

Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)

From: Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 2:55 PM
To: Scharf, Paul; Chris Samuel; Kujala, Kristine
Cc: Magner, Steve (CI-StPaul); Dornfeld, Matt (CI-StPaul); Singerhouse, Rich (CI-StPaul); Yannarely, Joe (CI-StPaul); Moloney, Trudy (CI-StPaul); Lantry, Kathy (CI-StPaul); Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul); Schroeder, Greg (CI-StPaul); Skarda, Therese (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: 806 Edmund Ave

Good Afternoon All,

Sounds like we've got a few items to sort through. I'm always hesitant to do this kind of multi-layered communication by email, but I'm going to give it a shot. I hope we can sit down later and to clean up the loose ends. Paul, in your email you mention a couple of problem areas which you are concerned about. I'll try to tackle these individually.

The first concern is that of 806 Edmund. I have consulted with Roxanne Young and Joe Musolf in PED/HRA about whether this property is on a list being discussed for transfer to the city. They indicated no conversation has taken place, so there are no plans to transfer this property from the county to the city to Andy's organization. Perhaps your conversations have taken place with only Andy Barnett? Or, it could also be that Mark Oswald had a conversation with Cecile Bedor, the former director of PED/HRA, and this was not relayed to staff or documented.

As to the Council's actions on 806 Edmund, I recommended on October 11, 2011 that the Council grant 365 days for the county to take action to either rehab or demo. My records show I had conversations with Kris and I understood 4R was interested in rehabbing this structure – which is why I asked the Council to grant 365 days, versus the code-required 180. Admittedly, I am confused about why this building had not been demolished in either late 2012 or early 2013. I assume there were conversations among staff to slow things down. I may even have been involved, but I don't have any notes about that in my file. This situation identifies a potential short-coming in our follow-up procedures at the city, as action should have been taken more than a year ago. I am also concerned that there was a re-prioritization in the 4R program, when the Council's decision was premised on the county turning this around in 1-year. I think there needs to be a fresh conversation with the city in these instances, as a previous commitment is not being met. This is especially problematic for me, as I am the hearing officer reporting to the Council, providing them with the acceptable plans, etc and giving my endorsement/ recommendation for a particular plan of action. I need to be reliable and trustable in the work I do for them. And again, I believe this is something we can sort through with revised follow-up procedures within the city and county, and between us. In the case of 806 Edmund, I think we need to prepare a resolution to officially stay enforcement of the Order. We need to have a concrete plan, put it in resolution form, and then follow it. I will ask Mai Vang to schedule this hearing for June 10th when she returns from her vacation next week.

The email also indicated there were concerns about the city's notification process for demolitions. It is the city practice to provide official notification of Council action on Orders to Abate Nuisance Structures go out within a week of the Council decision. A certified copy of the resolution goes by certified mail, unless it involves a P.O. Box – where certified mail cannot be delivered. In those cases, the notices go by first class mail. Files in DSI indicate the following about the notification for 806 Edmund: the certified resolution was mailed, certified mail, to the property owners of record on October 12, 2011: Nicholas Bartyzal at 20539 Camden Ct in Farmington, MN and to Chase Bank USA at 200 White Clay Center Dr in Newark DE. Ramsey Co TFL was not the owner of record when council action was taken granting the owner 365 days to complete the rehabilitation or remove the building. I know Kris and I were actively communicating on this order to abate a nuisance building at the time, but am unclear as to follow-up procedures on your end.

You mention specifically the demolition of 260 Maria and I am inferring there was a problem with this case. Here's what I know on this end. The City Council adopted the resolution for the razing and removal of 260 Maria at its September 11,

2013 meeting. This resolution originally came forward in April of 2011. It was in front of the Council. The resolution was signed by the Mayor on September 18, 2013. The certified resolution was mailed on September 18, 2013 to State of MN Trust Exempt at PO Box 64097 in St. Paul, MN 55164. This was not sent by certified mail because certified mail cannot be sent to a PO Box. This is the address Ramsey County lists as the property owner of record as well as the address used on the VB registration form dated March 27, 2013 (Res 11-471).

It was September 11th when the county was ordered to remove the property. Under normal circumstances, the city would have acted to remove the property within a couple of months. However, there were significant budget restraints in the fall/winter of 2013, so many property demolitions were put off until spring, which was the case with 260 Maria. The result of all of this is that the county had fully 6 months to take action on its own. I'm glad to hear the county continues to be willing and ready to knock down structures which have been ordered removed. I believe we have acted effectively together on this for many properties over the last several years. I, like you, really think it's easier for everyone if the county/owner acts, rather than the city.

As I understand your email, you are looking for an additional notification nearer to the demolition time, if the city ends up needing to take action. I think we can explore this further. The only procedural wrinkle I can see on our end is that I think we, as the City, need to be able to use the mailing of the certified resolution as our official notice for all these orders. I am concerned as we need to avoid a circumstance where personal notification is expected to take the place of official notices... I think just too many things can go wrong. With that understanding, I think there's a lot of room for improved communication in this area.

I'd like to meet with folks to look at specific nuisance building cases we share right now and those we anticipate are coming forward, so we can review our strategies on them. We can also talk about refining communication processes where we have glitches popping up. I'll ask Mai if she can do this in the 1st or 2nd week in June.

All my best, Marcia

From: Scharf, Paul [mailto:paul.scharf@CO.RAMSEY.MN.US]
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 1:20 PM
To: Yannarely, Joe (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Kujala, Kristine; Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul); Magner, Steve (CI-StPaul); Chris Samuel; Dornfeld, Matt (CI-StPaul); Singerhouse, Rich (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: 806 Edmund Ave

Hello Joe,

We have included 806 Edmund in our rehabilitation schedule for this year. At legislative hearing back in 2011, Kris and I had stated that this property, after evaluation, was found to be repairable under the 4R Program. This project was initially scheduled for 2012. Management directed me to alter scheduling that year and reprioritize my focus due to expedited changes that were taking place. In more recent past, I have been informed that Mark Oswald has been in discussions with St Paul about a possible acquisition. During my visits with Andy Bennett, and other city agents, just a couple of months ago, we had a conversation about the city's ability to acquire old TFL inventory that has already been through the first year of forfeiture. 806 Edmund seemed to be of interest as possibly fitting this type of scenario. It's my understanding that discussions are continuing at the city level, mainly with HRA and PED. I currently have a number of code compliance reports that are heading for expiration this summer and 806 Edmund is one of them. I plan on moving forward with the release of 806 Edmund this summer as a rehabilitation under the 4R Program, unless I am instructed otherwise.

The attached 4R Program rehab schedule for this year has been aggressively developed to try to make use of the active code compliance reports before they expire. I have also attached the schedule for building removals that we will be performing this year as well. The recent and unexpected happenings with 260 Maria have reminded me that, although I believe there has been substantial progress made in the manner of communication between city and county

departments, there is still more that can be done. The 4R Program has now proven itself in its ability to perform. If DSI decides to act upon the emergency removal of 806 Edmund or any other structure within the Ramsey County Tax Forfeited Land inventory, due to an active resolution or any other reason, I am asking to be personally notified as soon as possible so that I can remove the structure asap.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need further clarification. If city staff have any additional concerns regarding 806 Edmund, I would be more than happy to sit down and have a discussion.

Sincerely,

Paul Scharf

Lead Real Estate/
Property Mgmt Specialist
Ramsey County
Tax Forfeited Land
90 W Plato Blvd
St. Paul MN 55107
Phone: 651.266.2047
Fax: 651.266.2022
Email: Paul.scharf@co.ramsey.mn.us

From: Yannareilly, Joe (CI-StPaul) [<mailto:joe.yannareilly@ci.stpaul.mn.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:50 AM
To: Scharf, Paul
Cc: Magner, Steve (CI-StPaul); Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)
Subject: 806 Edmund Ave

Hi Paul, the Council gave 365 days to rehab/raze this house on August 3rd 2011 (attached). There are no permits pulled and the code compliance expires in July. What is the plan for this property? Thanks.



Joe Yannareilly

DSI INSPECTOR III

Department of Safety and Inspections
375 Jackson Street
Saint Paul, MN 55102
P: 651-266-1920
F: 651-266-1926
joe.yannareilly@ci.stpaul.mn.us

The Most Livable
City in America



Making Saint Paul the Most Livable City in America