



# 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, December 14, 2021

9:00 AM

Remote Hearing

---

#### 9:00 a.m. Hearings

##### Remove/Repair Orders

- 1 [RLH RR 21-69](#) Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 439 HERSCHEL STREET within fifteen (15) days after the December 22, 2021, City Council Public Hearing.

**Sponsors:** Jalali

*By COB December 20, 2021 PO to 1) submit work plan, including schedule and bids, 2) financial documents sufficient for completing the rehab, 3) affidavit dedicating funds to the project, and 4) property must continue to be maintained.*

*Rose Olson, owner, appeared via phone*  
*Brandon Olson, son of owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff update by Manager Steve Magner: letter was sent November 24, 2021 confirming the matter was laid over to today. Must post a \$5,000 Performance Deposit with DSI, that has been done. Submit evidence of financing, note second half taxes have not been paid—*

*Brandon Olson: those have been paid.*

*Magner: submit affidavit dedicating funds to the project, submit work plan with a schedule and signed bids, must be maintained.*

*Moermond: and I believe she omitted the samples and forwarded later. It is hard to know what I have in my hands because they are so blurry.*

*Brandon Olson: when we came down Friday we have stuff to photocopy but the clerk told us we had to talk to Reid Soley. We were at a loss to who to give it to. We had it ready and available.*

*Moermond: you were at DSI, not my office.*

*Brandon Olson: and she said we had to go to Reid.*

*Moermond: and I don't know who "she" is, but she didn't know what was going on. The*

stuff should have been coming to the courthouse building. The woman you talked to didn't know the kind of case it is, which has different rules. Inadvertently the documents are blurry, but you have clearer copies, which we need. I don't know the quality of your phone camera, is that what I'm looking at?

Brandon Olson: yes, my mother's phone.

Moermond: you can bring them in person, we do have a receptionist here. The other piece is the schedule for doing the work.

Rose Olson: plumbing is 5 to 8 weeks out. That's what they're telling me.

Moermond: that's not so bad. We're talking about a six month grant of time, so that's still well within that time from the Council. Make sure to include what they are telling you in that schedule so we have a measure of what is going on. We do know contractors are swamped, permits are slower because there's so much activity, and there are supply chain issues. We just ask you to be planful so you can be ready if things go sideways and can recover. When can you have those documents to my office?

Brandon Olson: next couple of hours.

Moermond: that would be marvelous.

Brandon Olson: except for the schedule and things.

Moermond: make one trip. Can you have those documents by Friday? This goes to Council next Wednesday.

Brandon Olson: I'll do my best and call and harass them.

Moermond: you are far enough along here that we'll get this over the finish line. This goes to Council December 22 and we need time to review it before you submit it. It is looking like you'll get the 180 days. We need unblurry documents and schedule. When we were looking over the financials, you have a MN Deferred Comp account being drawn on. Is that a current retirement account? Borrowing a loan out of?

Rose Olson: neither. That is just extra deferred comp, it is not pension or anything. Just money sitting there.

Moermond: those sometimes have rules that say you can't borrow from them until you start taking payments at retirement. I don't have a total for what it will cost.

Brandon Olson: the electric and plumbing bids were both under \$2,000.

Moermond: that's good. We'll take a look at those unblurry documents and hopefully we don't have to worry about deferred comp.

Brandon Olson: understandable. I just wanted to cover that.

Moermond: I don't think we should have a problem, but if we are missing an item before Wednesday I'll ask the Council to delay its vote to January 5 to give you 2 weeks to get that information in. I'd like to do it sooner so your contractors can start. If we review these documents and are in agreement then your guys can pull permits right

away, so no delay based on the Council vote.

Brandon Olson: schedule, affidavit, unblurry bids, electric, and plumbing. Taxes have been paid.

Rose Olson: and copies of all the income stuff?

Moermond: yes, perfect. How you're going to pay for it. I'd like clearer ones; the top half is blurry.

Brandon Olson: sounds good.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 12/22/2021**

**2**      [RLH RR 21-70](#)

Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 1722 REANEY AVENUE within fifteen (15) days after the December 22, 2021, City Council Public Hearing.

**Sponsors:**      Prince

*If \$5,000 PD is posted by COB December 21, 2021, refer back to LH January 11, 2022 at 9 am via phone for status of cleanout of property. CCI must be ordered by January 11, 2022. (CPH 12/22/21, 1/26/22)*

*Joseph Rossman, attorney o/b/o Reverse Mortgage Funding, LLC, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we did have a hearing on this last time, and then learned you are representing the mortgage company. We'll review the information again and where we go from here.*

*Staff update by Manager Steve Magner: Staff report by Manager Steve Magner: the building is a one-story, wood frame, single-family dwelling, with a detached two-stall garage and attached shed, on a lot of 15,246 square feet. According to our files, it has been a vacant building since June 27, 2019. The current property owner is Reverse Mortgage Funding LLC c/o Compu Link Corporation d/b/a Celink per Amanda and Ramsey County Property records. On September 15, 2021, an inspection of the building was conducted, a list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed and photographs were taken. An Order to Abate a Nuisance Building was posted on September 21, 2021 with a compliance date of October 21, 2021. As of this date, the property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code. Taxation has placed an estimated market value of \$40,000 on the land and \$155,800 on the building. Real estate taxes are current. The vacant building registration fees were paid by assessment on July 30, 2021. As of November 22, 2021, a Code Compliance Inspection has not been done. As of November 22, 2021, the \$5,000 performance deposit has not been posted. There have been twenty-eight Summary Abatement Orders since 2019. There have been eleven work orders issued for boarding/securing, tall grass/weeds, snow/ice, and vegetation blocking public right-of-way. Code Enforcement Officers estimate the cost to repair this structure exceeds \$50,000. The estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$20,000.*

*Moermond: Mr. Rossman, which of these companies are you representing?*

*Rossman: I represent the current owner following the assignment of sheriff's certificate, Reverse Mortgage Funding LLC.*

*Moermond: when did that happen and where are you in that process?*

*Rossman: I heard dates being referenced in 2019. As we know, in March of 2020 the eviction moratorium was put in place. We would have normally moved forward with an eviction. We had knowledge there was a former mortgagor. This was a reverse mortgage, both of them were deceased. A son of a former mortgagor was using the property, living there.*

*Moermond: squatting because it was a registered Vacant Building*

*Rossman: yes, but due to the moratorium we couldn't proceed with an eviction. There could be an argument for evicting squatters, however the legislators weren't clear. It was a blanket hold in the state of Minnesota. Since the eviction window opened we completed an eviction action in state court. We have a court order and completed a lock out December 1. Prior to 2021 we weren't able to go in and secure it or kick anyone out or do any repairs. Now we are in a storage period following the lockout, there was an inventory of the property. There was significant quantity of property, but our firm's policy is we would post the inventory list and store it onsite for 28 days. That expires December 29. Since we did the underlying foreclosure in 2019, we received notice from the City regarding the demo notice and order to abate. I did forward those on to my client and they didn't really formally retain me to do anything. I thought they were handling it directly with the City. I spoke with them yesterday to prepare for today, they did indicate they sent someone to show up at the hearing on November 23. But I didn't get details of what happened, if they spoke with anyone, or what came of that.*

*Moermond: bold letters saying this is a teleconference hearing so it is nice they showed, up but that's not how it was being conducted. I can tell you that I don't know that you were interpreting the eviction moratorium correctly for the facts for this case looking backwards, but that's water under the bridge. The exterior you did have control over. There were 28 notices over 2 years to do the most basic things. Nothing was stopping your company from doing those things. Mowing, shoveling the walk, trimming vegetation going into the right of way. Not a great neighbor. The fact the hearing was missed by your client is indicative of their management style. I need them to show up for real and make this not a nuisance property. That will begin with what is in the correspondence that a \$5,000 Performance Deposit needs to be posted and a Code Compliance Inspection conducted. I'm hearing it is a full house?*

*Rossman: no, the inventory list had a lot of basic furniture items. Chairs, desks, bookshelves. Couches and beds. I wouldn't consider it hoarded. It is just full. This was a tough spot; the City thinks this was a clear case of a squatter but we have to proceed within the scope of the eyes of the law. Proceeding cautiously. I would like to state for the record that my client, despite what has happened so far, does want to avoid demolition. They have been out there and it is now boarded and secured as of December 1. I can now indicate to them they need to get the inspection done and post the Performance Deposit.*

*Moermond: and those are the basic things to get you a continuance to do the rest of the necessary items to rehab the property. I would like to see that happen. The property having items in it makes it impossible to have it thoroughly inspected. While you could make that application, we would need a time certain on the cleanout before inspectors would go out. They need clear visuals to walls, ceilings, floors and so on.*

*Magner: generally the mortgage company would do a trash out before we would do the inspection. Once they have control of the property they would follow the steps of doing*

*the trash out, getting a Code Compliance Inspection and putting a lockbox on, and then having a contractor submit their bids for potential rehabilitation.*

*Moermond: what is the client's ability to have that \$5,000 posted by December 22?*

*Rossman: I don't have an exact answer for you. I did speak with them and their intention is to avoid demolition. I would presume that should be able to be complied with. That's 8 days from today. I have a follow-up scheduled immediately after this call.*

*Moermond: it is 8 days from today, but several months since the September letter indicating this information to your client.*

*Rossman: I understand, I apologize, I was just commenting on your question on getting that completed. I don't see any reason why that cannot be complied with now.*

*Moermond: good to hear that. That will be what I'm looking for as an act of good faith that your client is in this. This is step 1 for all properties in this condition. It is returnable upon rehabilitation within the time granted by Council. It is also returnable if that time isn't given. We also look for a work plan with a schedule and bids from the contractor. That junk out does need to happen before that Code Compliance can happen. And you'll need that before the bids. You also need to show the money available to do that rehabilitation. Often banks say yes, we have money. But it needs to be set aside for this purpose, so we need an affidavit from an official at that institution. It sounds like they have the place boarded. I would assume basic property maintenance is underway, so it is neatly shoveled if Mr. Magner's team was to go by today. Understand you are tightly monitored now. I don't want to stand in front of Council saying you haven't been maintaining because that's an indication you aren't committed. REO folks need to be there taking care of it. This won't all be done by next Wednesday. If they post the Performance Deposit I can ask the Council to continue the matter. I'll check in again January 12 and we'll make sure the junk out is done by then and the Code Compliance Inspection is ordered. If that is done, we'll set another day to talk about work plans and financing for completing the project. Any questions or comments?*

*Rossman: I believe that timeline sounds reasonable. Thank you for that. My understanding this has to be approved next Wednesday. Our plan is to do the trash out on or after the expiration on December 28, 2021. With it close to the holidays realistically probably January 3. Once it is cleaned out we'll order that Code Compliance Inspection that week.*

*Moermond: next Wednesday I'll ask them to continue it into January 26. That will be the first date it goes back to Council. If we don't meet benchmarks from earlier we'll report that back, if we are I'll ask for another continuance. We'll talk with you again in a few weeks' time on that Code Compliance Inspection application and the junk out. This is all contingent on getting that Performance Deposit done. I'd like it done no later than close of business next Tuesday.*

*Rossman: I have not personally done one of these matters. Is there an exact way that is done?*

*Moermond: there is a form online, we have your email. We'll email you a link to that form so you have that and can see what those expectations look like. You'll get a formal follow-up letter to this hearing Friday this week.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 12/22/2021**

- 3 [RLH RR 20-22](#) Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 678 SNELLING AVENUE NORTH within fifteen (15) days after the May 27, 2020 City Council public hearing. (To Refer to October 26, 2021 Legislative Hearings)

Sponsors: Jalali

*Layover to LH March 29, 2022 at 9 am further discussion. PO to submit written update by close of business Friday, March 25, 2022.*

*Lisa Kugler, consultant, appeared via phone  
Gene Gelgelu, AEDS and owner, appeared via phone*

*Voicemail left for Gene Gelgelu at 10:10 am: trying to call you about a hearing for 678 Snelling Avenue. We'll conduct the hearing and [cut off]*

*Moermond: we got the update yesterday so I haven't had a chance to read through this well yet. Any summary we should be aware of?*

*Kugler: it is actually 2 pages, the good news and bad news. 3 grants were received, \$65,000 Star grant, \$150,000 from the Saint Paul foundation and \$100,000 from the Hardenburgh Foundation. We have reasonably positive news from the other 2. The big piece is the federal DEED money. They created a different program with a Monday deadline and decision date of January 21. After the applications were received, they extended the deadline, which extended the decision time. That is a problem and I'm not sure how we are going to fix that. The only other significant thing is we are done with schematic design and have a cost estimate. That is more than we expected. But a lot of that is everyone hedging bets for construction next year. This is 27% contingency in that number, presumably we'll be able to get that down. The construction supply chain and demand and labor shortage are really affecting how people are pricing. Pricing from a schematic design they have relatively little information.*

*Moermond: the header on the document says October 21, but I see another for December 13. Pages 1 and 2 are for December 13, great.*

*Kugler: I apologize for not having it in on Friday.*

*Moermond: so construction starting the way it is set up now would be July 15.*

*Kugler: best case, yes. Worst case is November. That hinges on the line above, how quickly the EDA grant is committed. They must commit by September 30, they can commit earlier, but make no promises. The sooner we get the application in the better, but without any DEED money the federal share goes up so it is less competitive. We have to figure out what to do. For the DEED application we put in enhanced first floor and second. I don't know if we want to do that for the EDA application. Hopefully we won't have to. The timing is not working out. I'm probably giving you more information than you need?*

*Moermond: no, anything is helpful. Trying to make sure we are clear to the public about delays and documenting that. Mr. Magner, any questions?*

*Magner: from reading this the total project cost is 4,586,817? How many square feet?*

*Kugler: 13,000 and something.*

*Magner: don't you think that's a little high?*

*Kugler: I absolutely do. Part of it is construction costs based on schematic design are high. Usually you can work with a General Contractor to make decisions during the design process to get the most cost effective construction at the beginning. The federal money doesn't allow that, so I'm reasonably convinced the actual costs will be lower, but I can't put a number to that and neither can anyone else. We have to go all the way through construction documents and take lowest responsible bidder and do value engineering at that point*

*Magner: I understand that. For 4 million dollars, 327,000 per square foot, you can raze this building and it will be more cost effective. Just part of your evaluation as you move forward. I'm not an expert but that is my opinion.*

*Kugler: that was the original decision made, then for a couple of reasons the neighborhood group and the City had the opinion the building shouldn't be torn down. The actual construction cost is less awful. \$266,000 per square foot. Which, on another project I would quote it \$250,000 to \$270,000 a square foot for new construction of a commercial building.*

*Moermond: the next big decision point will come May to September, but I'd like to check in 3 months from now. That would push us out to March 29. Let's get another written statement. You'll have the January matching information by then. March you'll have an answer for sure*

*Kugler: hopefully, yes. This whole thing has demonstrated that the process for these projects is not very efficient. Running around for sources of money, it is just not how it is done in the private sector so it is more expensive.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/29/2022**

- 4      RLH RR 21-75      Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 419 FRY STREET within fifteen (15) days after the January 12, 2022, City Council Public Hearing.**

**Sponsors:**      Jalali

*Layover to LH January 11, 2022 at 9 am. By COB January 7, 2022 PO to 1) submit work plan, including schedule and bids, 2) financial documents sufficient for completing the rehab, 3) affidavit dedicating funds to the project, 4) bring second-half 2021 taxes current, and 5) property must be maintained. (CPH Jan 12, 2022)*

*Paul Johnson, owner, appeared via phone*

*[Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Manager Steve Magner: the building is a two-story, wood frame, single-family dwelling with a detached two-stall garage on a lot of 4,792 square feet. According to our files, it has been a vacant building since March 24, 2009. The current property owner is Paul Johnson per Amanda and Ramsey County Property records. On September 29, 2021, an inspection of the building was conducted, a list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed and photographs*

were taken. An Order to Abate a Nuisance Building was posted on October 4, 2021 with a compliance date of November 3, 2021. As of this date, the property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code. Taxation has placed an estimated market value of \$25,900 on the land and \$210,200 on the building. Real estate taxes for the second half of 2021 are delinquent in the amount of \$3,399.71.

The vacant building registration fees were paid by assessment on May 3, 2021. A Code Compliance Inspection was done on November 4, 2021. The \$5,000 performance deposit was posted on December 13, 2021. There have been eighteen Summary Abatement Orders since 2009. There have been two work orders issued for garbage/rubbish and snow/ice. Code Enforcement Officers estimate the cost to repair this structure exceeds \$50,000. The estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$20,000.

Moermond: so a Performance Deposit was posted yesterday, that is good. There are unpaid property taxes. Because you posted the Performance Deposit and got the inspection report I'm assuming you want to rehab this. Where are you at?

Johnson: I purchased it 6 or 7 years ago. I got to work off the original Code Compliance. Life happened and it had to just sit and I couldn't afford to continue rehabbing. Since then I have full employment and funds to complete. I posted the Performance Deposit and pulled the Code Compliance. I do have a licensed construction company to help facilitate. I want to live there when it is done. Unfortunately it just unraveled, but I'm back now and have the ability to complete it. I'd like to finish in the next six months.

Moermond: how are you situated in getting the 2021 taxes caught up?

Johnson: they said I have to December 31 to pay that; I will do that before the end of the month. I have those funds.

Moermond: perfect. Tell me are you managing the rehab and hiring subcontractors?

Johnson: yes, exactly. I tried to pull permits but I understand I have to wait for this hearing. I'm ready to pull permits as soon as the first and work to get it done. I love that neighborhood and want to live there.

Moermond: great, the main thing I am looking at this point is a scope of work, including a schedule and subcontractor bids. Those bids should be consistent with whatever the Code Compliance Inspection Report shows.

Johnson: with the Code Compliance I noticed there were items that were completed from the first and transferred over, some of the stuff seemed pulled from the original. Several items had been completed. I do have a licensed contractor who can go through those items.

Magner: generally they include original items if there haven't been sign off on permits. Let's say it said replumb the second floor bathroom. Half the plumbing is done but no fixtures are installed. It will still say that if the permit wasn't finalized, so it is still an open issue. If your contractor can go through and ID what is left to do that will give you a good basis to put a dollar amount on that.



Johnson: I had everything done through rough ins and then things got paused. Then the permits expired over the last couple of years.

Moermond: so taxes paid, work plan and bids in. Have you been working with subcontractors, are they ready to write bids?

Johnson: yes, I have a contractor. I didn't know about pulling permits, I wanted to speak with you. Some of the issues we have new plumbing and electric and gas and AC. We went from repairing to replacing. I do have contractors in place. My family does this, so I can bring in the original people for the permits.

Moermond: I'd like to give you a couple of weeks to pull that paperwork together. We also need to talk about the money for doing the rehab. You say you have the money; we need documentation that is available and an affidavit dedicating the funds to the project. We can send samples of all of this. If Mr. Magner and I agree on your documents you can pull permits. We don't have hearings December 28 so the next time I can look at this is January 11. I would invite you to get your materials in and we can review them ahead of time. We can green light earlier than that if you get it in. You'll get a follow up letter from Joanna Zimny confirming this discussion, reply to her with those documents.

Johnson: I'll wait for that letter. I'll get those taxes done by the end of the month.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 1/12/2022**

- 5      RLH RR 21-76**      Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 1853 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST within fifteen (15) days after the January 12, 2022, City Council Public Hearing.

**Sponsors:**      Prince

*Remove the building within 15 days with no option to repair.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Manager Steve Magner: the building is a one-story, wood frame, single-family dwelling on a lot of 10,019 square feet. According to our files, it has been a vacant building since March 13, 2020. The current property owner is RV Holdings Five LLC per AMANDA and Ramsey County Property records. On September 22, 2021, an inspection of the building was conducted, a list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed and photographs were taken. An Order to Abate a Nuisance Building was posted on September 27, 2021 with a compliance date of October 27, 2021. As of this date, the property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code. Taxation has placed an estimated market value of \$37,500 on the land and \$99,800 on the building. Real estate taxes for 2021 are due and owing in the amount of \$4,926.09. The vacant building registration fees were paid by assessment on April 1, 2021. As of December 13, 2021, a Code Compliance Inspection has not been done. As of December 13, 2021, the \$5,000 performance deposit has not been posted. There have been eleven Summary Abatement notices since 2020. There have been fourteen work orders issued for garbage/rubbish, boarding/securing, tall grass/weeds, and snow/ice. Code Enforcement Officers estimate the cost to repair this structure exceeds \$50,000. The estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$20,000.*

*Moermond: looks like they have a P.O. Box but no physical address so they couldn't be served. They are in South Carolina so I don't know if they saw the posting or not. Given the number of work orders it looks like City is manager. Given they haven't done the Performance Deposit, Code Compliance Inspection; those are all the earmarks of abandonment. No option but to order the building removed with no option for rehabilitation.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 1/12/2022**

- 6 RLH RR 21-74** Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 879 SIXTH STREET EAST within fifteen (15) days after the January 12, 2022, City Council Public Hearing.

**Sponsors:** Prince

*If PO has \$5,000 PD posted by COB Tuesday, January 10, 2022, refer the matter back to LH on January 25, 2022 for further discussion, including potential purchaser.*

*Roy Carlson, owner, appeared via phone*

*Carlson: here's my dilemma. I priced out the cost to fix this, it was \$50,000 for materials. It is basically a good house and the market is ok. But during Covid my job got knocked down so none of that could get accomplished. I looked for buyers, but most are out of state which isn't a good thing. I tried to find someone local and they aren't cooperating too fast. Now I'm going through realtors that have contractors to take the dilemma away from me. I don't have anyone lined up right now. I was waiting for some things to happen and something else I could sell but that didn't happen. I have materials to show I'm doing something. That's where I'm at.*

*Moermond: we have a few things going on here. One is I need Mr. Magner to put a report on the record.*

*Staff report by Manager Steve Magner: The building is a two-story, wood frame, single-family dwelling with a detached two-stall garage on a lot of 4,792 square feet. According to our files, it has been a vacant building since November 4, 2008. The current property owner is Roy R. Carlson per AMANDA and Ramsey County Property records. On September 16, 2021, an inspection of the building was conducted, a list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed and photographs were taken. An Order to Abate a Nuisance Building was posted on September 22, 2021 with a compliance date of October 22, 2021. As of this date, the property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code. Taxation has placed an estimated market value of \$11,600 on the land and \$99,400 on the building. Real estate taxes are current. The vacant building registration fees were paid by assessment on December 1, 2021. A Code Compliance Inspection was done on June 24, 2010 and has since expired. As of December 13, 2021, the \$5,000 performance deposit has not been posted. There have been twenty-one Summary Abatement notes since 2008. There have been sixteen work orders issued for garbage/rubbish, boarding/securing, tall grass/weeds, and snow/ice. The State of Minnesota has filed tax liens for unpaid individual income taxes and sales & use tax against this property as well as other properties owned by Roy R. Carlson, Senior and Beverly C. Carlson. The additional addresses are 987 Reaney Avenue and 1108 York Avenue in St. Paul, Minnesota. Code Enforcement Officers estimate the cost to repair this structure exceeds \$50,000. The estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$20,000.*

*Moermond: so what is noticeable is that has been a registered Vacant Building for 13*

years. No current Code Compliance Inspection done. We don't have a Performance Deposit posted and that a couple times a year the City has to write orders to maintain the property. Mr. Carlson, you were saying you don't have the resources to do the rehab and are trying to work with someone who might. Post a \$5,000 Performance Deposit before the Council meets January 12, 2022. By close of business January 10, 2022 you have that posted we can continue that conversation about work plans and other contractors. That is the demonstration of good faith you are in this. If you are unable to, or do not post that, we'll proceed to demo with this property. That posting is an act of good faith. I'd like to see that Code Compliance Inspection application done so that information is available for anyone who may be doing rehab on the property. That is necessary for proceeding. Any questions?

Carlson: no questions. I don't have an extra \$5,000 right now. As far as the stuff on the outside, we've been over there several times. We probably didn't meet the criteria on the day it was done. We cut the grass, chopped down growth. We shoveled the recent snow. I can't do certain things at the moment. I've been trying to find someone to help with financing the project. The last 2 years I thought I'd have it together with the extra time, and then I got less than half my wages. I've owned it since 1979. I've been paying the taxes. I need the time to do it and if it takes borrowing the money to show that. it will be sold or rehabbed. I hope the Department will work with me on that.

Moermond: can you outline the transfer of property in these circumstances, Mr. Wagner?

Wagner: a straight sale of a Category 3 Registered Vacant Building isn't allowed under Code. We've had other properties in the same situation where the seller brings a buyer to this forum and they would provide the information to the City they could perform the rehab and enter into a contract with you. They would rehab and then once the Code Compliance certificate is issued they can transfer title with the County. This happens on a regular basis. We've seen hundreds of these. It is just a matter of finding someone who is qualified and has the funds to do this.

Moermond: and we can summarize that in the follow up information.

Carlson: I'd appreciate this. I get 25 calls a week from out of state. I said no, I need someone local who knows what they are doing. Knows what the City's requirements are. I'm working on finding that individual.

Moermond: alright. I know this isn't your first rodeo so you understand the process.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 1/12/2022**

## 10:00 a.m. Hearings

### Making Finding on Nuisance Abatements

- 7      [RLH RR 21-79](#)      Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 1013 JAMESON STREET in Council File RLH RR 21-49. (To refer back to January 11, 2022 Legislative Hearing)

**Sponsors:**      Brendmoen

Refer back to LH January 11, 2022 at 10 am (per owner's request). PO to have property reinspected to determine percentage complete.

*Minute pending*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 12/22/2021**

**8**      [RLH RR 21-77](#)

Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 1023 JESSIE STREET in Council File RLH RR 21-25. (To refer back to January 11, 2022 Legislative Hearing)

**Sponsors:**      Brendmoen

*Refer back to LH January 11, 2022 at 10 am. PO to have building inspector out to determine percentage completed prior to January 10, 2022. PO to submit updated work plan/schedule and proof of financing by close of business January 7, 2022.*

*Rosalinda Costilla, owner, appeared via phone  
David Rocha, owner, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we're talking about where you are at with the rehab. It doesn't sound like things are great. Mr. Magner, please update the record.*

*Staff update by Manager Steve Magner: [reads December 1, 2021 letter from Mai Vang] Council Public Hearing December 22.*

*Moermond: we don't have a current percentage. We have one from last time, but not this time.*

*Magner: we do not have an update from Inspector Bruhn. We're back to the 45% back in April.*

*Moermond: Mr. Rocha, Ms. Costilla, what is going on?*

*Rocha: mostly it has to do with the supply chain. It is still moving along. We are with the insulation folks. They started that on the building. They ran out. They are waiting again for the foam. We have been waiting for 2 months just to have that insulation started. That is holding us up the most. The drywall people are on standby. They can get in once Nathan lets us. They will do the kitchen and bathroom, anywhere with plumbing. They will finish that. As far as insulation, those have been done already. The first insulation they did was 2 days ago. They got about 25% of it insulated. That was anywhere with plumbing fixtures. Bathroom, kitchen. Nathan is aware of this. They cancelled for today because there are waiting for more insulation. I'll call him tomorrow and let him know it didn't arrive and we're still at 25%. The drywall folks are on standby so as soon as Nathan gives the ok we'll get the walls up and the plumbing fixtures in. I wouldn't call it grinding to a halt, I would call it getting a lot of drag.*

*Moermond: I'm glad you're talking with Mr. Bruhn. I am really needing a percentage from him. I need him in there and reviewing permits to do that. When you talk to him tomorrow you need to have that conversation with him. That's important because that percentage plays a role in whether I ask for an additional Performance Deposit to continue with the project. We are one year in now. That is the question the Council is facing. Should they ask for more Performance Deposit because you are about the halfway point? I'm hesitant to recommend demo. I need to treat you like I do other properties. Let's get Nathan in. That's where I'm at with this. I'd like to get that follow up done and talk again January 11 about where you are at and that additional Performance Deposit. We'll get that percentage on the record. We'll need an updated*

*work plan with current estimates. I get we have contractor and supply chain issues, but I need to know you're on top of these things. I also need confirmation the dollars for the rehab are still there and haven't been spent elsewhere. I want to get you over this hump but we're at the 12 month check in and I need a lot more information. We'll send you a follow-up letter Friday, it will be similar to what we looked for in the past.*

*Rocha: ok.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 12/22/2021**

## 11:00 a.m. Hearings

### Summary & Vehicle Abatement Orders

- 9 RLH SAO 21-74** Appeal of Jim McEnroe to a Vehicle Abatement Order at 2121 REANEY AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Prince

*The nuisance is abated and matter resolved.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: the nuisance has been abated and the owner is not attending. Can staff confirm that?*

*Mai Vang: I talked to Mr. McEnroe and he is aware and agrees. He is no longer contesting.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 1/5/2022**

## 1:00 p.m. Hearings

### Summary & Vehicle Abatement Orders

- 10 RLH SAO 21-73** Appeal of Margaret Richardson to a Summary Abatement and Vehicle Abatement Orders at 1138 CHARLES AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Jalali

*The nuisance is abated and the matter resolved.*

*Margaret Richardson, owner, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: this is a recorded Legislative Hearing. I have Supervisor Kedrowski on the line. [gives background of appeals process] This is kind of different since there is no action to be taken, since I understand there is compliance. But we'll cover that in this conversation.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Richard Kedrowski: November 9, 2021 Code Enforcement received a complaint about a motor home in the rear of the yard that someone may be living in. I went out November 10 and found the motorhome with multiple violations, no current tabs, not on an approved surface, appeared inoperable. There also was a wood*

roof built on top with tarp over it. There was a Summary Abatement Order for the wood in the yard and a Vehicle Abatement Order for the camper. A reinspection was done November 22 and the makeshift roof had been removed along with the scrap wood. Additional time was granted for removal of the motorhome. I spoke with Ms. Richardson on a couple of occasions who said she was trying to get it started. I went back December 7 and found it had been removed.

Moermond: it looks like you filed the appeal November 22, which is a couple days after your deadline. What were you looking for, it sounds like you are in compliance? What is going on from your perspective?

Richardson: I disagree with several things the inspector stated, however, I did receive letters November 16 telling me from 2 different inspectors, Kedrowski and McCullough. I called the first number I came across for Mr. Kedrowski, left a Voicemail, and then called again end of day, didn't leave another Voicemail. Called again in the morning twice, and then decided to call the other inspector. He called me back within a couple hours of my Voicemail. He gave me a lot of information, which I felt relieved about. I was feeling like this was a stretch due to the language, which was the date of compliance. I had just gotten the letters on the 16, then more letters the 17. That was my first contact on the 17. Also, the letter stated clearly that if I didn't file an appeal by the 17 I would never have another chance. So, I felt like that's what I should do because I was feeling stressed and threatened and rushed. Didn't know exactly what to do. Mr. McCullough had reassured me I shouldn't file an appeal. We want to work with you. Said he would talk to Mr. Kedrowski, his supervisor, and he will call you and tell you exactly what to do. Told me not to worry and not to stress. I said that is helpful and around 2:00 I received a call, which I missed, I called him back. Then I was driving and had stressful and charged conversation with Mr. Kedrowski. It was very upsetting to me on a lot of levels. I was very confused because he was giving me opposite information than Mr. McCullough had that morning. I felt confused about what to do. Mr. Kedrowski was strongly encouraging me to file an appeal. He said that more than once. I don't know we need to get into the conversation but it was alarming and upsetting, I even told him that. I said this was too much and didn't know what to do. My understanding was I was trying to do something he had decided I was doing that I wasn't. Beyond stressful and threatening. It was accusatory. At any rate we ended the call and he could call back at 6 am since he was off the clock. He told me I'd already filed the appeal on the 17th, but I hadn't. I was literally doing what I was told on the paper. It was very, very, very confusing which is what I wrote on my appeal. The letters state this. Talk to one person after trying to reach another. Get completely different stories.

Moermond: I'm hearing that there is a stressful conversation with contradictory information. I understand you followed up with the administration and the Ward office on this. That is outside my jurisdiction. I'm not in the same chain of command. Different branch of government. We can let them know this testimony, which we always do. I don't have any supervisory authority but I have seen emails indicating that they are privy to this. I am hearing Mr. McCullough speak in a way he wants to work with you and be cooperative. I think it is unfortunate he indicated you shouldn't file an appeal. There should never be that indication, that is your choice.

Richardson: so I got that statement and then conflicting information from the supervisor.

Moermond: and I think Mr. Kedrowski was speaking from you being at deadline and protecting your own interests. It looks like this RV, which was not code compliant, was

*taken care of. It is under control that is fantastic. Whoever complained should be happy now. Knowing that the chain of command is privy to your concerns, do you have any other comments for the record?*

*Richardson: I do, but I will let it go. I do want to say I'm concerned about the future with the inspectors with the City of St Paul due to this because I am speaking out. I did talk to the Legislative Office. I am concerned about being sought out. I feel as though I was. I feel as though there was a decision about my intent before speaking to me.*

*Moermond: let me put your mind at ease a bit. I indicated that is completely your decision about appealing. If you feel unfairly targeted, you feel it there is inappropriate order, something comes up, I encourage you to appeal it. that would take it out of the direct communication between you and the inspector. Enforcement is stayed pending the conclusion of this appeal which should decompress any feeling of pressure. There's no penalty for filing an appeal. It is an opportunity to have a conversation like the one we're having. Hopefully that puts your mind at ease that there is a buffer built in.*

*Richardson: ok.*

*Moermond: I see the nuisance condition is taken care of and the administration is aware of your concerns. I've hopefully addressed some of those concerns as well.*

*Richardson: ok.*

*Moermond: thank you for bringing this to our attention and for addressing the nuisance. Terrific.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 1/5/2022**

### **Vacant Building Registrations**

- 11      RLH VBR      Appeal of Darleen Tareeq to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at  
21-84                      657 CANTON STREET.**

**Sponsors:**              Noecker

*Waive the VB fee for 90 days (to March 9, 2022).*

*Darleen Tareeq, owner, appeared via phone*

*[Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Supervisor AJ Neis: this was an inspection from November 26 in response to a fire. It was the Friday after thanksgiving. The Fire Department responded to the dwelling fire; it was extinguished. They had some concerns about the habitability of the building. I did a walkthrough and determined it was not habitable due to fire and smoke damage. There were also concerns about improperly installed gas lines. Xcel red tagged those. Utilities were disconnected. I placed a condemnation placard on the building and the Fire Department was advised it couldn't be lived in. A letter was sent to the property.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Matt Dornfeld: per that referral we opened a Category 1 fire*

*exempt file on December 9, 2021. As of right now we don't have a Vacant Building registration form requesting a 90 day waiver.*

*Moermond: can someone fill out that form online, or print and mail in?*

*Dornfeld: they are online however our website isn't the easiest to navigate. One was mailed to the appellant and that would be the easiest route.*

*Moermond: and that just happened Friday so she likely hasn't received it or will just today. That helps. Ms. Tareeq, I'm sorry to hear about this fire. What is going on and what are you looking for?*

*Tareeq: the gas line improperly installed, I got flooring put in my kitchen and the hard pipe was under my flooring. The pipe was there and is waiting for reinspection. Xcel wants to reinspection and I thought they were coming back yesterday. My kids' grandpa was over there and didn't see anyone. My kids were playing with a lighter and her mattress started on fire. Terrible thing. I wasn't even there when they talked to the Fire Department. I was in the hospital. There wasn't a lot of work done. But the things that are wrong are minor damage and I'd like to move back as soon as possible. My kids are homeless right now.*

*Moermond: have you been working with the Red Cross on this?*

*Tareeq: they came and gave me a gift card. I didn't have homeowner's insurance so I'm doing everything on my own. I don't know what "other electrical issues" are. There has been progress fixing their concerns. I'm trying to move back in as soon as possible.*

*Moermond: I'm guessing there needs to be permit pulled, Mr. Neis?*

*Neis: you are correct. Anytime a utility has been shut off by Xcel due to a fire or significant event the only way for them to restore the electric or gas is for them to get a licensed contractor and pull a permit and have an inspection of the gas lines. Do an air test. The appropriate contractor signs off and then they let Xcel know.*

*Tareeq: They said I didn't have a range above the oven but we fixed that too. It wasn't because of the fire damage. I had a TISH report when I bought it, they didn't say anything about inappropriate gas lines.*

*Neis: whenever a utility is shut off as part of a Fire Department response, whether a result of the fire or not, if the utilities are tagged the process is the same.*

*Moermond: you need to hire a contractor to do the fixes. If it wasn't called out in the TISH, that's unfortunate, but my concern is you are telling me you don't have homeowner's insurance which is unfortunate. Are you employed?*

*Tareeq: no.*

*Moermond: do you have equity in the house?*

*Tareeq: yes.*

*Moermond: good. We'll send you an email with a letter and I want you to have contact information for a City program with emergency loans for these situations. They may be able to help. The number is 266-6564 but we'll also email that information to you as*



*well. That woman's name is Zong Vang. You had questions about electric as well as the gas. Mr. Neis any additional comments on that?*

*Neis: no. The inspection I did was cursory and it was very dark. The ones reported to me were from what they said at the fire. I did see a lot of cords scattered around. In the room of origin, anytime there are outlets, the electrical needs to be inspected behind the charred walls to make sure there is no damage. They didn't get overheated, those types of things. We don't want another fire to start.*

*Moermond: I'm really concerned. Where are you staying right now Ms. Tareeq?*

*Tareeq: at a friend's house on the couch.*

*Moermond: have you talked to the House Calls program at all?*

*Tareeq: I have, but because I made Vacant Building they won't help me. Because that's too much out of what they can afford. Even the fee I may be exempt from, that is their cap. That is unfortunate.*

*Neis: Lauren Lightner did reach out to me the other day. They did confirm there wasn't anything they could do as far as resources, as well as the funding, for the year ran out.*

*Moermond: we do need you to get a contractor in there to deal with the gas lines and electrician to look at the electrical. That needs to be done before it can be reoccupied.*

*Neis: the other concern is the remediation, I know you need somewhere to stay, but the charring and smoke and soot remediation needs to be properly addressed. The long-term health effects of staying in a home with those carcinogens could be devastating. Those are other reasons the house isn't safe to occupied. They shouldn't be remediated without proper protective gear.*

*Moermond: there is enough work in terms of the charred structure and cleanup it may require building permit to be pulled?*

*Neis: potentially. Typically a restoration contractor or insurance would be the ones to help mitigate that for the resident.*

*Moermond: I am more than happy to waive that fee for a while to give you some time to get your feet underneath yourself. I encourage you to fill out that Vacant Building registration form so people know how to get ahold of you. We'll email another copy. I'm going to put a 90 day waiver on this which means you owe nothing if it is done within 90 days. If you aren't, I can work with you on prorating this. I encourage you to work with Zong Vang to see about that. I wish I could do more for you but I can't tell you it is ok to move back in based on what I'm hearing from Fire, Xcel, and staff. It is too dangerous. The condemnation makes sense given existing the conditions. We can talk to Ms. Vang about resources for temporary housing, I don't know if she does, but it is worth asking. Any questions Ms. Tareeq?*

*Tareeq: no.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 1/5/2022**

**2:00 p.m. Hearings**

---

**Fire Certificates of Occupancy**

- 12     RLH FCO  
21-153**            Appeal of Mark Younghans to a Correction Notice-Reinspection Complaint at 1191 EARL STREET.
- Sponsors:**        Yang
- Grant to January 1, 2022 for compliance.*
- No one appeared*
- Voicemail left at 2:07 PM: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council about your property at 1191 Earl. We'll try back in about 10 minutes.*
- Voicemail left at 2:35 PM: this is Marica Moermond calling you again from St. Paul City Council. We will follow up with a letter. We haven't received any additional information since our November 2 conversation. I'm looking at June 1, 2022 for the deadline. That will be confirmed on a letter going out Friday.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 1/5/2022**
- 
- 13     RLH FCO  
21-183**            Appeal of Bonnie Barlage, Boyeyey Holdings LLC, to a Reinspection Fire Certificate of Occupancy With Deficiencies at 991 ROSE AVENUE EAST.
- Sponsors:**        Yang
- All life safety items to be completed by December 17, 2021 (Items 2, 3, 8, 10, 13, 18, 19, 20, 24, 30, 32, 33, 34, and 35), grant to February 1, 2022 for balance of the orders.*
- Tried calling at 2:13 PM: Voicemail box full.*
- Tried calling at 2:37 PM: voicemail box full.*
- Moermond: we'll indicate we are accepting the work plan she has proposed. A follow up inspection letter will be forthcoming after the first deadline at the end of this week.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 1/5/2022**
- 
- 14     [RLH FCO](#)  
[21-185](#)**            Appeal of Daniel Burgess, 3M Aviation, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 680-690 BAYFIELD STREET.
- Sponsors:**        Noecker
- Layover to LH January 18, 2022 at 2 p.m. Staff to look at building permit history with Building Official.*
- Daniel Burgess, o/b/o 3M Aviation, appeared*
- [Moermond gives background of appeals process]*
- Staff Report by Supervisor AJ Neis: this is a fire Certificate of Occupancy correction notice for 2 buildings, 680 and 690. Both are owned by the same company, 3M Aviation. Issued by Inspector Imbertson. He noticed a few code violations at each*

*property, however what is being appealed is the sprinkler system is missing coverage in an area that had been opened up and then previously sealed. The room is 10x20 feet. He believes at some point that wall had been sealed up, causing a type of separation, which at the time meant a sprinkler wouldn't have been required at the time. Needless to say, the system had never been added into that part of the area. Inspector Imbertson did say there was no intentional storage in there, but there is debris and things like that.*

*Moermond: what difference does it make if it is used for storage, Mr. Neis?*

*Neis: obviously this is an aircraft hangar. It does appear to be wood frame construction. We need the fire protection system installed due to that. I couldn't find when the part of the building had been removed. Needless to say it is open with no separation, so it is required to have fire suppression.*

*Moermond: why are you appealing?*

*Burgess: we need to clarify the 2 different buildings. In 690 it does appear the area was sealed off. In the air, about 25 to 30 feet there are a couple spots where the panels were removed to bring different utilities through that wall from the backside of the hangar. 680 there is no evidence that wall was ever in place. If you look at the studs themselves, they are unmarked. There was never coverage there and nothing removed. I don't know if you have access to the photographs I supplied, but it makes more sense if you look at the 1965 photos. Looking at the photos, the building to the left is 690 and to the right is 680. The Phillips 66 sign is on the 680 side, and just to the right is the area we are talking about. In 1997 that building was removed because it had fallen into disrepair. These pockets remained as part of the original building and support was added behind the outside of the building to accommodate the large sliding doors. That has what has created this void space. The other corners were originally designed as part of the hangers. It has created an area outside of the hangar that is only open to the inside of the hangar when the doors are shut. Our concerns with walling it off or putting sprinkler water in there is the limited width. It is only 42" wide and over 60 feet tall. This creates a bigger hazard than the void. The void itself is all steel. The only side with any combustible material is toward the hangar which does have fire protection. This was work was done under permit and inspection when it was done. We are concerned if we do run sprinkler water into the area, given the proximity to the pocket, we'd run into a freeze hazard with the sprinkler water. It isn't designed to receive heat and is not insulated. I have been the facility manager for over 6 years and didn't know they existed until he walked in. It isn't something we use or something used for anything. The materials inside were from the actual construction in the late 90's. Some sheets of Sheetmetal like the one used on the outside of the building. We believe it poses more hazard to workers to close it off then leaving it open poses to the entire hangar.*

*Neis: I do see a permit finalized in 2001, closed without final approval, for terminal storage building demolished and new one constructed. Is that what you are referring to?*

*Burgess: I can't say without seeing it. I know in 2001 we did work to the fuel farm, that is independent of the buildings.*

*Neis: this says a 55,000 sq foot was demolished and a new one of 14,000 sq feet being built.*

*Burgess: the 14,000 is puzzling.*

*Neis: it was never finalized so the work may not have ever been done. Perhaps they paid for the demo permit but decided to not build that new terminal.*

*Burgess: it is possible, I did hear talk about a building in front going between the 2. The work I had said the demo started in 1997 and ended in 1998. It very well could have hung open. I've seen stranger things.*

*Moermond: do you have additional comments Mr. Neis?*

*Neis: I'm looking at this coming down to this permit in 2001. Everything we are looking at appears to be what he is referring to. It was for a 2 million dollar permit. It says it was to build a new terminal, which would be connecting those 2 buildings. It does talk in the permit proposal that it was going to be fully sprinklered but also notes the corridor was not required to be rated. There may have been incomplete work done that was never caught previously. I hate to speculate.*

*Moermond: let's get the Building Official to look at his records to see if this can add any light. We won't be able to come to conclusion today. This isn't on fire, so I'm going to kick this to January 18 so I can speak to the Building Official. We can come to a conclusion then. We can phone you in so you can save yourself parking and a trip.*

*Burgess: we are asking for significant time to get it done if it is required. It is going to be challenging. We are existing at our existing system now. The company is making a move away from anything AFFF. We are trying to redo the foam system in both hangers. We would very much ask for a significant time, maybe a year, to figure something out to correct it*

*Moermond: logistics and capital, got it.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 1/18/2022**

**15 RLH FCO  
21-190**

**Appeal of Roger Barcus, St Paul Apostolic Church, to a Fire Safety Inspection Appointment at 219 LEXINGTON PARKWAY NORTH.**

**Sponsors:** Thao

*Grant to January 7, 2022 to have Fire C of O reinstated. Property to be reinspected January 6, 2022 at 3:00 p.m.*

*Roger Barcus, o/b/o St. Paul Apostolic Church, appeared via phone  
[Moermond give background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Supervisor AJ Neis: this actually started as a complaint inspection with our office July 8, 2021. The complaint came in that indicated the plumbing, sinks, and tub weren't working for over year due to flooding. Inspector Harriel spoke to the complainant and set up an inspection. It was indicated they had moved out of the property but they still had access to it, possibly to retrieve belongings. Inspector Harriel visited the property September 30 and revoked the Certificate of Occupancy. He was unable to make entry and was informed there was an eviction set up and advised to revoke the Certificate of Occupancy. He advised the owner to file an appeal. The tenant may have caused some damage to the house and didn't leave, but because it had gone on so long I advised to revoke and here we are.*

*Moermond: so an old revocation and new appointment letter. Why the new appointment letter?*

*Neis: the new appointment letter was for December 30th to inspect the house. My understanding after speaking with the inspector, he thought he needed to do that to check the status of the house. He put it as pending revocation, which doesn't send it to Vacant Building yet. It allows it to us monitor it to give the owner time to repair. If it isn't done we send it over to Vacant Building. So that was to see if there was any progress, and then the appeal was filed.*

*Moermond: what are you looking for today, Mr. Barcus?*

*Barcus: the reason there was a revocation was because of a complaint from the neighbors. I have been in contact with them many times. The people there did move out, except for their middle daughter who had a boyfriend who was a scrapper. He took everything he could from the house. Lots of holes in walls. It has been many thousands of dollars. They wouldn't leave. We did evict and that went in our favor, that took a month plus another 21 days. There wasn't any water because they broke the furnace thermostat, which I didn't know. It was flooding because the water meter froze and burst the bottom, so they had no water. They didn't have heat because of the broken thermostat. They wanted me to fix but they haven't paid rent since Covid started. They wouldn't and I didn't fix things and I wanted them out. The two left staying there did a lot of late night stuff which created a problem for the neighbors. I pity them. I have been in contact with several. They are so glad these people are gone. We had to have the police come out after the eviction twice. They kept climbing through a window from a tree. They threatened me with bodily harm. We reported that to the police. I asked him what they can do after taking them out twice, they said they can give them a trespass ticket. I had to have ServiceMaster come out on November 5 to board it. Then we had Junk King come in November 8 and they took all of the junk out of there. They broke all the glass, took the kitchen sink. We've been working on the house since the 9th. Just over a month. We have a majority of things fixed. We haven't taken the boards off. We put in new windows with the exception of 4. One I have to put in, 2 are special order for January 6, and one I can't find. That one is ok the way it is. The water works. We replaced the plumbing. We asked for time to be able to do this because we didn't have access to the house until they were gone. You can imagine with someone threatening us.*

*[Mr. Barcus was disconnected at 2:26 pm]*

*Moermond: I think it's a happy coincidence you have this appointment letter so you can get the Certificate of Occupancy reinstated. The question is whether we push it out to the end of January when you receive all your supplies.*

*Barcus: I am gone in January, so I would prefer that it be pushed to the first week.*

*Moermond: the first week of January. Mr. Neis, can you look at Mr. Harriel's calendar to schedule this?*

*Neis: I'm trying to find out why the address is like that. It says 219 – 207.*

*Barcus: that would be right, they are inseparable properties. That may be why. The church owns it.*

*Neis: he could do 3 pm on January 6.*

*Barcus: that works for me. This appeal was also to not have it revoked.*

*Moermond: that will be determined on the reinspection.*

*Barcus: oh, ok. I misunderstood.*

*Neis: right now its revoked without it going to Vacant Building, and that is what you are trying to avoid.*

*Moermond: and the only thing timely for appeal was the appointment letter since it was revoked September 30.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 1/5/2022**