



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, January 14, 2025

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Remove/Repair Orders

- 1 [RLH RR 24-44](#) Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 925 MAGNOLIA AVENUE EAST within fifteen (15) days after the December 4, 2024, City Council Public Hearing. (Refer back to Legislative Hearing Agenda for January 14, 2025)

Sponsors: Yang

Layover to LH January 28, 2025 at 9 am for further discussion after CCIR is completed.

No one appeared

Moermond: we are waiting for that Code Compliance Inspection Report to be conducted so the owner can put together that work plan. Mai, you spoke with Clint Zane?

Mai Vang: yes, and Mr. Zane is going to expedite the inspection. I got an email from the owner yesterday stating the lockbox number is wrong, so he put the lockbox in the email and I forwarded it to Mr. Zane.

Moermond: he made the application in a timely fashion right after that last hearing, but the application was somehow lost in a pile on a Vacant Building supervisor's desk.

Mai Vang: correct.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 1/28/2025

Staff Reports

- 2 [SR 25-9](#) Review of a potential stay of enforcement of demolition for Tom Radio, representing Allstate BK Real Estate Holdings, Ltd. at 455 ROBERT STREET SOUTH.

Sponsors: Noecker

Layover to January 28, 2025 at 10 am (unable to reach property rep).

[1/17 Tom Radio asked to reschedule to 2/11; MM approved 1/21 and email conf sent to Radio- JZ]

Voicemail left by Moermond: Good morning Mr. Radio, this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling you about Burger King on Robert. We'll have to push the hearing on this. We intended to have one day, which is what we spoke about after Council, but there appears to be a misstep in getting a confirmation letter out to you so you have it in writing so you could forward to your people. We need to schedule something sooner than later to discuss this matter. If you want to get back about your calendar we can see what we can put together. That would be great. Thank you, I look forward to talking to you.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 2/11/2025

10:00 a.m. Hearings

Making Finding on Substantial Abatements

- 3 [RLH RR 25-2](#) Fifth Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 939 CHARLES AVENUE in Council File RLH RR 24-6.

Sponsors: Bowie

Layover to January 28, 2025 at 10 am (unable to reach PO). CPH February 5.

Voicemail left by Moermond: I am trying to reach Lori Miller, this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling you about your property at 939 Charles. It has been difficult to reach you the past couple of hearings. We do need to talk with you. Your probably aware that you have already lost \$5,000 of your \$10,000 Performance Deposit you've posted because of not closing this out. Right now, you are in danger of losing an additional \$5,000 if we can't get this put to bed in a reasonable time. Let's actually talk. We'll try back in a little bit.

Voicemail left by Moermond: good morning again Ms. Miller, this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council. We have had difficulties getting ahold of you for a while. What I'm going to do, based on that, is go ahead and continue your case to the 28th being mindful this will have a Council Public Hearing February 5. My current recommendation is you forfeit the remaining \$5,000 Performance Deposit you have posted. If you can get it completed by then then we wouldn't be looking at doing that forfeiture. I strongly encourage you to do exactly that. One last check on my calendar on January 28th. You'll receive a letter confirming this.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 1/28/2025

- 4 [RLH RR 25-1](#) Second Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 1726 FOURTH STREET EAST in Council File RLH RR 24-33.

Sponsors: Johnson

The nuisance is abated and the matter resolved.

James Hoffman: nuisance is abated and the matter resolved. Code Compliance

certificate issued December 13, 2024.

Referred to the City Council due back on 1/22/2025

- 5 [RLH RR 25-3](#) Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 41 MILLER CREST LANE in Council File RLH RR 24-23.

Sponsors: Johnson

The nuisance is abated and the matter resolved.

James Hoffman: nuisance is abated and the matter resolved. Code Compliance certificate issued December 3, 2024.

Referred to the City Council due back on 1/22/2025

- 6 [RLH RR 25-4](#) Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 2117 MOHAWK AVENUE in Council File RLH RR 24-24.

Sponsors: Johnson

The nuisance is abated and the matter resolved.

James Hoffman: nuisance is abated and the matter resolved. Code Compliance certificate issued November 25, 2024.

Referred to the City Council due back on 1/22/2025

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Summary & Vehicle Abatement Orders

- 7 **RLH SAO 24-80** Appeal of Thomas Grant to a Vehicle Abatement Order at 1449 BREDA AVENUE. (Refer to January 14, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Jalali

Grant the appeal noting that if vehicle is to be parked on same location proper parking surface to be installed by July 1, 2025.

Thomas Grant, owner, appeared

Moermond: I think what we are looking for is a plan on how to move forward. You have a plan stamped. Ms. Martin, are we missing anything?

Martin: no, just approval from zoning he will be allowed to park on that vacant lot or can combine them.

Grant: the property got combined. It is going through the assessor's office but the County mapping people already gave it a PID, which is on this. It is my understanding that everything has gone through.

Moermond: I have a Department of Safety & Inspections Zoning site plan approval and a file ID from January 14. This is actually Department of Safety & Inspections approving the combination but now it goes to County?

Grant: the County has to do the combination, they took care of that already, or are in the process.

Moermond: do you have that paperwork you filed with them?

Grant: it seems I don't have that. I may have a photo. Would they have a copy at the County office? I can run over there.

Moermond: the plan has been approved by Zoning here, but we need it as one parcel.

Grant: the PID number was given to me by the County. Zoning looked it up and she said it was already combined on the map. So, it is in the data.

Moermond: it was a Frances, are you familiar Ms. Martin?

Martin: yes, she's newer in plan review. I'm not even seeing a copy in STAMP at this point.

Moermond: it is dated the 14th. It may be another couple hours before it is loaded.

Grant: I went in yesterday.

Martin: the parcel they both show under parcel 108.

Moermond: we will go with your testimony, so moving forward we have the ability to have parking on what used to be a vacant parcel but is now combined with the parcel that has the house on it. The question becomes what is an acceptable surface for that parking? What is the alley surface there?

Grant: that asphalt stuff.

Moermond: ultimately parking spaces you need to look at what is ok for surfacing, that's the last piece to deal with. The same people you talked to about the plan are the same people to talk to about that.

Grant: my description said pavers.

Moermond: that will do the job.

Grant: it was also stated in my plan and the corrected yesterday was that I needed a driveway to the spots from the alley. I just extended the pavers to the alley, so there are four rows of pavers to take me from the alley to the parking.

Moermond: that works from my perspective, given we have plan review signing off.

Martin: I can't see the plan, but pavers can go to an actual parking *pad* as long as there is an approved parking pad which is usually concrete. You can't park on pavers.

Grant: what can I park on?

Moermond: there is clearly written on this plan that was approved 3 sets of parallel pavers to accommodate tires. Grass in between.

Martin: I don't think that was approved correctly. I can verify that.

Moermond: I'm not here to evaluate whether or not zoning made an error or not. What is see is it was signed off on.

Martin: it says a proposed parking area to accommodate the tires, but it doesn't show the actual—they're just showing pavers. I'll have to verify, but there may be a correction to this.

Moermond: for my purposes I'm going to recommend the appeal is granted and in terms of "proposed" of course it will say proposed because he's seeking permission for it to exist there before installation. If Zoning wants to go back and change how it managed this that's fine but for my purposes I'll recommend granting the appeal.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/5/2025

- 8 [RLH SAO 25-2](#) Appeal of JoAnn Lorvig Tsoumanis to a Summary Abatement Order and Excessive Consumption Order at 1400 CHARLES AVENUE.

Sponsors: Jalali

Layover to LH January 21, 2025 at 11 am (rescheduled per PO request).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 1/21/2025

Correction Orders

- 9 **RLH CO 25-2** Appeal of Jennifer Adams to a Correction Notice at 2147 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Johnson

Grant the appeal.

Jennifer Adams, owner, appeared

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: December 12, 2024 a Correction Notice was issued to owner and occupant regarding vehicles. The whole backyard was filled with vehicles. There is obviously approved parking to the garage, the side there is no set-back which appears to be an unapproved surface where those vehicles are. It looks like Mr. Kedrowski quoted the zoning ordinance, discontinue use of operation of vehicle repair and/or sales business from the property. Compliance date of December 23. Photos are attached.

Moermond: item one is the one we can deal with. If this was a Vehicle Abatement Order staff would have already specified parking surface, missing vital parts, and so on. Lacking that, what can you tell me?

Martin: right, a Correction Notice is just a general notice that goes out to say we have a concern with the number of vehicles you have, making sure they are correctly licensed and to the property, parked on an approved surface. If not, please remove from the yard, put in garage, or remove from the property. This is not specific to any one vehicle.

Moermond: that would have been helpful in the inspector's notes. I'll be dealing with the vehicle and property maintenance code. If it is a zoning matter, this isn't the right place, but we'll see where we go with it today. If you need to pursue that we'll help you with the right process.

Adams: 25 years ago, I had new electrical pulled in from the pole, my entire house upgraded for the electrical. 220 out to the rear yard and put in a commercial gate operator. The chain-link fence was removed and six-foot fencing installed to screen my cars. Now we are revisiting this conversation again. I am in compliance. All the vehicles are operational. I'm not running a vehicle repair or sales business on the property. I'm surprised I'm having this conversation again, I thought we resolved this 25 years ago.

Moermond: tell me about your fence.

Adams: it is six feet, completely enclosed. It has an automatic sliding gate that is secure. It is a 12 code operator no one can guess the code on. It is completely screened, and it is anywhere from 6 to 12 feet above grade. No one can see my backyard. No different than opening up a garage to see what is in it.

Moermond: I'm looking at the fencing. Does it go around the front yard?

Adams: the entire property is fenced. The front is chain link. The back is 6-foot cedar.

Moermond: you don't have specific observations from the inspector, Ms. Martin?

Martin: looking at the yard, everything parked along the side of the fence would be in a grassy, unapproved area. We're not showing a site plan showing the entire yard is approved for parking.

Adams: the car in the yard has been moved. The plates that were off of one car in the backseat are now on it. I don't believe I have to have tabs on vehicles that are that old, they are classic cars.

Moermond: do they have classic plates?

Adams: no. Not aware per the statute that I have to have those.

Moermond: you do. Would plan review from 25 years ago still be in the system or is that something that would need to be manually pulled?

Martin: we'd have to manually pull it.

Adams: there's an electrical permit from back then to put in the gate operator.

Moermond: I'm looking for when you established this 25 years ago with respect to the surfacing in the back within the fence. I'm not seeing a fence permit either. What the expectation was about surfacing and any documentation I could refer to. That's where I'm coming from with that question. Could you check the file Ms. Martin, anything historically on that?

Martin: I can research that tomorrow.

Moermond: I'm showing some historic permits here. The ones in the 90's were for HVAC and licensing, maybe dogs.

Adams: I'm referencing 1995 to 2000.

Moermond: I understand. You are really agitated and I can sense that.

Adams: it is a sore spot. I'm trying to be polite and civil.

Moermond: I know, it is ok I just want to make sure I'm doing everything I need to and making sure I catch everything so we don't have to keep revisiting this. I want resolution for you too. The more I can sort through the better. I can see in the aerial, and the photos taken by the City, how were they taken?

Martin: through the fence.

Adams: you can see the gate, they're over the fence.

Moermond: all I'm hearing is we're left with approved surface from the inspector's perspective. When I look at the aerial photo it does look like the side does have cars lined up.

Adams: I have a concrete driveway; when they came there was a car in the yard that has since been moved. I thought I said that at the beginning of this.

Moermond: what car was moved, just for my notes?

Adams: 2005 Buick Lacrosse, white.

Moermond: that helps a lot for the photos. They are saying this parking along the fence doesn't have proper surfacing.

Adams: I don't think she said that. I think she said the car next to my garage here was on an unapproved surface, which it was. In the grass.

Moermond: [reviews aerial photos] it is hard to tell with the snow on the ground what is going on there. One of the aerial photos does show the area where it fits 5 vehicles side-by-side, on the Winthrop side, are on an okay surface. The question becomes what is the other use? I don't see any detail here about the inspector's specific concerns. I'm going to recommend the Council grant the appeal lacking that better information.

Adams: thank you.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/5/2025

Making Finding on Nuisance Abatements

- 10 [RLH SAO 25-3](#) Making finding on the appealed nuisance abatement ordered for 1289 DANFORTH STREET in Council File RLH SAO 24-84.

Sponsors: Kim

The nuisance is abated and the matter resolved.

Moermond: Bagster has been removed, so the nuisance is abated and the matter resolved. Property is now in compliance.

Referred to the City Council due back on 1/22/2025

1:00 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

11 **RLH VBR
24-70**

Appeal of Richard A. Bowen to a Vacant Building Registration Fee Warning Letter at 767 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST.

Sponsors: Noecker

Grant to March 21, 2025 for orders related to interior items and wires; grant to October 31, 2025 for exterior related items, except for repair or replacement of broken windows which has extension to June 1, 2025; grant the appeal to be released from the Vacant Building Program.

*Richard Alan Bowen, co-owner , appeared via phone
Andrew Dawkins, co-owner, appeared via phone*

Moermond: the last set of orders was December 10th, so you've had a chance to review them for a bit. I'm at the point of trying to figure out what makes sense deadline-wise and where you're at with your decisions about the building.

Bowen: as far as deadlines, I have some basic procedures at Mayo in Rochester for a couple of weeks. We've already started some of the items. I think I misplaced the order. Can I get another copy of that?

Moermond: you don't have that anymore?

Bowen: I have it somewhere. I misplaced it. First was sent via email; second was US mail.

Moermond: I believe it was sent both ways. You got a follow up letter by email with the orders and were handed a set when you were here. We'll email it again. Sixteen items on it.

Bowen: we didn't receive anything at the last hearing we showed up for. I was emailed later.

Moermond: the orders were attached to that email. We have a number of interior and exterior items. I spoke with Mr. Imbertson about exterior and weather considerations. I'm thinking the interior items are all similarly situated as far as safety. Number 1, extension cords, are those removed?

Bowen: yes.

Moermond: electrical cord going from office through door into another office?

Bowen: yes.

Moermond: basement has several; clearance path to electrical panel, 36" of clearance.

Bowen: I have to check on that. Our maintenance guy was going to do that but I haven't verified it.

Moermond: similar order about mechanical equipment.

Bowen: same situation.

Moermond: handrail to basement is loose, and disconnected bracket in middle.

Bowen: everything in the basement I need to verify.

Moermond: rodent droppings, have you hired an exterminator?

Bowen: we haven't. I needed to go look at the top of the water heater where they said they saw it. I've been there for a long time and we haven't had any issues ever. There's no food in there.

Moermond: well, the photo of the water heater is pretty gross. I think there's a problem.

Bowen: we'll take care of it.

Moermond: garage issues, no access. I did want to touch on the electrical hazard on the outside, where it says "Remove branches that are growing into the main electrical drop to the building. Remove vine where growing into exterior electrical conduit through an open cover." That doesn't sound safe to me.

Imbertson: two separate items under the same Code. The first part is the branches that are starting to grow into the electrical drop from pole to house. The second part was an electrical line going to a garage and there's a photo of this (page 41).

Bowen: can we get copies of these photos?

Imbertson: 41 and 44. If the vine had not caused any other damage yet it may be a quick fix but there's a small cover missing where service goes into the side of the building and the vine was going straight down the opening alongside the water.

Moermond: is the box spring against the garage removed?

Bowen: yes. We also have someone to take care of the electrical problems if Xcel won't. The ceiling in the upstairs western office is scraped and repainted as well.

Moermond: "Correctly install the unsupported PEX piping going from 1st floor kitchen sink through floor to the 2nd floor bathroom." Mr. Imbertson, what are you looking for there?

Imbertson: it looked like the line wasn't run correctly to begin with. It looked like maybe it was meant as a temporary repair, but there was a line that appeared to be the original supply line to the second floor that wasn't being used and a new line run with PEX piping stubbed off of the kitchen sink. It was coming out the side of the cabinet, unsupported, up through the middle of the room. We'd need that rerun in a professional manner.

Moermond: the only other thing I am noticing, which is more a Vacant Building issue, is these windows where they've been broken and boarded and insulation stuffed in them. They're secured by other than a normal means, which we do need to be time-sensitive on. It looks like you also have a decent sized hole in one of the windows to the basement.

Bowen: it is routinely broken into.

Moermond: it would be a little person in that sized hole.

Bowen: we've caught a little person once before.

Moermond: an 8" x 10" person?

Bowen: I'm just saying they're routinely broken into. I did have a camera in the trees to tape some of the burglaries but they stole the camera too.

Dornfeld: I think we'd all prefer if windows were in tact and operational per code. A board can suffice for a period of time while we're working to replace windows. Boards being a permanent solution is not code, Ms. Moermond.

Moermond: secured by other than normal means is problematic. You do need to keep the building secure and I understand you are struggling but you need to figure it out. No question it is a nuisance condition. Given how infrequently the office is used and the interior and exterior conditions, there's definitely excessive clutter in some spaces. That all comes together in looking more like a candidate for the Vacant Building program than not. If you are working there and address these things I can see putting some extensions in. A couple of months for the interior violations for example.

Bowen: I'd like to find out what Mayo will be saying about my future needing surgery, what or when. I'd like that knowledge which I don't have until these procedures are done. I can update you on that.

Moermond: I want to give grace here, but maybe you should be hiring someone. We are at a place here where these are some safety concerns that are significant. I see branches and electrical and think it needs to be dealt with sooner than later. The issues in the basement you mentioned someone doing that for you. I want to give you time to be able to get someone hired or do it yourself and give you grace; we haven't talked yet about the significant exterior violations. I know you're thinking of selling, I don't know if you have someone who will be purchasing. March 21 deadline on interior and wires.

Bowen: I'll put it in my calendar.

Moermond: what about the exterior? Sale and doing that exterior work?

Bowen: we've had two purchase agreements and each time the purchaser was going to tear it down and build apartments but they didn't come up with the financing they thought they had so they fell through. Currently I need to speak with our realtor again.

Moermond: I can recommend the Council give an extension through the construction season, but if the work isn't done by then what is the implication? If you fail to meet them you are again with your revoked certificate and in the Vacant Building program.

Bowen: I don't understand why it was sent to Vacant Buildings if it was never vacated. We've officed there since the 1980's. We still do. I said earlier that it is used infrequently, but that isn't the case either. The fact is, yeah there are some conditions that we need to comply with for the Fire code, but to say the building has been vacant is erroneous. I was told we were a Vacant Building because I wasn't there when the inspector came, but then agreed at the last hearing I was never notified.

Moermond: that wasn't agreed to. The letters went to Mr. Dawkins rather than you because he was listed as the Fire Certificate of Occupancy Responsible Party.

Dawkins: I was out of town.

Moermond: I understand but Mr. Bowen saying no notification was sent is in fact, itself, erroneous.

Bowen: no notification was sent to ME.

Moermond: I understand the appointment letters. If it is revoked and looks to be vacant by staff, which is why we are here today. Seldom used is what it looks like from photos of the interior. Safety concerns in terms of clutter at the very least. Then the other violations as discussed. I don't mind recommending this isn't in the Vacant Building program, what I want to see are these things addressed. On its face it isn't great and without a Certificate of Occupancy you can't occupy, period. Mr. Imbertson, anything to add?

Imbertson: I would agree from the inspection it certainly didn't look to be occupied regularly, but not necessarily in a position to judge how frequently the property is visited. Either way, we'd require a Certificate of Occupancy to be maintained if there is ANY use of the property, so at that point it is somewhat irrelevant whether it is used daily or infrequently.

Dawkins: I'm going to say for interior items and wires on the exterior March 21, 2025 as a deadline. For exterior items I'm going to give to October 31, 2025 with the exception of the broken windows. It is a visual nuisance and a safety matter. I'd like to split that and say that work can be done June 1, 2025. That's the window frames, window glass itself. I'll recommend you're out of the Vacant Building program, unless it needs to be revoked, it is reinstated pending you meeting these deadlines.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/5/2025

12 RLH VBR 25-5 Appeal of Thang Nguyen to a Vacant Building Registration Fee Warning Letter Requirement at 1205 EDGERTON STREET.

Sponsors: Kim

Waive VB fee for 120 days (to April 11, 2025) and allow permits.

Thang Nguyen, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Matt Dornfeld: the Fire Certificate of Occupancy was revoked and it was transferred to the Vacant Building department on December 11, 2023. James Hoffman opened the file as a Category 2. Currently we do not have a

Code Compliance Inspection Report or permits on file. We did have to issue four Summary Abatement Order this past summer for tall grass and weeds. On return inspections all were in compliance, so no work orders. Presently we see it vacant, secure, and maintained.

Nguyen: I had bad tenants and I had to evict them. They didn't pay the water bill, it was \$10,000. They didn't pay for years. I had to pay about \$20,000 for the water bill. I had to take care of my wife and I didn't have the time or money to take care of the house. That's why I left the house in this condition. Right now, my wife is better and back home in Minnesota. Please consider my situation the fee is hard. I'd rather take the house back to good condition. I need your help. After two years even vacant, the property tax plus the normal fees.

Moermond: your paperwork has you on Marion, and you're talking about being out of state. Where are you now?

Nguyen: I'm back now. Living here on Marion.

Moermond: you have a big water bill you paid. I imagine a lot of the money you would have used to fix the house was used for that. Is fixing it something possible? It seems like you may be struggling to get it done.

Nguyen: I will try to do it if you help me with the fee.

Moermond: one thing the City will want is the Code Compliance Inspection Report done.

[Dornfeld explains that process]

Moermond: you need to get that so you know what to do to fix it properly. We'll send you a follow up letter and include an application to get a Code Compliance Inspection Report. You can then apply for that. The issue of paying the fee now, I'd like to slow that process down. I'll ask the Council to give you a 90-day waiver, which if you aren't done, will come forward as a special tax assessment and we can try and prorate that assessment. I want you to focus on repairs and we'll worry in the future about the Vacant Building fee.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/5/2025

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate - Fire Certificate of Occupancy

- 13 [RLH VO 24-38](#) Appeal of Scott Swanson to a Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection (which includes condemnation) at 999 HUDSON ROAD. (January 14, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Johnson

Deny the appeal and grant to March 1, 2025 to have Fire C of O reinstated.

*Scott Kragness, owner, appeared via phone
Amy Mason, attorney, appeared via phone*

Moermond: we have Supervisor Der Vue on the line as well. We were checking in to see what was going on with your eviction and the heat situation. Last time we spoke mid-December things were coming to a head and the person was going to be out. Is that where things are?

Kragness: we didn't need to evict, her lease expired and she vacated in accordance with the termination of her lease agreement. She is out. There is adequate heat. We have a crew out there now patching walls and making repairs to get the unit back into a position to be re-leased.

Moermond: when will you re-rent the unit?

Kragness: probably a month away. March 1 occupancy.

Supervisor Vue: based on the conversation with the inspector as well as the Supervisor on the East team, Leanna Shaff, the plan was to move forward with a full Certificate of Occupancy renewal inspection. Inspector Dravis had the most recent complaint did send a couple letters to complete that as the renewal inspection is due. We appreciate the work being done now and it may work well to do an inspection while you're doing a turn, to renew the Fire Certificate of Occupancy.

Kragness: we can definitely get that on board. I know the folks working are working off Inspector Dravis' last list. We would definitely be ready for the inspection to get a fresh Certificate of Occupancy.

Vue: that sounds great. I can pull up Inspector Dravis' schedule and get something on the books, or he can reach out and coordinate a date and time.

Kragness: he does have my contact info, if he could reach out to me when I have my calendar in front of me and I'll check with Craig at the building as far as the main items being completed. I would say the next two weeks we could get this done.

Vue: I'll have him reach out to you.

Moermond: make sure you plan carefully so the work is done. They are very understaffed so you don't want a delay because of that if it has to be rescheduled.

Kragness: I'll keep that in mind when I schedule and get a good timeframe from the contractor.

Moermond: I'll give an extension to March 1, 2025 for compliance.

Referred to the City Council due back on 1/15/2025