

Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)

From: Sandberg, Connie (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 1:37 PM
To: Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul); Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Townsend, Tanya (CI-StPaul); Dornfeld, Matt (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: 394 Clifton St.

Mai,
Amanda fees don't work the way Marcia wants them to work. We have to do manual things with the records. I wrote the note about deleting it, because that's what I had to do so it wouldn't continue to show up as \$1,100. I then expected someone would tell me to put in \$550 as a fee if that was what had to happen. It didn't happen, so it didn't get entered. It just stayed deleted in the Amanda system.

I think Real Estate didn't get the Resolution about splitting the assessment over 2 years? Did that get sent to the property owner?

I think the whole issue, now, is between you (Hearings) and Real Estate to figure if and what is supposed to be on the tax bill. I think you two need to be in communication with the property owner about what she's supposed to be paying. Like I said, I/we don't care if you decide to delete the whole assessment, or leave it as it is. That's your decision to make. If you consider it a done deal with the Resolution you sent me showing the change to split the assessment over 2 years, then do that.

You ultimately need to address the property owner's rambling email (that started this issue today). Straighten her out on what Marcia agreed to do.

Our system doesn't have any information beyond what I stated earlier in this chain. We just weren't in the decision-making and alteration process once this went to Hearings.

Thank you for the work you've done to look into this matter. I think the property owner misunderstood Marcia and expected a different outcome. I don't think we in Code Enforcement should be responding to the property owner because we don't have the full story in our records.

Did you get that original email, the one that was sent to *CI-StPaul_LegislativeHearings, that started this chain??

Connie

From: Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 12:43 PM
To: Sandberg, Connie (CI-StPaul); Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Townsend, Tanya (CI-StPaul); Dornfeld, Matt (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: 394 Clifton St.

I listened to the Jan 4, 2012 video from the Council meeting and MM recommended approving the assessment and spreading over 2 years. If this really need to be a deletion, let me know and I can do an amended Resolution for Dec 5. From looking at notes in STAMP, notes didn't make sense either. 11/15/11: LHO deleted fee. Waive to 1/15/12. If done, then half fee. (Usually Marcia would say – waive the VB fee until January 15, 2012 and if done, will prorate it)

Mai

From: Sandberg, Connie (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 9:13 AM
To: Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul); Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Townsend, Tanya (CI-StPaul); Dornfeld, Matt (CI-StPaul)
Subject: FW: 394 Clifton St.
Importance: High

Marcia, Mai,

Apparently there was a massive miscommunication about all this. As far as we in DSI-VB are concerned, no fee is due to us.

The first year fee (2010-2011) was paid off at Real Estate with a check from Bank of America

The second year fee was the subject of all the hearings. In our system we cancelled the fee, after it was sent to Real Estate. Hearings occurred after the fee went to Real Estate. Apparently no message about what to do with that assessed fee went to Real Estate after the Hearings decisions (Nov 2011? & Jan 2012?), so the fee remained in their system, unchanged.

Please look at your Hearings records and determine what you intended to happen with the fee and do a Council Resolution to make that happen, before the fee is sent to Ramsey County (Dec 5?). If you want to delete the whole thing, it's fine with us.

Then, please let us, Matt Dornfeld and me, know what you've decided to do, and when it will happen, and who is going to convey that information to the property owner, Kristin Quinlan..

Thank you,
Connie

From: Dornfeld, Matt (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 7:13 AM
To: Sandberg, Connie (CI-StPaul)
Subject: FW: 394 Clifton St.
Importance: High

Could you please read this (sorry) and then lets talk. Thanks.

From: Kristin Quinlan [<mailto:kristinrae30@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2012 9:36 PM
To: *CI-StPaul_LegislativeHearings
Cc: Dornfeld, Matt (CI-StPaul); mike@flemingoffice.com
Subject: 394 Clifton St.
Importance: High

November 14, 2012

Marcia Moermond-

I am writing in regards to 128805 Vacant Bldg Fee August 2011 for \$1,250.00, now at \$1,300.92 from accrued interest on my property 394 Clifton St.

I purchased my home on 8/26/11 and wasn't aware of the vacant home status until Matt Dornfeld left a business card on my back door and mailed me a letter. I went before you on Tuesday, November 15th, 2011. At that time you continued the fee, gave me additional time to get the work completed, and pursue legal action. You

stated you would be willing to consider a radical reduction or elimination of the assessment if I complied with the Code Compliance Process and pursued this civilly, which would validate that this wasn't properly disclosed to me due to the situation. I had already been in touch with a lawyer and was at the early stages of action, and did in fact continue the pursuit per your request.

On the morning of January 3rd, 2012 I was scheduled to see you again. Prior to court I received a call from Mr. Dornfeld, where we discussed my situation again. He gave me a 45 day extension on the work and fee, as I thought I completed and satisfied everything that was asked of me, but there were something's that needed to be re-inspected and it couldn't be fit into the timeline that was initially given to me. I appeared for the hearing as scheduled, to ensure you were aware of the progress and status as well. You stated you had spoken with Matt, the extension was granted, and I was free to go.

I received a letter titled Vacant Building Registration Fee on February 17th, 2012 for \$1,100, but previous information I received and was presented to me said \$1,250. I called Mr. Dornfeld to follow up and he said I didn't need to do anything with it at the time, since it was in continued status. Continuously, through the 45 days I kept in close contact with Mr. Dornfeld. He continued to assure me I wouldn't need to worry about the fee as long as I kept complying with the process and stayed in contact with him, which I did.

On March 7th, 2012 I completed my last individual inspection and had Mr. Seeger out on March 9th, 2012 for the final overall walk through. At that time he verbally informed me I had successfully passed all my inspections, would ensure each inspectors information was entered and closed out, so he could issue the Certificate of Code Compliance. I immediately contacted Mr. Dornfeld to make him aware. At that time he stated he would check with Mr. Seeger and then assured me he would waive the fee; I didn't have anything to further worry about or do, and thanked me for my cooperation. I received my Certificate of Code Compliance via mail, which is dated March 14th, 2012 and signed by James Bloom, Building Official.

Last evening November 13th, 2012 I logged onto the City Assessments page to electronically pay my current assessments due November 15th, 2012. At that time I noticed the assessment listed above is still pending against me.

Right away this morning I called Mr. Dornfeld and he is out of the office until Thursday November 15th, so I left him a voice mail. I also contacted one of the DSI clerks that I worked with frequently through this process and she is out of the office today as well.

I then contacted the assessments department directly. I was told by the lady I spoke with she wasn't seeing anything about it being waived only continued over 2 years of payments. I explained the situation and what I was told. She researched a little further and said she saw a fee from July 2011 to July 2012 that was waived and the one still listed was from July 2010 to 2011, although it's listed August 2011. So, I am very confused. I was never aware of or informed of 2 vacant fees or a total of approximately \$2,500 owed. From anything I have ever been told (from several city staff), information listed, or paperwork/ information I have received through this whole process was for one fee of \$1250, again in which I was told would be waived. She told me there wasn't anything she could do and directed me to contact Mr. Dornfeld, which I already had done. She also stated that if it doesn't get put in for removal from the ledger by tomorrow November 15th, 2012, it will be added to my taxes.

After receiving this information, I contacted my attorney Mr. Michael Fleming who is currently out of town, but directed me to contact you.

I paid out of pocket for the other fees that were incurred in order to comply with the process and resolve the issue, not including the costs to fix the home, which were unexpected. I don't feel it's fair to be charged for a fee that I was never aware of, or on home I didn't even own at the time and had nothing to do with me, if this is truly the case based on what I was told.

I am a single mother of two and have put a lot of my money back into this home to make it nice again. I truly can't afford for my mortgage payment to be raised, which would happen with the tax increase due to this fee. I also feel I shouldn't be penalized for something that wasn't my fault from the beginning, and was told would be waived if I complied, which I did. I find it unfortunate the previous owner who ultimately caused all this and didn't comply isn't having any accountability or responsibility financially for his actions, as the fee is attached to the property not the person from what I was told by the lady I spoke to today. I am hopeful you will take this into consideration and help me get this removed.

Thank you for your time, it's greatly appreciated! I look forward to hearing from someone.

Sincerely,
Kristin Quinlan
394 Clifton St.
St. Paul, MN 55102
651-335-1807