moermond: when?*

*Johnson: we closed July 31, 2020.*

*Moermond: the problem is that the first letter. It was issued July 10, so the seller knew this was a bill on the property and would become a pending assessment. Evidently they didn't disclose this to you as legally required. Similarly, July 21 there was another letter to Mr. Francisco. He had the information prior to closing and there was a bill attached to it. Normally, if someone is forthright in this transaction they disclose this to the purchaser. Can you tell me what happened?*

*Johnson: I did know there was some assessments. I knew what the situation was going into the purchase and had a plan of action. But as far as these two, I don't have the file in front of me. He did give me some letters with abatement orders before purchase, but I don't know if this was among that bunch. I'm not sure if he disclosed or not I guess.*

*Moermond: I will cut you a little break on this one. We had just talked about the*

cleanup occurring August 6, from July 10th orders. It looks to me like the inspector billed you for the first one and then not for the second one. Basically that de facto extension cost \$122. The City did end up cleaning it up, so I'm going to delete this resinspection. So that goes down \$122. The other was related to multiple visits, I might be more sympathetic except that this trip was the fifth violation in a 12-month time period. That's pretty bad. That's a lot of City resources. So for this one, I will recommend reducing \$279 to \$157. I'm deleting one of those \$122 bills.

Johnson: every bit helps, I guess.

Moermond: Well, we're doing what we can here. Next is TA 21-107.

Staff report by Joe Yannarely: this is another excessive consumption, for inspections during August 26 to September 21, 2020. Date of the orders was September 3, with a compliance date of September 8. It was rechecked Sept 8, but per your ruling on September 1, issuing EC fine for failing to finalize permits and vacate house. The cost is a total assessment of \$279.

Moermond: so we have a revoked C of O. They didn't empty the house, per instruction, but rather than forcing the vacate the office issued an excessive consumption fine. Because of Covid it couldn't be emptied by the City because it is an administrative matter rather than being condemned for unfit for human habitation. The City is similarly situated to a landlord in that case. Mr. Johnson, tell me about this one?

Johnson: I've been trying to get these people out since I bought end the place at the end of July. I was offering to pay them to leave, they wouldn't leave. The moratorium prevented me from evicting them. There was nothing I could do to comply to this one.

Moermond: right. That is the only tool in the City's toolbox to get compliance with the Council's decision. There were extensions given to the best of my recollection, as well as a Herculean effort to get this taken care of by the previous owner. I'm going to recommend this is approved for that reason.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/17/2021**

## 9:00 a.m. Hearings

- 7      **RLH TA 21-100**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 308 COMO AVENUE. (File No. J2104A, Assessment No. 218503)

Sponsors:            Thao

Approve the assessment.

No one appeared

Moermond: so the property owner is no longer appealing?

Mai Vang: I spoke with her and she wanted to know if it was the same cleanup that they had done. I sent her the videos and photos and she looked and said she wasn't aware, but because it was a different cleanup she wasn't going to appeal. She would just pay it.

Moermond: so she was confused and then agreed to pay.

---

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

- 8 [RLH TA 21-102](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1314 FOURTH STREET EAST. (File No. J2106A, Assessment No. 218505)

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Layover to LH March 2, 2021 at 9 am (unable to reach owner).*

*Tried calling 9:15 am - unable to leave message*

*Tried calling 9:21 am – unable to leave message*

*Tried calling 9:34 am – unable to leave message*

*Moermond: the date of the original Legislative Hearing date was November 17, with a February 3 Council Public Hearing. What's going on here and why do we have it today? Sent back from Council?*

*Mai Vang: she called me the day of the Public Hearing. I told her I couldn't put a packet together that quickly, so we referred it back to today. I sent her the photos and it was just a box spring that was sitting by the container.*

*Moermond: just the springs?*

*Vang: yes, the bare springs. She said she got notice but she still wanted to appeal.*

*Moermond: we don't have a Council Public Hearing date for this, so let's lay this over to March 2, 2021 at 9 am and email her a confirmation. If we can't reach her, this will go to Council on March 17*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/2/2021**

- 9 [RLH TA 21-103](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1027 IGLEHART AVENUE. (File No. J2014A1, Assessment No. 208544)

**Sponsors:** Thao

*Delete the assessment.*

*Michelle Schumacher appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is a Summary Abatement Order for snow and ice on public sidewalk. Orders were sent December 5, 2019, compliance date of 48 hours. Rechecked December 13 and found in noncompliance. The abatement was done December 16 for a total cost of \$322.*

*Moermond: Ms. Schumacher, why are you appealing?*

*Schumacher: I purchased the property December 6, 2019. It was a lot. We didn't receive any notification; it went to the previous owner. That was North Star Construction. My guess is the guy assumed it was cared for prior to purchase. It wasn't, obviously. I never got a notification to the address of the homeowner, myself.*

*Moermond: the notification went to the previous owner at the same time you assumed ownership, therefore you didn't get legal notification. I can tell you based on the snow and ice there hadn't been anything done for weeks, it was really bad. It wasn't for no*

reason the City was out there. I'm going to recommend deletion because of the timing of orders.

Schumacher: great, I appreciate it.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

- 10 RLH TA 21-104** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1708 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST. (File No. VB2105, Assessment No. 218804)

**Sponsors:** Prince

Delete the assessment.

No one appeared

Moermond: when I reviewed the file with staff on Friday, we observed it was only in the vacant building program for two months. Normally we would do a 90-day waiver, so I'm going to recommend this is deleted entirely. Ms. Vang talked to the property owner.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/17/2021**

- 11 RLH TA 21-118** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 105 ROSE AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2111A, Assessment No. 218510)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

Delete the assessment.

Lynn Connolly, owner, appeared via phone

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this was for a Summary Abatement Order issued to remove mattresses from rear of property, near the alley. Orders were issued October 27, compliance date of November 3. It was rechecked November 3 and found in noncompliance. Parks did the abatement November 5 for a total proposed assessment of \$442.

Moermond: so we have a mattress and box springs tucked behind a white fence along the alley.

Connolly: that is outside of our yard. The gate is the back end and then there's the garage.

Moermond: why are you appealing?

Connolly: we contacted our trash service to have them picked up on September 16. They said we were too late for that Friday pickup, but it would be picked up the following Friday. It was within our bulky items, we had two we hadn't used. We left for Rochester, to the Mayo September 20. My husband was diagnosed with terminal cancer and was starting his treatment and chemo on May 21. We came home from Rochester on the 12th and I started going through my mail. My daughter had been collecting it for us. I hadn't even looked in the alley, we park in front. I spoke to Mr. Williams immediately when I got this. It was supposed to be picked up. He said he wondered because your property is usually clean. He said it was already picked up,

was sorry it happened, and then to appeal because there was nothing he could do.

*Moermond: it looks like the hauler is Advanced and your collection days are Fridays. Two things, yes I will recommend this assessment gets deleted. Second, we are going to flag this situation for Chris Swanson, who manages the contract for garbage hauling, so he knows the ball was dropped on this and caused problems for the property owner.*

*Connolly: that would be wonderful because this isn't the first time this has happened. Fortunately we were home that time. My husband had noticed it hadn't been picked up, so we followed up and they said they had it noted that we had called in, but yet hadn't been picked up.*

*Moermond: we'll make sure that's noted to our staff. Them not following through meant you had to go through this whole situation. We'll make sure this gets flagged.*

*Connolly: since then we found out the cancer has metastasized so it hasn't been a good few months.*

*Moermond: I'm so sorry to hear that. Take care of yourself, I wish you both the best. We will take care of things on this end.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/7/2021**

**12**     [RLH TA 21-67](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1802 ROSS AVENUE. (File No. VB2104, Assessment No. 218803)

**Sponsors:**     Prince

*Duplicate file; withdrawn and archived.*

*Moermond: This is for 1802 Ross, for a vacant building fee. VB 21-04 was already heard and is set to be considered by Council March 17. What we have today is a duplicate file, also for VB 21-04. This file will be withdrawn and archived.*

**Withdrawn**

**10:00 a.m. Hearings**

**13**     [RLH TA 21-32](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 721 VAN BUREN AVENUE. (File No. CRT2104, Assessment No. 218203)

**Sponsors:**     Jalali

*Reduce assessment from \$363 to \$156.*

*Jeffrey Emig, owner, appeared via phone  
Winnie Crosbie, seller, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: were conducting a follow up Legislative Hearing on the Fire C of O for 721 Van Buren.*

*Staff report by Supervisor AJ Neis: an appointment letter was sent July 2, 2020 to Winnie Crosby in St. Louis Park for an inspection July 13, 2020 by Inspector Harriel. On July 13 an inspection was done and he created a list of deficiencies. Reinspection was set for August 13. That was performed and done. On August 13 everything was*

done except the exterior numbers so he approved a C of O with corrections. Subsequently a picture was sent with the garage numbers on August 14, 2020. It is my understanding the former property owner was in contact with the inspector and said the house was in the process of being sold. Inspector Harriel informed them that while he was there the C of O was still due as there were renters still residing there. Based on the fact it was occupied by tenants and before the closing date, he would do the inspection. The reason why we do that is because people often tell us they are going to sell and the sale falls through and we'll close out the referral thinking it will be owner occupied and then it isn't.

Moermond: Mr. Emig finds he gets the assessment letter for the Fire C of O costs and this isn't something that was brought up in the closing.

Emig: correct.

Moermond: what I notice in this situation is we have an appointment letter in July, and inspection, a follow up in August, and then you follow up with the inspector August 14 with pictures. But yes August 13 you said you didn't need the inspection because you were selling. I guess I'm wondering why you sent the follow up pictures to show compliance, but also you already had a bill in your hand at time of sale. What was going on with your thinking on that?

Crosbie: I didn't want to try for the new rental license knowing I was selling it. I know he said sometimes the deal falls through, but we can always apply for one if it falls through. I had no intention of keeping it. I feel it is unfair I am forced to get a rental license for the next year because I didn't need it.

Moermond: did you have renters in the property in 2020?

Crosbie: yes.

Moermond: when did they leave?

Neis: I just wanted to point out that if that was her argument, the C of O renewal was due April 9, 2019. So while we may have inspected it later, the renewal period began April of 2019.

Crosbie: the tenant closed on his house in June of 2020, so he must have left in June.

Moermond: sometimes they don't leave when they close. They do renovations.

Crosbie: this was a new house.

Moermond: do you have the documents or are you just saying that?

Crosbie: no, I have it. He moved out the end of June.

Moermond: so you got appointment letters the beginning of July. Why didn't you say something then? Why wait six weeks to have that conversation when you already had the letters in your hand?

Crosbie: I don't know why, but when he came to see the house he should have seen the house was vacant.

*Moermond: and he sees it is vacant, but that means you're in between renters more often than not.*

*Crosbie: the house was on the market by then. I did call and say I don't think I need this inspection.*

*Moermond: there is record of you calling but it was 6 weeks after the original appointment letter. In fact, one inspection already had taken place. You communicated August 13 at 10:13 am and your second inspection was that same day at 4:15 p.m. You kind of knew what was going on and didn't communicate timely.*

*Crosbie: I think the initial inspection I already was against, but the inspector said the house wasn't sold so I had to have the inspection. So I just let it happen. Later on I questioned why I needed it when I'm selling.*

*Moermond: you aren't new to this game and you had the ability to appeal the appointment letter and the orders that were sent. Why didn't I see an appeal? I know you know how.*

*Crosbie: I probably was busy and overlooked it.*

*Moermond: you are a real estate professional. It appears at the closing you didn't disclose to the buyer that two and a half weeks before closing you got a bill in the mail on the property. Why didn't you disclose that when you are a real estate professional?*

*Crosbie: I just am too busy and forgot about it and it is in my name, so I don't think it would affect the new owner.*

*Moermond: are you serious?*

*Crosbie: yes I am. It probably is my fault I didn't pay attention to that.*

*Moermond: how long have you been in this business?*

*Crosbie: a long time. But this is the first time this has happened. I never have sold a house of my own and had an inspection done on a house I'm selling. Yes, I'm an agent but this is the first time this has happened to me. If it was a regular occurrence, I would know how to handle it properly.*

*Moermond: so you didn't follow up with the inspector timely fashion, and you didn't disclose to the buyer you received a bill. I am troubled you are in real estate and didn't do either of those two things. You hear where I'm coming from?*

*Crosbie: yes, I do and you understand that this isn't a regular occurrence.*

*Moermond: does that mean taxpayers should be paying for this rather than you?*

*Crosbie: ok. I just feel the inspection when the house was already on the market—I know where you are coming from and me too. I will not have the new owner pay for that; it isn't his problem. if you insist I have to pay for it I will, but I'm trying to contest and show my point of view.*

*Moermond: do you have an LLC?*



Crosbie: yes.

Moermond: so what is the LLC you use to own your properties?

Crosbie: this property is Losam Losay Property, LLC.

Moermond: the 2020 property tax statement went to Losam Losay Properties, LLC c/o Scott and Winnie Crosbie in St Louis Park.

Crosbie: that is correct.

Moermond: Since the inspector heard from you the morning of your second inspection on August 13 that you didn't want the Fire C of O, may have had the option to reschedule until after a potential closing date. I'm going to recommend the Council reduce this in half, so from \$363 to \$156. This assessment will go to Mr. Emig. My expectation, Ms. Crosbie, is you reimburse him for this expense. We will respond to your email with this. I'm concerned you weren't making the legal disclosures properly in a closing. That troubles me. You hear where you are coming from.

Crosbie: yes, I do, but like I said it isn't something—

Moermond: you had many opportunities prior to August 13 to correct the situation, you didn't do that. The City did do inspections, so I'm struggling with your position on this. I'm being more than generous for giving you credit the inspector had the option to reschedule. Mr. Emig, you have contact information for our office. This is scheduled for Council Public Hearing February 24, next week. Within a week you will get an invoice for the reduce amount. I would anticipate Ms. Crosbie will have got you the money by then unless one of you testifies and the Council is inclined to reduce it further.

Crosbie: can I pay the City now?

Moermond: you probably can. Ms. Vang?

Vang: Tanya Panzer at 651-266-6153.

Crosbie: I will call her to arrange payment.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 2/24/2021**

**14 RLH TA 21-123** Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 899 BURR STREET. (File No. VB2103B, Assessment No. 218813)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Delete the assessment.

Lucas Ainsworth, owner, appeared via phone

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: this was a vacant building fee for a total assessment of \$2,284. The vacant building fee was 14, through July 20, 2020. The mail was returned to Lucas Ainsworth in Burr street. No forwarding address. It has been a category 1 vacant building, rehabbed and reoccupied. The vacant building file has been closed since then.

*Moermond: you are an owner occupant?*

*Ainsworth: yes, I homesteaded it. I forwarded that paperwork. The prior owner got some correspondence from you guys, The prior owner was listed on one of these. Not sure if it is this or a different one. It may be a later snow removal. Dan Mohr was sent some correspondence to an address in White Bear Lake. Oh, yes, it was for a snow removal. I'm not sure if he got this one. I spoke with your fire inspector back and forth about this vacant building fee and I sent him correspondence that because of Covid I couldn't get back home. I do work engineering out of state and because of the travel restrictions I couldn't get back. My girlfriend told me this was sent to me but I didn't have any way to get it in my hands, I had to go through her. I had my bills forwarded to her because of that, and then I had an issue with the City because my water bill was sent to that and they looked to her as an occupant. I never had any renters. The prior owner did have the building rented, that wasn't ever known to me. I did send an attached document of proof of homestead. I travel for work so I'm not always there. My girlfriend stops by. I'm home now, I don't have a job, but I was having it forwarded to her.*

*Moermond: I have a question, are you buying this property on a contract for deed?*

*Ainsworth: no. I went with a bank financing and paid off the original Contract for Deed. I do have a note with the bank. It was originally contract for deed. Then I got the bank financing and paid him off.*

*Moermond: something strange is happening in the computer system here. In 2017 I see the owner as Thomas Bohlen. From 2018 to present I see your name on the property taxes. What I don't see is a date of your purchase. The last official sale I see registered was from 2005. Because that was so long ago it looks like the contract for deed wasn't registered with the County. It is a good idea for you to reach out to the Ramsey County recorder's office and see what you need to square this away so your title looks the same as your situation.*

*Mai Vang: 651-266-2000 is their general number.*

*Moermond: I'm going to delete this vacant building fee; I think the notification situation is strange and I don't want to say that's your fault. It really does need to be squared away in the records.*

*Ainsworth: so I'm clear, what pertinent information am I inquiring about?*

*Moermond: I would tell them you are listed as the taxpayer since 2018, but you bought it on a contract for deed and that wasn't ever registered.*

*Ainsworth: so Dan Mohr failed to do that?*

*Moermond: yes, it was his responsibility. Then tell them you have traditional financing and that sales transaction isn't showing up. Ask them to help make the ownership information accurate in their office.*

*Ainsworth: do I need to contact my bank?*

*Moermond: I'd see what the Recorder's office needs. I don't know that. It may be a mistake on their end, but make sure you call them. You show up as the tax owner, but not as recorded sale.*

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021

- 15 RLH TA 21-121 Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 899 BURR STREET. (File No. J2019A, Assessment No. 208534)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

*Approve the assessment, make payable over 2 years.*

*Lucas Ainsworth, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: summary abatement order issued for snow and ice February 27, 2020, compliance date of February 29. Rechecked March 3, 2020 and found in noncompliance. Total assessment of \$322.*

*Ainsworth: I received the videos from Ms. Vang on these. March 4 is when they went there, and my guy that I pay, I spoke with him yesterday and sent the videos. I pay him for snow and ice removal since I'm out of town a lot. I'm not there during the week, usually just weekends. I watched the videos and spoke with him; he did put some sand and salt down but I read through your assessment on what is required as far as width. I just got another one today. It is a communication thing between to me. Unbeknownst to him and me, not knowing isn't an excuse. I'm just letting the Council know I'm using a third party to try and keep up with the city requirements. I guess the third party wasn't aware of the City requirements. I've voiced that to my company.*

*Moermond: when I look at this I'm seeing the Burr side of your sidewalk he did. You live on the corner of Burr and York?*

*Ainsworth: I think so.*

*Moermond: he ignored the York side.*

*Ainsworth: yes, towards the backyard. The flow for that sidewalk, he said it goes because there is a storm sewer gutter at the corner so when it melts you see the big ice dam. He says he cleared it. I told him to take pictures from now on. I need to talk to him today about the last storm. He says he clears it and then melts and it is all damming towards where those two sidewalks intersect. Everything that is coming down York, all of your flow comes from the corner. He says he cleared it all, but I don't have pictures.*

*Moermond: I'm kind of thinking your guy may be pulling your chain. I'm looking at orders from February 27. The two snow events preceding that were February 9 and February 17. 5 inches on the 9th, 2 more inches on the 17th. Ten days later your neighbors finally called it in. When I look at the Burr side, it is evident he went and hacked away at the Burr side, you can see the line where there is 5" worth of ice. That isn't consistent with how he describes things. Additionally I'm looking at the high temperatures and there were plenty of days over 32 degrees so the salt and sand would have worked. It looked completely neglected for a long period of time. That's an ankle breaker, so I'm struggling here.*

*Ainsworth: your guy pans to the right on the second video, and there's a big pool of water by the telephone pole in the street where York meets Burr. I do see what you're seeing, on the one video it looks like he literally stops where York starts. He did Burr and didn't even do the corner. I get he quit.*

*Moermond: that's the one we're talking about now. You can even see the thick ice on the boulevard that he has hacked out so it is possible. So I'm recommending approval. Would it be useful to have payments divided over a couple years?*

*Ainsworth: yes, I'm unemployed and not getting unemployment payments.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

- 16 RLH TA 21-122** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 899 BURR STREET. (File No. J2110A, Assessment No. 218509) (Public hearing continued to September 8, 2021)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

*Continue PH to September 8, 2021. If no same or similar violations reduce assessment from \$450 to \$150. If there are same or similar violations, approve the assessment and make payable over 2 years.*

*Lucas Ainsworth, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by supervisor Lisa Martin: October 5, 2020 orders were sent to remove discarded bags and toilet from front yard. Compliance date of October 12, rechecked October 13 and found in noncompliance. The crew went out October 14 and did the work for a total proposed assessment of \$450.*

*Moermond: so orders go out October 5, crew goes out October 14. Why are you appealing this?*

*Ainsworth: I was actually doing some construction in the house; I didn't need a permit. I actually had a company coming to pick that up. I didn't receive this correspondence. I don't know why I didn't get it. I didn't get mail on either one of these, the ice one or this abatement. I was home around this time. On the 14th I wasn't working, I was in between projects. I hired a third party to come pick it up, that's why it was put out there. I didn't know there was any type of paperwork to clean this up. They called me and said they stopped to pick it up and it wasn't there. I am not sure what happened here. This is the one that was actually sent to Dan Mohr in White Bear Lake.*

*Moermond: for previous assessments the assessment went to you, occupant and Can Mohr in White Bear Lake. Two letters were sent to Burr. None were sent back. For this one only one assessment, it was sent and it was to you at your address.*

*Ainsworth: I never received any of this. I spoke with my girlfriend also, she said she never saw anything on either one of these. The first time I saw them was when Ms. Vang sent them last week on February 11. That's why these are surprises to me. I'm going to call Mr. Mohr. If he says that he never received anything then that's a problem and that's why I'm appealing*

*Moermond: and I hear what you're saying is going on with your mail. I hear you had called to have someone remove these items, but you also said you are planning on selling?*

*Ainsworth: no. I asked if the assessments since you are splitting them, what would happen if I decided to sell.*

*Moermond: thank you for clarifying. What I'd like to see is no more problems with the*

*maintenance of your property. I'm going to ask the Council to look at this one September 8, 2021. If there are no same or similar violations, I'll ask them to decrease it to \$150. if there are, I will ask them to approve and make payable over 2 years.*

*Ainsworth: and I hope the Council realizes that I'm following CDC guidelines and not all people work 9to 5 in their home state within driving distance of their house. I didn't create these guidelines.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

**17 RLH TA 21-98**

**Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 869 JENKS AVENUE. (File No. J2014A1, Assessment No. 208544)**

**Sponsors:** Yang

*Approve the assessment (assessment has been paid).*

*Joel Stiras appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: this is for a summary abatement order for a tote container, garbage, and other miscellaneous debris in rear yard near the alley. Orders were sent December 13, 2019, compliance date of December 20, 2019. It was rechecked December 20 and the work was done December 27, 2019 for a total assessment of \$450. Mail was sent to the occupant, Renter's Warehouse, and Joel Stiras in Minneapolis.*

*Moermond: why are you appealing?*

*Stiras: when the assessment was issued I paid it. The problem is my tenant that lives there is a Liberian lady in her 60's living there alone. The trash is from people dumping, we suspect the house 2 doors down. My tenant has a language barrier so when she contacts the inspector on the orders she gets frustrated trying to explain she isn't responsible, and then gets mad. She isn't equipped to deal with it. I paid the assessment, but I have problems with her financial problems. The governor's orders prevent me from evicting her, she hasn't paid me any money from February of 2020. I'm asking for any help. I saw the video; I'm disappointed she didn't make an effort to clean it. I'm just trying to relieve some financial stress for her not paying rent for a year.*

*Moermond: you said you paid the assessment?*

*Stiras: I did.*

*Moermond: that means you agree with it when you write a check instead of going through this process. The other thing I notice is that you didn't clean it up either, even though you got the letter, as well as your property manager. They didn't take action either. I'm thinking it would have cost you \$100 at most.*

*Stiras: sure.*

*Moermond: that didn't happen. I'm sympathetic you haven't received rent, but having paid the assessment I don't have a lot of options here. I did just double check and you have no pending assessments. I don't know what I can do for you, sir, since it has been paid.*

*Stiras: that's fine. I was just surprised to see the paperwork again.*

*Moermond: if that garage has an electrical hookup, it may be useful to install a motion light and some no dumping signs. Those things help a lot. I wish I could do more for you today.*

*Stiras: thank you for your time.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

- 18 RLH TA 21-120** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 646 FULLER AVENUE. (File No. J2112A, Assessment No. 218511)

**Sponsors:** Thao

*Delete the assessment.*

*Richard Bowen appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: this is for a summary abatement order to dispose of disassembled drawers and miscellaneous debris from rear of property by the alley. Orders were sent November 3, 2020 with a compliance date of November 10. It was rechecked November 10 and found in noncompliance, work was done November 17 for a total proposed assessment of \$478. No history on the property since 2014.*

*Moermond: so definitely a one off. Mr. Bowen, what happened?*

*Bowen: I got the notice that someone had dumped a dresser on my property, the alley side of my fence. I wasn't sure if it was my neighbors. By the date I was supposed to be done I had taken it apart and drug it 25 feet to the west by my can to be picked up by Highland. I'm in my 70's with health issues, but I did it. I have the smallest can, so my trash is picked up once every 2 weeks.*

*Moermond: I think you made a good faith effort on something that was half in the alley and half on your property and you have absolutely no history. So between those two things I'll recommend deletion of this assessment.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/7/2021**

- 19 RLH TA 21-80** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 661 LAWSON AVENUE EAST. (File No. J2110A, Assessment No. 218509) (Legislative Hearing on March 2, 2021)

**Sponsors:** Yang

*Layover to LH March 2, 2021 at 10 am (interpreter needed and unable to reach owner).*

*No one appeared*

*Tried calling February 16, 2021 11:36 am – unable to leave message.*

*Talked to appellant 11:51 am – need an interpreter; will call back in 30 minutes.*

*Louis, Language Line Interpreter, on the line for third attempt.*

Voicemail left February 16, 2021 at 12:16 am – rescheduled to March 2, 2020 between 10 and 11:30 and will have an interpreter on the line. Any questions call 651-266-8515.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

20 [RLH TA 21-99](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 876 MARGARET STREET. (File No. J2015A, Assessment No. 208515) (Public hearing continued to September 8, 2021)

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Continue the PH to September 8, 2021. If PO installs motion light, camera and no dumping signs, as well as has no same or similar violations, delete the assessment.*

*Dustin Washam, owner, appeared via phone*

*Washam: I can save you some time, I thought it was for this year, this last month. I didn't realize it was from last year and I totally agree with one, the one for snow removal. I was on vacation, so that's fine.*

*Moermond: so withdrawing your appeal on that.*

*Washam: then one for a couch in my alley. That I would like to talk about.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: Summary abatement order was sent for furniture in the rear yard near the alley. Orders were sent January 2, 2020 with a compliance date of January 8, 2020. Work was done January 10, 2020 for a total assessment of \$478. No returned mail. There are 4 previous complaints at the property from 2019, then 3 in 2020, all were abated by owner except a September 4, 2020 vehicle abatement sent to parking enforcement.*

*Moermond: what was going on with the couch?*

*Washam: it wasn't mine. Someone left it back there. The back alley behind there, there are couches and mattresses duped constantly. What should I do? I don't have the means or money to take care of it. Is there something the City offers?*

*Moermond: the first thing is, what size garbage can do you have?*

*Washam: same size as my recycling container.*

*Moermond: so every year your bill covers 3 bulky items with no additional cost to you. Do you have electric to your garage?*

*Washam: yes. I am planning on putting a camera and security light up. I'm waiting for it to get warmer to put it up.*

*Moermond: on top of doing that, consider putting up two signs, one saying no dumping and one saying under video surveillance. Between the lights and signage you may be in a better position. Do you know who your hauler is?*

*Washam: Waste Management.*

*Moermond: if this happens again, call them and if they have a couple days' notice they can send out a truck to pick it up. If you do those things we talked about and have no*

*other same or similar violations through September 8, 2021 I'll delete this assessment then. Follow through on your side and I can delete the whole thing.*

*Washam: that sounds good.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2021**

- 21 [RLH TA 21-101](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 876 MARGARET STREET. (File No. J2016A, Assessment No. 208524)

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Approve the assessment (appeal withdrawn by owner).*

*Dustin Washam, owner, appeared via phone*

*Washam: I can save you some time, I thought it was for this year, this last month. I didn't realize it was from last year and I totally agree with one, the one for snow removal. I was on vacation, so that's fine.*

*Moermond: so you are withdrawing your appeal on that.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2021**

- 22 [RLH TA 21-97](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1817 MARYLAND AVENUE EAST. (File No. J2105A, Assessment No. 218504)

**Sponsors:** Yang

*Layover to LH March 2, 2021 at 10 am (unable to reach owner).*

*tried calling February 16, 2021 at 11:51 am – unable to leave message.*

*Voicemail February 16, 2021 at 12:18 pm: this is our second call to reach Jennifer Viveros. We are going to reschedule to Tuesday, March 2 between 10 and 11:30 am. Please call Joanna Zimny at 651-266-8515 with questions.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/2/2021**

- 23 [RLH TA 21-74](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1214 PACIFIC STREET. (File No. J2110A, Assessment No. 218509)

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Approve the assessment.*

*Aaron Schumm, Reimagine Real Estate on behalf of Verburgt Holdings, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: you need to fill out a new Fire C of O form.*

*Schumm: we've done it a couple times.*

*Moermond: the notice went to the occupant, you, and a lot of people.*



*Schumm: we didn't get the one to Romahwe. I think it was rejected.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: this was a summary abatement order for garbage. It was sent October 19, 2020 with a compliance date of October 23. Rechecked the 23 and found in noncompliance. Work was done October 26 for total assessment of \$534. No returned mail and quite a history on the property.*

*Moermond: so the owner who is financially responsible did get notice*

*Martin: yes.*

*Schumm: the challenge is the owner lives in California. The Excelsior Boulevard address is a mailing box that gets forwarded to California. It gets mailed out, delivered 3 days later, goes to California, he finally sees it, and then talks to us. So there are delays there. In regard to the tenant that was there, we would drive by once a month to make sure the furnace filter was changed. When there was notice we'd go out, because of the eviction moratorium we haven't been able to get them out for the last year. Our hands are tied. We can only try to pressure them to clean. I do believe the trash one we got in time; the challenge was because it has been a targeted property due to the excessive consumptions. There was a wave runner covered and a tarp and old pool in the yard, and that's what was the basis for the charge.*

*Moermond: did you see the video and package?*

*Schumm: I did. We did pay to get the tenants out and after seeing the video if you want to charge it, fine. But I wanted to correct the mailing address so we get it.*

*Moermond: why doesn't the owner change the mailing address to their address in San Diego?*

*Schumm: I don't know that answer.*

*Moermond: seems they would get their mail faster.*

*Schumm: but-for this problem there hasn't been an issue since we're the property management company. Other than this instance it hasn't been an issue. That's what he's paying us to do. Part of the other problem is most owners don't want their personal address of record somewhere because of angry tenants.*

*Moermond: when I looked at the video I saw a lot of household junk in the yard, but the troubling item was raw kitchen garbage all throughout the property. That is something that is a problem.*

*Schumm: it would have been a disaster had it been summer, yeah.*

*Moermond: yes, I still wouldn't have wanted to be the neighbor. Ms. Martin, was this a field find or a complaint from a neighbor?*

*Martin: it was a complaint that came in. This property needs more eyes on it, obviously.*

*Moermond: do you have an email address for Verburgt holdings?*

*Schumm: you can send it to me.*

*Moermond: we'll need to Fire C of O form with your information and their signature. The legal responsibility is to make sure the owner of record gets notification, and it looks like they did and through their own mail management didn't get it as quickly as they would have liked. I'm going to recommend approval of this one.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/3/2021**

**24**     [RLH TA 21-75](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1214 PACIFIC STREET. (File No. J2104E, Assessment No. 218303)

**Sponsors:**     Prince

*Approve the assessment.*

*Aaron Schumm, Reimagine Real Estate on behalf of Verburgt Holdings, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: we have five vehicles lacking tabs, unapproved surface. We did talk to a Katie in Management, and were given an extension and it was removed, but because there were more than three complaints in 12 months the Excessive Consumption fee is automatically generated. This was a total assessment of \$157.*

*Moermond: I'm not seeing the bill was issued for more than 3, I see noncompliance on deadline.*

*Martin: yes.*

*Moermond: July 22 noncompliance, for a bill on August 6, and extension had been granted and the extension was granted after the deadline to have things complete. The extension was requested July 17, a few days before the deadline. It was granted to go to August 4, 2020 and it was reinspected August 5 and it wasn't in compliance on the new deadline.*

*Martin: yes, then it was all taken care of by the new owner a couple weeks later.*

*Moermond: ok, so for not being done by the date of the extension. A trip charge.*

*Schumm m: at the end of the day I'm willing to accept these fines. I wanted to appeal on behalf of the owner. I wanted it on the record that this eviction moratorium causes a lot of problems to tenants who don't pay rent, and then they run up these extra charges. So we have to eat \$700 on top of the damage and repairs they did, and no rent. It is my intent to vent my frustration as a property management company in the City of Saint Paul because we have no way to non-renew or evict. They are thumbing their noses and treat properties like garbage. We had to pay them to leave so we could turn it over to try and get it rented again, which is hard in the winter. Had we been able to evict in the last 12 months, 80 percent of these problems would be resolved.*

*Moermond: I do notice you didn't send anyone else to clean up the garbage.*

*Schumm: other than towing cars, it would have been challenging. No one wanted to tow a jet ski. That's why we asked for the extension. They said they were going to get it out by the date. The extension of the deadline was the 6th. There were two property site visits by the City. The long story short is we finally got rid of them. I just implore the*

*City Council to understand what they are doing to landlords. We are trying to sell all of our properties because of the short-sighted guidelines.*

*Moermond: and you know that is a state guideline?*

*Schumm: I know. They are short-sighted.*

*Moermond: I can't say the responsibility to maintain this property falls on the other taxpayers' shoulders. That's what I'm left with. I do wish you well.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 2/24/2021**

- 25 RLH TA 21-114** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 930 SAINT PAUL AVENUE. (File No. J2112A, Assessment No. 218511)

**Sponsors:** Tolbert

*Delete the assessment (mattress which was picks up by the Parks crew was not the same mattress orders were written on).*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/7/2021**

#### **Special Tax Assessments-ROLLS**

- 26 RLH AR 21-22** Ratifying the assessments for Property Clean Up services during November 2 to 13, 2020. (File No. J2111A, Assessment No. 218510)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/7/2021**

- 27 RLH AR 21-23** Ratifying the assessments for Property Clean Up services during November 13 to 30, 2020. (File No. J2112A, Assessment No. 218511)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/7/2021**

#### **11:00 a.m. Hearings**

##### **Summary Abatement Orders**

- 28 RLH SAO 21-11** Appeal of Joe Schaak, House2Home Property Management LLC, to a Summary Abatement Order at 677 THOMAS AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Thao

*Grant the appeal, the nuisance is abated.*

*Joe Schaak appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we looked at this and are following up with the appropriate staff on this. We are going to go straight to a staff report on this. Ms. Martin?*

*Supervisor Lisa Martin: all of the furniture has been abated and all moved to 678 Lafond Avenue.*

*Schaak: oh, interesting.*

*Moermond: it is now where it likely originated, but the orders for your property are now moot. I will recommend your appeal is granted. Ms. Martin, are you issuing orders for 678 Lafond?*

*Martin: it was issued this morning.*

*Schaak: I appreciate it, thank you.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/10/2021**

### Correction Orders

- 29 [RLH CO 21-1](#) Appeal of Joseph Schachtner to a Correction Notice at 38 MOUNDS BOULEVARD.

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Rescheduled to February 23, 2020 at 11:00 am by staff.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 2/23/2021**

### 11:30 a.m. Hearings

#### Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations

### 1:30 p.m. Hearings

#### Fire Certificates of Occupancy

- 30 [RLH FCO 21-21](#) Appeal of Michael Ortner, Representing Tenant Onnis Gonzalez-Buell, to a Correction Notice - Complaint Inspection at 1256 WILSON AVENUE, #110.

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Grant extension to March 1, 2021 for compliance.*

*Michael Ortner, attorney on behalf of tenant Onnis Gonzalez-Buell, appeared via phone  
Steve Minn, owner, appeared via phone  
Stephanie Harr, Ward 7 Legislative Aide, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: this is a complaint we received January 29, 2021 saying there was a leak in the ceiling and a portion of ceiling was removed a week ago with no work had been done since. James Thomas responded to the complaint and issued orders February 2, 2021 saying to provide and maintain the fire rated wall separation, floor, and ceiling and then the third item was permits are required for the plumbing work. That was done with a resinspection on February 8.*

*Unfortunately he didn't respond on the 8th, he responded on the 9th. The orders are unchanged. There are some pictures attached. We see a lot of plastic hung up where the plaster has been pulled down. From talking with Mr. Ortner, the tenant isn't appealing that the repairs need to be made, simply the short timeline for the repairs to be done. It looks like the management is looking for six weeks due to Covid and the lack of availability in materials due to pandemic and is requesting the City to not have tenants occupy the unit since the bathroom has to be disabled entirely. My understanding is the tenant above tried to add on their own bidet, which flooded this unit, number 110.*

*Moermond: so the unit above did illegal plumbing resulting in the ceiling collapsing.*

*Shaff: the walls too.*

*Moermond: we're looking at standard correction orders, with a tight timeline, but no condemnation for unfit for human habitation?*

*Shaff: that's what I gathered from his orders.*

*Moermond: what would make it rise to that level?*

*Shaff: a totally unusable bathroom.*

*Moermond: and right now it is usable, it is just the ceiling is removed. Presumably the water has stopped leaking, but we don't have a full ceiling and fire separation from the unit above it. We also don't have the accumulation of mold since it was opened up quickly, I'm guessing?*

*Shaff: that would be my guess.*

*Ortner: I have been in contact with Mr. Morgan Okney who is the attorney for the landlord. They have been cooperative and we've had some movement. My client's problem is they received this letter February 4 with 72 hours to vacate which is unreasonably short. They are still in the unit. The bathroom is not fully functional, they are doing work arounds on that. They are using it as little as they can. My client has been given the opportunity to find a new apartment, which they are doing. They have also been given the option to move to a different unit in the same building, preferably on a six-month lease, which may be reasonable accommodation. Essentially, my concern is that my client needs a reasonable amount of time to find alternative living accommodations and also the management still hasn't come in and sufficiently cleaned the bathroom area. It would take a 30 minutes at most. This may be resolved on its own in a couple days, but I would like to have some sort of insurance that if not, my client has a reasonable amount of time to vacate, instead of three days.*

*Moermond: for clarity's sake, I would like you to confirm that I didn't read the apartment would need to be vacated, it says reinspection immediately on the 8th. Is that right?*

*Shaff: yes.*

*Moermond: so no order to vacate this unit.*

*Shaff: yes.*

*Ortner: they have been given notice to vacate by management.*

*Moermond: Mr. Minn, you are appealing this, what are you looking for?*

*Minn: we are just looking for an appropriate amount of time to put the bathroom back together. There's an underestimate of what is involved here. I don't think Ms. Shaff has all her facts. The damage is more than the ceiling. The wall behind the toilet was running with water for more than two months before we discovered it. We haven't destroyed that wall, they have a child of 18 months with a heart condition, so we tried not to create more damage in the bathroom. Without picking too many details we have urged them to find other accommodations as quickly as possible if the child is really at risk. The toilet does not function right now. They are filling the toilet tank with water from the tub or sink to flush it. The supply has been cut off since February 2.*

*Moermond: how?*

*Minn: we turned it off, it is on a single stack with the one above it. We changed the coupling on 210, so the bidet is no longer connected. We are uncertain what damage is behind that wall until we open it up. The floor is on a gypsum pad, we think we will have to rip the tile out under the toilet to look for mold there. This is why we have urged the tenant to seek shelter. It is unfortunate they don't have insurance; we urge all tenants to do that.*

*Moermond: does your lease cover a circumstance where you would need to provide housing for a certain amount of money every month? A situation where Mr. Ortner could ask you to put people up?*

*Minn: no.*

*Moermond: in spite of renter's insurance?*

*Minn: he could do whatever he wants. If the landlord was negligent he may have a claim, but in this case a third party created the issue. We are harmless for that; our lease is clear on that.*

*Moermond: this isn't housing court.*

*Minn: most of the units available for lease have been spoken for in the last two weeks. We had one client that didn't meet the criteria and we extended an offer to them for 310, I'm happy to work with Mr. Ortner on that. I was under the impression that Thomas condemned it when he was there because the toilet is nonfunctional. That's why we need the help to move people now, it doesn't have a functional toilet.*

*Moermond: Ms. Shaff, I don't see anything about the toilet being shut off in the orders?*

*Shaff: me either.*

*Minn: we disconnected it. The other bathroom fixtures and kitchen still function. If the tenant has turned the water back on to the toilet without us knowing they could be causing more damage. I'm not going to create a hazard while they're occupying. We asked them to move out within three days, they said they can't. We said seven. They can't do that. We offered to make accommodations, but we can't get it done. It needs insurance and claims adjustment and quite a bit of demolition.*

*Moermond: so you are looking for time. You also assumed there was an order to vacate, but I'm not seeing that in the February 2 letter*

*Minn: Inspector Thomas told Erin Gray, my site manager, that no toilet equals no habitability. We had crossed papers with an appeal on February 2 to get to this hearing.*

*Moermond: I have a photo document from February 9, but no orders associated.*

*Shaff: there are no notes in the system.*

*Moermond: once an appeal is filed, enforcement is stayed. I see in both these cases, we got one appeal February 10 and one February 11.*

*Minn: we filed the appeal February 3.*

*Moermond: no, we didn't get that appeal in our office. I saw an email to Ward 7. I saw an email to the Inspector. I did understand from our receptionist of late she thought, incorrectly, we had one because I forwarded something from the inspector as an FYI. She didn't understand that, which is on us, but we didn't receive it until the date I mentioned.*

*Minn: I was told you had it and the check was rerouted.*

*Moermond: that is incorrect, she was holding an email and nothing was sent to the City Clerk. I'm sorry there was that misunderstanding, and there shouldn't have been. As you know, the last one was handled as it should have been. So everyone is asking for more time to deal with this. We have a bucket flushing the toilet. The toilet being shut off, I assume you removed the handle because that's how you've done it in the past?*

*Minn: yes.*

*Moermond: did that happen before or after Thomas was there?*

*Minn: that preceded Mr. Thomas's second visit.*

*Moermond: was it off before he got there originally? Or after the 9th?*

*Minn: before he got there on the 9th, it was off. I don't know about the 2nd, but I think it was off then.*

*Moermond: and there was nothing in the orders indicating the toilet had been shut off, and nothing in the complaint that came into the City saying the toilet wasn't working. Got it. Anyone have anything to add?*

*Shaff: no.*

*Ortner: I also was unaware of the situation with the toilet. That being the case, it increases the urgency some, which I will let my client know. However, it doesn't substantially change my position.*

*Minn: none.*

*Moermond: whether I should or shouldn't be looking at set of orders that reflects the*

toilet is one thing. I'm looking at orders that don't reference that. It also doesn't vacate the unit if the orders aren't met on deadline. That would be future orders. All that is in front of me now is a reasonable deadline for accomplishing the task at hand. The original deadline was one week. I heard everyone wanting more time. I need to look at the significance of the violation. I'm inclined to go until March 1, 2021. That means the reinspection date is March 1 to see whether repairs were done. I'm sure they won't be based on our conversation, and then he can take additional enforcement action. Any questions?

Minn: you understand that there is no valid point for us to do further demolition or work if we're working around a tenant to destroy the bathroom. You're leaving a condition in place where we don't know if mold is growing, which may be a hazard to the child if they supposedly had a heart condition.

Moermond: I don't have an order for unfit for human habitation in front of me. I cannot create orders. I can review appeals; I can't make them more than what it is. I can say it merits another inspection, which it does, but March 1 is a short turnaround and the first of the month is often convenient for people to relocate. They are making it work with the bucket and toilet. I'm also not convinced there is a mold problem. We don't have anything to lead us to that conclusion in front of me. I just have open walls and plastic and repairs need to be made under permit and the area cleaned up. I think this is about where you would have been otherwise without an appeal. Some extra time, the only impact is your reinspection is March 1 and hopefully the tenant can relocate by then. Any questions?

Minn: I'm not going to hold the apartment on the third floor for the next two weeks in the hopes of the tenant deciding to move up there, and I won't do any repairs to their unit before March 1. They need to make decisions outside of this Legislative Hearing and they need to do so by the end of tomorrow.

Moermond: that's a conversation for you and Mr. Ortner, not with me

Minn: so I want to make sure it is clear to you I won't do any work between now and March 1. My legal counsel said not to do any work until they are out.

Moermond: that was my understanding all along. It sounds clear you and Mr. Ortner need to connect. Mr. Okney certainly has the contact information.

Ortner: if my client does move out by the end of the week, is management free to begin repairs?

Moermond: management can pursue the repairs when they want to. I assume the move out isn't temporary, but rather permanent since it will last at least six weeks. They can begin work at their leisure. My guess is the enforcement officer, finding the work not done on deadline, will revoke the certificate for this unit until the repairs are done. That shouldn't be surprise. Ms. Shaff?

Shaff: we'll un-certify the unit which requires it be reinspected before it is reoccupied. This is to make sure everything is back online.

Moermond: it is an imperfect solution to an imperfect situation. I'm sorry everyone is stuck with a mess on their hands.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 2/24/2021**



- 31 [RLH FCO 21-22](#) Appeal of Jess Nelson, Halverson & Blaiser Group Ltd., on behalf of Steve Minn to a Correction Notice - Complaint Inspection at 1256 WILSON AVENUE, #110.

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Grant extension to March 1, 2021 for compliance.*

*Michael Ortner, attorney on behalf of tenant Onnis Gonzalez-Buell, appeared via phone  
Steve Minn, owner, appeared via phone  
Stephanie Harr, Ward 7 Legislative Aide, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: this is a complaint we received January 29, 2021 saying there was a leak in the ceiling and a portion of ceiling was removed a week ago with no work had been done since. James Thomas responded to the complaint and issued orders February 2, 2021 saying to provide and maintain the fire rated wall separation, floor, and ceiling and then the third item was permits are required for the plumbing work. That was done with a resinspection on February 8. Unfortunately he didn't respond on the 8th, he responded on the 9th. The orders are unchanged. There are some pictures attached. We see a lot of plastic hung up where the plaster has been pulled down. From talking with Mr. Ortner, the tenant isn't appealing that the repairs need to be made, simply the short timeline for the repairs to be done. It looks like the management is looking for six weeks due to Covid and the lack of availability in materials due to pandemic and is requesting the City to not have tenants occupy the unit since the bathroom has to be disabled entirely. My understanding is the tenant above tried to add on their own bidet, which flooded this unit, number 110.*

*Moermond: so the unit above did illegal plumbing resulting in the ceiling collapsing.*

*Shaff: the walls too.*

*Moermond: we're looking at standard correction orders, with a tight timeline, but no condemnation for unfit for human habitation?*

*Shaff: that's what I gathered from his orders.*

*Moermond: what would make it rise to that level?*

*Shaff: a totally unusable bathroom.*

*Moermond: and right now it is usable, it is just the ceiling is removed. Presumably the water has stopped leaking, but we don't have a full ceiling and fire separation from the unit above it. We also don't have the accumulation of mold since it was opened up quickly, I'm guessing?*

*Shaff: that would be my guess.*

*Ortner: I have been in contact with Mr. Morgan Okney who is the attorney for the landlord. They have been cooperative and we've had some movement. My client's problem is they received this letter February 4 with 72 hours to vacate which is unreasonably short. They are still in the unit. The bathroom is not fully functional, they are doing work arounds on that. They are using it as little as they can. My client has been given the opportunity to find a new apartment, which they are doing. They have also been given the option to move to a different unit in the same building, preferably*

on a six-month lease, which may be reasonable accommodation. Essentially, my concern is that my client needs a reasonable amount of time to find alternative living accommodations and also the management still hasn't come in and sufficiently cleaned the bathroom area. It would take a 30 minutes at most. This may be resolved on its own in a couple days, but I would like to have some sort of insurance that if not, my client has a reasonable amount of time to vacate, instead of three days.

Moermond: for clarity's sake, I would like you to confirm that I didn't read the apartment would need to be vacated, it says reinspection immediately on the 8th. Is that right?

Shaff: yes.

Moermond: so no order to vacate this unit.

Shaff: yes.

Ortner: they have been given notice to vacate by management.

Moermond: Mr. Minn, you are appealing this, what are you looking for?

Minn: we are just looking for an appropriate amount of time to put the bathroom back together. There's an underestimate of what is involved here. I don't think Ms. Shaff has all her facts. The damage is more than the ceiling. The wall behind the toilet was running with water for more than two months before we discovered it. We haven't destroyed that wall, they have a child of 18 months with a heart condition, so we tried not to create more damage in the bathroom. Without picking too many details we have urged them to find other accommodations as quickly as possible if the child is really at risk. The toilet does not function right now. They are filling the toilet tank with water from the tub or sink to flush it. The supply has been cut off since February 2.

Moermond: how?

Minn: we turned it off, it is on a single stack with the one above it. We changed the coupling on 210, so the bidet is no longer connected. We are uncertain what damage is behind that wall until we open it up. The floor is on a gypsum pad, we think we will have to rip the tile out under the toilet to look for mold there. This is why we have urged the tenant to seek shelter. It is unfortunate they don't have insurance; we urge all tenants to do that.

Moermond: does your lease cover a circumstance where you would need to provide housing for a certain amount of money every month? A situation where Mr. Ortner could ask you to put people up?

Minn: no.

Moermond: in spite of renter's insurance?

Minn: he could do whatever he wants. If the landlord was negligent he may have a claim, but in this case a third party created the issue. We are harmless for that; our lease is clear on that.

Moermond: this isn't housing court.

*Minn: most of the units available for lease have been spoken for in the last two weeks. We had one client that didn't meet the criteria and we extended an offer to them for 310, I'm happy to work with Mr. Ortner on that. I was under the impression that Thomas condemned it when he was there because the toilet is nonfunctional. That's why we need the help to move people now, it doesn't have a functional toilet.*

*Moermond: Ms. Shaff, I don't see anything about the toilet being shut off in the orders?*

*Shaff: me either.*

*Minn: we disconnected it. The other bathroom fixtures and kitchen still function. If the tenant has turned the water back on to the toilet without us knowing they could be causing more damage. I'm not going to create a hazard while they're occupying. We asked them to move out within three days, they said they can't. We said seven. They can't do that. We offered to make accommodations, but we can't get it done. It needs insurance and claims adjustment and quite a bit of demolition.*

*Moermond: so you are looking for time. You also assumed there was an order to vacate, but I'm not seeing that in the February 2 letter*

*Minn: Inspector Thomas told Erin Gray, my site manager, that no toilet equals no habitability. We had crossed papers with an appeal on February 2 to get to this hearing.*

*Moermond: I have a photo document from February 9, but no orders associated.*

*Shaff: there are no notes in the system.*

*Moermond: once an appeal is filed, enforcement is stayed. I see in both these cases, we got one appeal February 10 and one February 11.*

*Minn: we filed the appeal February 3.*

*Moermond: no, we didn't get that appeal in our office. I saw an email to Ward 7. I saw an email to the Inspector. I did understand from our receptionist of late she thought, incorrectly, we had one because I forwarded something from the inspector as an FYI. She didn't understand that, which is on us, but we didn't receive it until the date I mentioned.*

*Minn: I was told you had it and the check was rerouted.*

*Moermond: that is incorrect, she was holding an email and nothing was sent to the City Clerk. I'm sorry there was that misunderstanding, and there shouldn't have been. As you know, the last one was handled as it should have been. So everyone is asking for more time to deal with this. We have a bucket flushing the toilet. The toilet being shut off, I assume you removed the handle because that's how you've done it in the past?*

*Minn: yes.*

*Moermond: did that happen before or after Thomas was there?*

*Minn: that preceded Mr. Thomas's second visit.*

*Moermond: was it off before he got there originally? Or after the 9th?*

*Minn: before he got there on the 9th, it was off. I don't know about the 2nd, but I think it was off then.*

*Moermond: and there was nothing in the orders indicating the toilet had been shut off, and nothing in the complaint that came into the City saying the toilet wasn't working. Got it. Anyone have anything to add?*

*Shaff: no.*

*Ortner: I also was unaware of the situation with the toilet. That being the case, it increases the urgency some, which I will let my client know. However, it doesn't substantially change my position.*

*Minn: none.*

*Moermond: whether I should or shouldn't be looking at set of orders that reflects the toilet is one thing. I'm looking at orders that don't reference that. It also doesn't vacate the unit if the orders aren't met on deadline. That would be future orders. All that is in front of me now is a reasonable deadline for accomplishing the task at hand. The original deadline was one week. I heard everyone wanting more time. I need to look at the significance of the violation. I'm inclined to go until March 1, 2021. That means the reinspection date is March 1 to see whether repairs were done. I'm sure they won't be based on our conversation, and then he can take additional enforcement action. Any questions?*

*Minn: you understand that there is no valid point for us to do further demolition or work if we're working around a tenant to destroy the bathroom. You're leaving a condition in place where we don't know if mold is growing, which may be a hazard to the child if they supposedly had a heart condition.*

*Moermond: I don't have an order for unfit for human habitation in front of me. I cannot create orders. I can review appeals; I can't make them more than what it is. I can say it merits another inspection, which it does, but March 1 is a short turnaround and the first of the month is often convenient for people to relocate. They are making it work with the bucket and toilet. I'm also not convinced there is a mold problem. We don't have anything to lead us to that conclusion in front of me. I just have open walls and plastic and repairs need to be made under permit and the area cleaned up. I think this is about where you would have been otherwise without an appeal. Some extra time, the only impact is your reinspection is March 1 and hopefully the tenant can relocate by then. Any questions?*

*Minn: I'm not going to hold the apartment on the third floor for the next two weeks in the hopes of the tenant deciding to move up there, and I won't do any repairs to their unit before March 1. They need to make decisions outside of this Legislative Hearing and they need to do so by the end of tomorrow.*

*Moermond: that's a conversation for you and Mr. Ortner, not with me*

*Minn: so I want to make sure it is clear to you I won't do any work between now and March 1. My legal counsel said not to do any work until they are out.*

*Moermond: that was my understanding all along. It sounds clear you and Mr. Ortner need to connect. Mr. Okney certainly has the contact information.*

*Ortner: if my client does move out by the end of the week, is management free to begin repairs?*

*Moermond: management can pursue the repairs when they want to. I assume the move out isn't temporary, but rather permanent since it will last at least six weeks. They can begin work at their leisure. My guess is the enforcement officer, finding the work not done on deadline, will revoke the certificate for this unit until the repairs are done. That shouldn't be surprise. Ms. Shaff?*

*Shaff: we'll un-certify the unit which requires it be reinspected before it is reoccupied. This is to make sure everything is back online.*

*Moermond: it is an imperfect solution to an imperfect situation. I'm sorry everyone is stuck with a mess on their hands.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 2/24/2021**

## 2:30 p.m. Hearings

### Vacant Building Registrations

- 32 RLH VBR 21-9** Appeal of Heather Cothorn, Alpha Capitol Services LLC, to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 375 HAWTHORNE AVENUE EAST.

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

*Make the property a Category 1 VB and waive the VB fee for 90 days (to May 2, 2021)*

*Heather Cothorn, o/b/o Maximize Property Management, appeared via phone*

*Cothorn: I'm with MPM who manages the property for Alpha Capitol Services, LLC.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: we received a complaint of no heat on January 19. Supervisor Neis and Inspector Vue responded. They found a lot of things, mostly the dwelling was condemned due to multiple code violations, gross unsanitary, blocked egress, excess accumulation, and it was lacking smoke alarms. The inspector makes comments the tenant did allow access. They did advise the tenant the property was condemned, there was some aggression and the inspectors called the SPPD to assist. They secured the occupant and placarded the building and advised they must vacate within ten days. It seems most of the issues were due to the tenants. Garbage, windows, glass, excessive use of extension cords. Most of it is walls, ceilings, carpet replacing. Generally it is trashed. My understanding is the tenants have been removed.*

*Moermond: so it was condemned and referred to vacant building program.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Matt Dornfeld: nothing to add. We opened a category 2 vacant building per that referral. Inspector Hoffman notes the locks were changed and appears vacant, and hopes an alarm was installed.*

*Moermond: an empty building with mostly cosmetic problems. I notice in the orders, item 9: unapproved exposed wiring work that may need a permit, and item 21: unsafe heating appliance that needs repairs. Those give me pause in addition to the smoke*

and carbon issues. Ms. Cothorn, what are you looking for?

Cothorn: we'd like the condemned status removed. As they stated, a majority of this was resident cause. We were in there in August and provided them a new washing machine and dryer. It was a great shock to me when we got this call on a Saturday afternoon that there was no heat, it was never reported to us. We immediately acted and got it running. I met AJ Neis. The locks were changed, windows boarded, security system installed. A nonresident kept returning to the unit. At this point it has been two weeks, it has been completely cleared out. We got written verification to dispose of all belongings left behind by the leaseholder. Carpet has been pulled carbon and smokes are up. We are down to purely cosmetic items. Painting of windows and brand-new carpeting and appliances.

Moermond: what was going on with the heating?

Cothorn: I believe they were referring the resident's space heater plugged into an extension cord. That was removed once the heat was fixed. They weren't the resident of the unit, which is why they didn't actually call us.

Moermond: they were squatters. Based on the testimony of Fire Inspector, I'm going to ask that Mr. Dornfeld to make this a category 1 vacant building and waive the fee for 90 days. This is an investment property; you know you can't rent it until you have your Fire C of O reinstated. If you get that within the 90 days, by May 2, you will have no vacant building fee whatsoever.

Cothorn: that shouldn't be an issue.

Moermond: Ms. Shaff do you have Maximize Property Management as the appropriate contact?

Shaff: we still have BMK Managers, LLC.

Cothorn: I'll send the form over.

Shaff: send it to inspector Vue, you also need to contact her to make your follow up appointment.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/10/2021**

**33 RLH VBR 21-8** Appeal of Kevin Christ to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 1216 REANEY AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Prince

Grant the appeal and make the property a preliminary vacant building.

Kevin Christ, owner, appeared via phone

Christ: Myself and Trent Peterson are 50/50 owners of Green Jacket, LLC.

Staff report by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: this is an inspection attempt by Thomas. We have no entries on October 12 and November 9 and then a revoked vacant on January 21, 2021. Mr. Christ is saying the letters are sent to an old address. It was finally updated with us on October 26 of 2020. That letter and November 29 were sent to Green Jacket at the Highland Road address. We have not been able to gain entry to

*the property.*

*Moermond: the County has an address in Mound for Green Jacket.*

*Staff report by Matt Dornfeld: nothing to add other than we opened the vacant building file on January 26, 2021 as a Category 1 vacant building.*

*Moermond: we have an address situation that can be solved with some forms. What's going on?*

*Christ: the first couple letters in September were going to my 529 St. Mary address, which was the old one. Then I got a call from the inspector and we did correct the address and I did get a letter but I received it 2 days before the inspection and I tried to reschedule and never got a response back. That's why that one was missed, and I think that was the last one in November. I tried to send a couple more emails about the reinspection and then I got the vacant building notice. I was surprised, I sent another email asking why. I'm asking for one more chance to have an inspection.*

*Shaff: Inspector Thomas does make a note on January 21 that there is no response to phone calls and the building is vacant.*

*Moermond: are you a landlord, flipper, what is your intention?*

*Christ: it was rented, we are in the process of renovating it to sell. I tried to respond to tell him that and I never got any communication back. I don't know why he's saying we didn't respond. I know we did talk in November and I would have definitely answered his calls in January. I guess there are communication issues. I'd like to have one more chance if we need an inspection still, seeing as we are selling it.*

*Moermond: any comments from staff?*

*[none]*

*Moermond: it looks to me like Ramsey County taxation has the address in Mounds, not in Minnetrista. I think that may be the root of some of the problem here. The letter Mr. Dornfeld sent was likely forwarded from this previous address. I'm not sure.*

*Christ: that wouldn't be the case, it was over a year ago. They won't forward mail that long. I didn't receive anything.*

*Moermond: when you appealed what triggered that?*

*Christ: the inspector did call me the second week of November and we did make the address correction at that point.*

*Moermond: with the Fire C of O file?*

*Christ: yes. I tried to call to get an extension and never heard back. I think the communication at that point ended. I tried to send a couple emails asking about the next inspection and never got anything back.*

*Moermond: we have a category 1 vacant building. I'm going to ask Mr. Dornfeld to convert this to a preliminary file and follow up in several months' time and see if it has become occupied. The fee goes away, but it will be revisited to see if it is an occupied*

property.

Christ: who can I call to talk about what that entails?

Dornfeld: in this case, we simply look for occupancy. As soon we could acknowledge that, we would close the prelim file.

Christ: and if we're looking to sell?

Moermond: since it is a preliminary file you would not have a pending assessment on the property. It should make the transaction simpler. Again, he will follow up. If you want to rent it and keep it you need a Fire C of O. The County doesn't have your correct address. If you are selling it may not be worth fixing but know City orders go to the address of record which is in Mound. You'll get an email from us and we'll get you Mr. Dornfeld's contact information, as well as the inspector assigned to this file.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/10/2021**

**34 RLH VBR  
21-10**

Appeal of Michelle Chalifoux to a Vacant Building Registration Fee Warning Letter at 963 WATSON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Noecker

Grant a VB fee waiver to May 1, 2021.

Michelle Chalifoux appeared via phone

Staff report by Supervisor Matt Dornfeld: this property was a made a category 1 vacant building December 10, 2019. It was referred to our office via a vacant building registration form submitted with payment from Altisource. It remains a category 1 vacant building. The new ownership has pulled all their permits and finalized them. Rehab appears to be complete. There is a TISH on file that shows no hazards and 3 very minimal below codes. I believe they are here to appeal the fee due now to buy them some time to sell or have the file closed. This is Hoffman's file now, and he and Magner gave a 60-day waiver in December. It is maintained and secure.

Chalifoux: I agree with everything Mr. Dornfeld stated. I plan to put it on the market in a week when the cold snap is over and have it sold and occupied in 60 to 90 days. It is being maintained, I go every few days and shovel and do what is needed.

Moermond: do you think by April 10 it will be sold?

Chalifoux: I hope so, typically closing is 60 days from an offer, so maybe more like 90 days to occupied. I can aim for that.

Moermond: I ask because it is super easy for me to give a 90-day waiver, but that's from December 10, so that just takes us to March. I was looking at April and 120 days. If it goes longer than that I'd say let it go to assessment. I'd rather not see it go that way. I'm going to say if the property isn't occupied by May 1 the department should process the assessment. That assessment is appealable.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/10/2021**

**3:00 p.m. Hearings**



## Other

**35 RLH OA 21-5** Appeal of Natosha Carney to a Code Compliance Report at 1544 BEECH STREET.

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Grant the appeal; property can be reoccupied if permit is finalized by April 8, 2021.*

*Natosha Carney, owner, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: calling about the code compliance inspection report at 1544 Beech. I think there was a disconnect in communication between City Council and DSI. We can send you a copy of the language, but what the City Council did was say if you repair or replace your heating system under permit by a licensed contractor by April 8, you don't need a code compliance inspection. All you need to have is a finalized permit on your heating system and the other stuff goes away.*

*Carney: [crying in joy] I was going to tell you because I wanted to appeal the decision, I just spent all my money to rewire the whole house. I'm glad I found out I had to get this done.*

*Moermond: I hope this next year goes better than the last. I hope you stay healthy and warm. You can move in as soon as the permit is finalized.*

*Carney: thank you so much!*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/10/2021**