Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)

From: zoe zhi <zoezhi2000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, August 08, 2014 1:22 AM
To: *CI-StPaul_LegislativeHearings
Subject: Re: address
Attachments: CCI080714_0001.jpg

Hello Mai,

This is Zoe Zhi with Hyacinth Ave LLC regarding 1690 Hyacinth Ave E, St. Paul. I would like to thank you again for spending the time listening to me this morning. I would like to follow up with these scanned images of letters since your copy does not show our address.
We have received two letters in total regarding this mattress and box spring issue at 1690 Hyacinth Ave. E. One letter post-marked on July 15 but dated on May 21, states that we owe $120 for Excessive Consumption. Since we did not receive this letter in time to pay for it, we received another letter post-marked July 17 (just 2 days later) for Public Hearing Notice regarding $310 assessment.
My questions are:
Question #1. Why was the May 21 letter delayed to be mailed until July 15?
Question #2: The inspector's office said that the May 21 letter was also mailed to the previous owner Pao Yang/Pazao Lee whose names were on the letter. How would they fit in Pao Yang's address to the standard City envelope? As shown in the attached picture here, Pao Yang's name barely shows in the address window. In addition, if it was addressed to Pao Yang, my tenants would not have opened the letter.
Question #3. Even if the inspector's office had sent a letter to the previous owner at 1690 Hyacinth Ave E, that letter should have been returned to the Inspector's office because they no longer live at the address. The previous owner did not seem to have set up address forwarding.
Question #4. We were told that three copies of Summary Abatement Order were sent to all three parties addressed on the letter: Hyacinth Ave LLC, Occupant, and Pao Yang. Inspector's office said no returned mails. First of all, the inspector's office should have received at least one returned mail from Pao Yang because he no long lives at 1690 Hyacinth and the letter was not deliverable. Why didn't they receive returned mail from Pao Yang? Because they never mailed it. Second, the standard city envelope would only fit in one address at a time, there should be three copies of different letters written by the inspector, but there do not seem to have three different letters. Therefore, the letters were not mailed out to all three parties obviously.
Question #5. Why didn’t we ever receive the Summary Abatement Order letter on May 14? We have more than 30 rent check letters coming into our address every month and the US post office has done a reliable job in delivering them. We never have had

lost even one rent check so far, why would the US post office want to lose this City letter in particular? The answer is they never mailed it.

All these questions drive down to one answer: that is the inspector's office never sent out three copies of the Summary Abatement Order letter to three different parties. The inspector's office delayed to mail the May 21 letter after almost 2 months.
I am a City Council Member of City of Lakeland Shores - of course a much smaller city compared to St. Paul. I would never have left the mattress and box spring in the yard if I had seen it myself or had been notified by the City. Unfortunately I have never been notified by the City. I am also a licensed realtor with property management experience. As a licensed realtor, I am well aware of tenants' rights to quiet enjoyment of their rental home and privacy. In our lease we specifically states that the landlord should give advanced notice of at least 24 hours before me show up at their doors. We certainly do not wish the tenants to think they are watched everyday and live under 24-hour surveillance.
My tenant took a day off work sacrificing her wages to come to the hearing even though she was not required to do so. This shows that she is a responsible person. She would never have left the mattress and box spring in the yard if she had received the notice from the City. Her husband who is tall big and strong could have removed the mattress and box spring within a few minutes. Removing is not a huge project for our tenants at all. Again why didn't I or my tenants remove the mattress and box spring then? The only reason was that neither of us were notified by the city letters.I hope this is convincing enough to make a decision to remove all our charges. By the way we are also charged $155 by the city for excessive inspection service. We would request the city remove it too.Thank you very much for your attention to this matter.Zoe Zhi, Realtor and Property Owner/Manager9522708770