



# 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, May 3, 2022

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

---

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

##### Special Tax Assessments

- 1     **RLH TA 22-166**     Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1230 EDGERTON STREET. (File No. VB2209, Assessment No. 228811)

Sponsors:     Yang

*Reduce assessment from \$2,284 to \$1,142 if property has permits finalized and C of O reinstated by June 15, 2022.*

*Jay Mitchell, property representative, appeared via phone*

*[Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: this is a Vacant Building fee from November 2021 to 2022. The property entered the Vacant Building program on the revocation of the Fire Certificate of Occupancy. The prospective fee is a total of \$2,284.*

*Moermond: why are you appealing Mr. Mitchell?*

*Mitchell: we've had a car that hit the building, that's why it went into the Vacant Building program. We couldn't get repairs done because of Covid. The current tenant wasn't allowing access. That's why the work isn't done. The permits have been pulled we just haven't been able to do the finals. There's an issue between tenant and management. We'd be done otherwise. We were hoping that because our hands are tied something could be done with the fee.*

*Yannarely: the last interaction was April 28 when St. Paul Police Officer Tharalson and a Vacant Building inspector were at the property to remove the tenant, who has filed a lawsuit against the property owner. At the time there was no answer at the door. No resolution at that time.*

*Moermond: so a condemnation of the unit after a car it. That unit got its Certificate of Occupancy revoked and referred to the Vacant Building program. The owner has problems with tenant and would like grace because of those tenant problems. Correct?*

*Mitchell: yes.*

*Moermond: no, but I can look at prorating. If your permits are signed off by June 15, I'll cut it in half. But no reduction after that point. You have a window to get those permits finalized. If they are not it is the full fee.*

*Mitchell: ok, thanks.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/15/2022**

## 10:00 a.m. Hearings

### Special Tax Assessments

- 2 RLH TA 22-139** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 46 FIFTH STREET EAST (360 CEDAR STREET). (File No. CRT2208, Assessment No. 228207)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Reduce assessment from \$346 to \$189.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: we have a recommended reduction from Real estate*

*Mai Vang: we got an email from Tanya Panzer that Met Council is the owner of this commercial business for a Certificate of Occupancy fee. The assessment office is recommending removal of the service charge, down to the original fee. The check was received on February 16, 2022 but was not processed until now and didn't go to assessment until March 4, 2022.*

*Moermond: so from \$346 to \$189, so recommended.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/15/2022**

- 3 RLH TA 22-163** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 175 KELLOGG BOULEVARD WEST. (File No. CRT2208, Assessment No. 228207)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Reduce assessment from \$1,027 to \$870.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: the Certificate of Occupancy address is 150 West Kellogg. This is a Fire Certificate of Occupancy for a parking garage. Total assessment of \$1,027. We're recommending the deletion of the service charges. We had an error in our Licensing software that held up the actual paperwork for the Certificate of Occupancy. That was our fault, so we're recommending it is just the original fee.*

*Moermond: and noting for our files the Certificate of Occupancy is under 150 W. Kellogg.*

Shaff: yes.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/15/2022**

- 4 [RLH TA 22-161](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 310 LAWSON AVENUE EAST. (File No. J2217A, Assessment No. 228516)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

*Approve the assessment.*

*Robert Lo, owner, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: I have three special assessments in front of me this morning. [Moermond gives background of appeals process] This first one is for work conducted December 28, 2021.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: we issued a Summary Abatement Order December 16, 2021 to the occupant and owner in Kirkland WA to remove garbage, chairs, and debris from garage, apron, and property. It was not done, no returned mail. The total proposed assessment is \$562. There are photos and videos on this. There is a long history of noncompliance at this property.*

*Moermond: why are you appealing?*

*Lo: I'm the owner, I live out of state. We hire a local property management company, Midwest, it has a long history. Since we picked it up, we found out it has issues. We've had these issues since November of 2020 during Covid. First we are appealing because by the time we receive these abatement orders in Washington it is often already passed the action deadline. That is one of the issues. You mentioned you sent to the occupant and Investor Capital. We found out these were being sent to them, which is the previous owner, and they of course didn't let us know. April or June of 2021 we let the City know that our property management is Midwest and we submitted a form to the City in June. We have 3 little kids so we relied on our property management company to take care of it, but we found out in October that they were still sending most of the letters to Investor Capital. My property management company was not consistently receiving notice regarding these orders. I do agree the pictures are of garbage at my property, but I wanted to share my point of view that it was often already past the deadline, my property management company didn't get a letter. Now I'm working more closely with the management company, we are paying them extra to go over twice a week to make sure the garbage is being put out. They weren't being collected by Waste Management. We sent out notices to each tenant to make sure we reduce the amount of trash. There is also dumping. We are also installing cameras to monitor the dumping. I'm asking for leniency on this matter. There is no doubt it is trash at my property but I wanted to share the whole situation.*

*Moermond: I have to tell you. I heard your statement and what I'm drawing from it is that you as the owner have been getting notification out of state. You expect that the local property manager will take care of business, so you have the expectation they are managing. Now you're working more closely. The problems began with Covid in October of 2020. But that is when you acquired the property, I can't say whether it is Covid or poor management. The legal requirement is to provide notice to owner of record via first class mail. In this case the order was issued December 16 and the*

work wasn't done until 12 days later. That could have been 2 garbage cycles, for sure it was 1. It is a mess in these photos.

Lo: I'm trying to work on this puzzle of why Waste Management wasn't doing the pickup.

Moermond: it seems to me the City did provide proper legal notification and did the work. No dispute there. I'm struggling to find a justification for decreasing or eliminating the assessment.

Lo: I have 3 young kids from 1 to 6 at home. We caught Covid as well. It was not easy to manage this property, we probably made a mistake in buying a property out of town. It was probably out fault in relying too much on our property management company. We were expecting them to do something, and they agreed they messed up. Often I would send them notices. I'm not trying to shift blame, but I want to share that my wife and I finally have time now to actively manage it.

Moermond: I'm having trouble subsidizing your relationship with your nonperforming property manager. You aren't experiencing the nuisances the neighbors are. You're then asking those same residents to pick up that bill. That's the rub here.

Lo: I understand.

Moermond: if you have a complaint it would be with your property manager or perhaps your hauler. I don't see a justification here for decreasing or deleting. Again if you want to dispute that further to Council you certainly can. We'll move on to the next assessment.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/4/2022**

**5 RLH TA 22-162** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 310 LAWSON AVENUE EAST. (File No. J2218A, Assessment No. 228518)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

Approve the assessment.

Robert Lo, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gave background of appeals process previously]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: we had another complaint January 6, 2022 sent again to occupant and owner. To remove garbage and debris. No returned mail. Total proposed assessment of \$562.

Moermond: is your appeal of the same nature here? anything to add?

Lo: not a whole lot more, just the same as what I was saying earlier. I will talk to the hauler.

Moermond: in the photos here we see a huge pile of trash outside of the can, many bags. Some are torn open. A lot is Christmas decorations. It isn't part of the contract to pick up bags outside of the cans unless previous arrangements have been made. They also won't pick up open and torn bags. I'm not sure how that discussion will go. Household waste is problematic since it invites rodents. Recommend approval on this

one.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/8/2022**

- 6 RLH TA 22-164** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 310 LAWSON AVENUE EAST. (File No. J2208E, Assessment No. 228307)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

*Approve the assessment.*

*Robert Lo, owner, appeared via phone*

*[Moermond gave background of appeals process previously ]*

*Staff report Supervisor Lisa Martin: this was for more than 3 complaints in a 12 month period. There is a huge history here.*

*Moermond: how many Excessive Consumption assessments have been issued since October 30 of 2020?*

*Martin: over 20 cleanups. 15 Excessive Consumptions.*

*Moermond: that is on top of the Summary Abatement Order and Vehicle Abatement Orders. So this is one of 15 bills for excessive consumption of code enforcement services. I don't think there's problem in documenting there's been 3 or more violations. This has been consuming a disproportionate share of City services. Again, Mr. Lo, I'll recommend approval but if you wish to appeal further to Council you certainly can. The method for doing so was in the notice for today's hearing.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/18/2022**

### **Special Tax Assessments-ROLLS**

- 7 RLH AR 22-43** Ratifying the assessments for Collection of Vacant Building fees billed during June 4 to December 13, 2021. (File No. VB2209, Assessment No. 228811)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/15/2022**

- 8 RLH AR 22-44** Ratifying the assessments for Securing and/or Emergency Boarding services during January 2022. (File No. J2209B, Assessment No. 228111)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/15/2022**

- 9 RLH AR 22-45** Ratifying the assessments for Demolition services from January 2022 (C.D.B.G. Funds). (File No. J2204C, Assessment No. 222003)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/15/2022

- 10 **RLH AR 22-46** Ratifying the assessments for Collection of Fire Certificate of Occupancy fees billed during December 1 to January 18, 2022. (File No. CRT2208, Assessment No. 228207)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/15/2022

- 11 **RLH AR 22-47** Ratifying the assessments for Excessive Use of Inspection or Abatement services billed during November 22 to December 22, 2021. (File No. J2209E, Assessment No. 228310)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/15/2022

## 11:00 a.m. Hearings

### Summary & Vehicle Abatement Orders

- 12 [RLH SAO 22-16](#) Appeal of Brad House to a Summary Abatement Order at 2285 ROCKWOOD AVENUE.

Sponsors: Tolbert

*Layover to LH May 17, 2022 at 11 am for further discussion. Staff to speak with PW and CAO.*

*Brad House, owner of 2285 Rockwood Ave, appeared via phone  
Judith Salaba, owner of 2291 Rockwood Ave, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we put these together since they are speaking to the same item, but if you wish to do it separately we can do that. [Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: a Summary Abatement Order was issued April 20, 2022 to several residents on Rockwood Avenue to remove the no parking signs. Private signs are not allowed on the public right-of-way so we asked them to remove them. Photos are in the file.*

*Moermond: Mr. House, tell me what is going on.*

*House: it is straightforward with the no parking signs on the mailboxes. The signs have been up for 4 years. Once the memory care center opened, the parking has been up tremendously and they block our mailboxes so we aren't getting our mail. It has fixed the problem. Why is this getting to this now? I thought mailboxes were federal property. Removing those signs creates a huge headache for me and my neighbors. It is a problem day after day unless you come up with a solution. Removing the sign may be a great solution for you guys but it leaves us in a terrible situation.*

*Moermond: and you understand the sign is not at all enforceable. It is just an FYI.*

*House: of course not. But people are now aware they are blocking the mailbox, it has solved the problem. It creates an issue every day otherwise.*

*Moermond: Ms. Salaba, anything to add?*

*Salaba: I've lived on the block for 69 years. It has always been a rural route, so the mailboxes are on the street, not at our house. When we had problems with people blocking the mailbox, the post office said to call the police. So we'd call the police, they would write a warning. I just talked to the post office last week. They said to continue to call the police. They said it is not legal to park in front of someone's box on the street. We put a no parking sign because most people do not know they can't do that. It lets them know they can't park there. Since we put them up four or five years ago we don't have problems. I am diabetic, I get everything through the mail. One time I had the mail not delivered 3 days and he wrote it wasn't delivered due to car in front of mailbox, so my medications go back. The post office says they don't have to get out of their car to deliver. I don't know how many rural routes there are, but ours is different than delivery where the workers walk their routes. The post office sent me, which I included in the letter, please do not block your mailbox. I mean, that is it. We're just telling people; they don't know they can't block mailboxes on the street. It is against our right of getting the mail. Plus calling the police is a waste of tax dollars.*

*House: like you said, they can't do anything anyway.*

*Salaba: we need something to inform people they can't park in front of a rural route mailbox. It would be like me parking in your yard so you couldn't get your mail. It is infringing on us.*

*Moermond: have you looked into establishing no parking on your side of the street?*

*Salaba: it is the other side too. It is all the rural route.*

*House: there are 9 houses on this block, a few a couple blocks away. Seems somewhat picking on us since their signs aren't getting removed. Their signs are still up. They need to come back if that's the new rule. When you allowed the memory care facility to be built, you allowed them to remove a bunch of parking. We're the ones paying the price for it.*

*Salaba: it is when they have family visitors or something special going on. They will park all over. We can't stand at our mailbox and wait for the mailman to come.*

*House: what is your recommendation?*

*Moermond: I haven't arrived at one yet. I'm hearing what is going on. I don't have all the information you do. I can look at City codes and I hear your conversation with the postal service. I simply don't think I can land the plane today. With respect to the no parking policy. Are you saying both sides are impacted by parking from this facility?*

*House: yes. But there are only 2 of us who decided to pay the \$25 to put our voices out. They are all impacted, but we are closest to the facility.*

*Salaba: we're 2 houses form the corner of the facility so we get the brunt of it.*

Moermond: have you considered permit parking? So you have to be a resident to park there?

Salaba: I don't know how to go about it.

House: I know they do that in Minneapolis.

Moermond: I'm trying to brainstorm ways to deal with it so we can deal with Public Works and their right-of-way requirements. I'm not clear from the USPS perspective what their federal policy is. I just don't know about signage that isn't a name or house number. That's in play as well. Establishing a no parking or permit parking area sounds like possible ways but it may not be perfectly tailored.

House: I think it is great you are thinking outside the box but what about visitors to the complexes or memory care center? Now they need a permit to visit a relative. Now no one can park which also doesn't seem fair. I don't mind if they park, just don't block the mailbox. Why can't we just have a sign that says the statute of the postal service that says it can't be blocked?

Moermond: and that's something Public Works needs to engage. I did have a brief conversation about policies from their perspective, and we maybe need to talk more with the City attorney's office and what their position is. I'm glad your mailboxes are blocked less. A parallel situation is a garbage can being blocked because of a vehicle. These things happen. People with Carriage walks. There are circumstances that are difficult. I don't know what the answer is. I'll continue this 2 weeks to allow some of those research and conversations to happen. Enforcement is stayed while we search for an answer, that goes for all the orders in the area. Those are stayed pending the outcome of this appeal so we can sort through this.

Salaba: do you speak with the post office? Do you have the cards I attached?

Moermond: I have a blue and white post card yes.

Salaba: on my letter it says who I talked to from the Post office by our house.

Moermond: yes, I have that letter.

House: I do feel the best solution, and simplest, is someone to let us put up a sign about parking or not blocking the mailbox. 95% of the humans would know not to block it.

Moermond: I will talk with you both in 2 weeks' time after some more homework is done.

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/17/2022**

**13**     [RLH SAO 22-15](#)     Appeal of Judith Salaba to a Summary Abatement Order at 2291 ROCKWOOD AVENUE.

**Sponsors:**     Tolbert

Layover to LH May 17, 2022 at 11 am for further discussion. Staff to speak with PW and CAO.

Brad House, owner of 2285 Rockwood Ave, appeared via phone

*Judith Salaba, owner of 2291 Rockwood Ave, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we put these together since they are speaking to the same item, but if you wish to do it separately we can do that. [Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: a Summary Abatement Order was issued April 20, 2022 to several residents on Rockwood Avenue to remove the no parking signs. Private signs are not allowed on the public right-of-way so we asked them to remove them. Photos are in the file.*

*Moermond: Mr. House, tell me what is going on.*

*House: it is straightforward with the no parking signs on the mailboxes. The signs have been up for 4 years. Once the memory care center opened, the parking has been up tremendously and they block our mailboxes so we aren't getting our mail. It has fixed the problem. Why is this getting to this now? I thought mailboxes were federal property. Removing those signs creates a huge headache for me and my neighbors. It is a problem day after day unless you come up with a solution. Removing the sign may be a great solution for you guys but it leaves us in a terrible situation.*

*Moermond: and you understand the sign is not at all enforceable. It is just an FYI.*

*House: of course not. But people are now aware they are blocking the mailbox, it has solved the problem. It creates an issue every day otherwise.*

*Moermond: Ms. Salaba, anything to add?*

*Salaba: I've lived on the block for 69 years. It has always been a rural route, so the mailboxes are on the street, not at our house. When we had problems with people blocking the mailbox, the post office said to call the police. So we'd call the police, they would write a warning. I just talked to the post office last week. They said to continue to call the police. They said it is not legal to park in front of someone's box on the street. We put a no parking sign because most people do not know they can't do that. It lets them know they can't park there. Since we put them up four or five years ago we don't have problems. I am diabetic, I get everything through the mail. One time I had the mail not delivered 3 days and he wrote it wasn't delivered due to car in front of mailbox, so my medications go back. The post office says they don't have to get out of their car to deliver. I don't know how many rural routes there are, but ours is different than delivery where the workers walk their routes. The post office sent me, which I included in the letter, please do not block your mailbox. I mean, that is it. We're just telling people; they don't know they can't block mailboxes on the street. It is against our right of getting the mail. Plus calling the police is a waste of tax dollars.*

*House: like you said, they can't do anything anyway.*

*Salaba: we need something to inform people they can't park in front of a rural route mailbox. It would be like me parking in your yard so you couldn't get your mail. It is infringing on us.*

*Moermond: have you looked into establishing no parking on your side of the street?*

*Salaba: it is the other side too. It is all the rural route.*

*House: there are 9 houses on this block, a few a couple blocks away. Seems somewhat picking on us since their signs aren't getting removed. Their signs are still up. They need to come back if that's the new rule. When you allowed the memory care facility to be built, you allowed them to remove a bunch of parking. We're the ones paying the price for it.*

*Salaba: it is when they have family visitors or something special going on. They will park all over. We can't stand at our mailbox and wait for the mailman to come.*

*House: what is your recommendation?*

*Moermond: I haven't arrived at one yet. I'm hearing what is going on. I don't have all the information you do. I can look at City codes and I hear your conversation with the postal service. I simply don't think I can land the plane today. With respect to the no parking policy. Are you saying both sides are impacted by parking from this facility?*

*House: yes. But there are only 2 of us who decided to pay the \$25 to put our voices out. They are all impacted, but we are closest to the facility.*

*Salaba: we're 2 houses form the corner of the facility so we get the brunt of it.*

*Moermond: have you considered permit parking? So you have to be a resident to park there?*

*Salaba: I don't know how to go about it.*

*House: I know they do that in Minneapolis.*

*Moermond: I'm trying to brainstorm ways to deal with it so we can deal with Public Works and their right-of-way requirements. I'm not clear from the USPS perspective what their federal policy is. I just don't know about signage that isn't a name or house number. That's in play as well. Establishing a no parking or permit parking area sounds like possible ways but it may not be perfectly tailored.*

*House: I think it is great you are thinking outside the box but what about visitors to the complexes or memory care center? Now they need a permit to visit a relative. Now no one can park which also doesn't seem fair. I don't mind if they park, just don't block the mailbox. Why can't we just have a sign that says the statute of the postal service that says it can't be blocked?*

*Moermond: and that's something Public Works needs to engage. I did have a brief conversation about policies from their perspective, and we maybe need to talk more with the City attorney's office and what their position is. I'm glad your mailboxes are blocked less. A parallel situation is a garbage can being blocked because of a vehicle. These things happen. People with Carriage walks. There are circumstances that are difficult. I don't know what the answer is. I'll continue this 2 weeks to allow some of those research and conversations to happen. Enforcement is stayed while we search for an answer, that goes for all the orders in the area. Those are stayed pending the outcome of this appeal so we can sort through this.*

*Salaba: do you speak with the post office? Do you have the cards I attached?*

*Moermond: I have a blue and white post card yes.*

Salaba: on my letter it says who I talked to from the Post office by our house.

Moermond: yes, I have that letter.

House: I do feel the best solution, and simplest, is someone to let us put up a sign about parking or not blocking the mailbox. 95% of the humans would know not to block it.

Moermond: I will talk with you both in 2 weeks' time after some more homework is done.

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/17/2022**

**14**     [RLH SAO 22-14](#)     Appeal of Fredimar Calderon to a Vehicle Abatement Order at 607 TOPPING STREET.

**Sponsors:**     Thao

Layover to LH May 10, 2022 at 11 am for further discussion. Staff to speak to zoning & CAO.

Fredimar Calderon Santa Maria, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Calderon Santa Maria: I want to make it easy; I want to follow your instructions. I read the letter, but it says the truck is improperly parked.

Moermond: we need that staff report first, then we can talk about the details.

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: April 21, 2022 a Vehicle Abatement Order was issued to Fredimar Santa Maria at this address. There is a white semi truck with unknown plates in the backyard. You can see it from over the fence from the public right-of-way. You can't have it in a residential neighborhood, especially not parked in a backyard.

Moermond: what are you looking for?

Calderon Santa Maria: I already moved the truck and put plates on. What else do you want me to do? It is drivable.

Moermond: you want to keep the truck at your property? Is that why you're appealing?

Calderon Santa Maria: yes. The driver comes from Connecticut. He's going to come in a couple months. He has some problems. I don't know. I'm going to wait a couple months and if he doesn't come back I have to go back to work myself with that truck. This is a commercial area kind of. I don't want problems. I talked to my neighbor; he doesn't mind.

Moermond: tell me, I'm looking at an aerial photo of your property, the corner of topping and Dale. Is the fence on the sidewalk or set back?

Calderon Santa Maria: the sidewalk is 4 or 6 feet away from the fence. Then there's a garage and an asphalt driveway.

*Moermond: did you go up the driveway to park it?*

*Calderon Santa Maria: yes. You can have someone come out and look.*

*Moermond: Ms. Martin, the orders don't say anything about a commercial vehicle in a residentially zoned property.*

*Martin: yes under section 157.11(d)(2) says no commercial or overweight vehicle shall be parked overnight or stored on property zoned residential or occupied exclusively as residential.*

*Calderon Santa Maria: excuse me, that area is kind of commercial. There are a lot of semis on the street. So I can move it to the street. I didn't do it because the tabs are expired. I know it's a residential house. My house is the first one and I already talked to the neighbor. I don't bother anyone.*

*Moermond: I think the City Attorney needs to look at it. It is I1, it is used as a legal non-conforming use as a single family but it is industrially zoned. We need to be crystal clear on what code applies. I'll continue this for a week to get more information. Don't do any changes in the meantime. Is it ok if someone comes to your yard to take a picture?*

*Calderon Santa Maria: yes, absolutely. Can you give me a few months to figure this out? It won't be there forever. It will go to work.*

*Moermond: Ms. Martin, send someone to take a picture. I'm wondering if you would still have an order on tabs and operability if you had a better look at it and that may help. I'll talk to attorney about the zoning versus the use.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/10/2022**

### Correction Orders

- 15     [RLH CO 22-2](#)     Appeal of Eva Stites to a Correction Order and Appointment Letter at 1099 GERANIUM AVENUE EAST.

**Sponsors:**     Yang

*Layover to LH May 17, 2022 at 11 am (rescheduled per PO's second request).*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: there was a request for a layover to Hearing staff because was sick. Ms. Martin I understand she declined 2 inspections because she was sick?*

*Martin: yes, along with 15 other times previously where she said the same thing.*

*Moermond: this would be the one layover in Legislative Hearing to May 17 and we'll deal with it then. If she has an inspection by then great, if she does not we'll operate with the information we have. Do you want to send another appointment letter?*

*Martin: she was going to call me back when she was feeling better. I'll send another letter.*

*Moermond: and our follow up letter will indicate I am expecting an inspection report at the May 17 hearing.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/17/2022**

### 3:00 p.m. Hearings

- 16 RLH TA 22-123** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 559 CASE AVENUE. (File No. CG2201A3, Assessment No. 220102)
- Sponsors:** Brendmoen
- Approve the assessment.*
- Voicemail left at 3:08 pm: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling you about special assessments for 559 Case. We'll try again in a couple of minutes.*
- Voicemail left at 3:13 pm: this is Marcia Moermond again, I'm going to recommend approval of these assessments. You will have had an email from Joanna Zimny and if you wish to contest further, you can do so and there will information on how to do that in an email from her.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 5/25/2022**
- 17 RLH TA 22-124** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 559 CASE AVENUE. (File No. CG2104A3-1, Assessment No. 220103)
- Sponsors:** Brendmoen
- Approve the assessment.*
- Voicemail left at 3:08 pm: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling you about special assessments for 559 Case. We'll try again in a couple of minutes.*
- Voicemail left at 3:13 pm: this is Marcia Moermond again, I'm going to recommend approval of these assessments. You will have had an email from Joanna Zimny and if you wish to contest further, you can do so and there will information on how to do that in an email from her.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 5/25/2022**
- 18 RLH TA 22-174** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 858 STICKNEY STREET. (File No. CG2201A1, Assessment No. 220100)
- Sponsors:** Noecker
- Delete the assessment.*
- Moermond: so we're handling this by staff report, no owner participating.*
- Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: the property owner stated they hadn't received their invoice at their current address. By the time they resolved the issue and ensured the hauler had the correct billing address, they paid their Quarter 4, 2021 assessment via PayPal. Hauler records show the reason the invoices weren't sent to the correct address was the CSR accidentally copying the service address over the billing address on the account. The property owner called the hauler on January 27, 2022 to notify then*

*that they had never received their Quarter 4, 2021 invoice. Following this complaint, the hauler updated the mailing address and sent a copy of the current Quarter 1, 2022 invoice. However, since the property owner would have not received any invoices or notices of nonpayment during Quarter 4 2021 the hauler recommended that we remove that assessed late fees of \$14.85. Payment was sent to the assessment office, which left a balance of \$14.85.*

*Moermond: let's get that deleted.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/25/2022**