Mr. Lang called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

I. Roll Call

Steven Andersen – Not present
Jeffrey Ehler - Present
James Lang - Present
Jay Palu – Present
Gerald Reimer - Present
Ryan Richard - Present
Jerry Standerford - Present

Others Present:
Scott Lane, Chief Housing Inspector
Jared Dean, City Attorney
Clinette Ingram, Board Secretary
Todd Shearer, Housing Inspector
Mike Champion, Housing Inspector
Steve Andersen, Housing Inspector

II. Approval of Minutes: Approval of May 7, 2020 minutes.

Motion by Mr. Palu to approve the minutes. Second by Mr. Standerford.

AYES: Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

ABSTAIN: Richard

Motion carried: 5-0-1.
III. Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19-29 (Layover from 11/7/19 &amp; 5/7/20)</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
<th>APPEAL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Gray</td>
<td>3615 Bedford Ave</td>
<td>Notice dated 9/9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2935 Nicholas St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, NE 68131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on June 4, 2020, the applicant failed to appear before the board. Todd Shearer appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer stated that he had had no contact with the applicant since the appeal was filed in September 2019. There was also no contact with the person who appeared at the May 7, 2020 meeting. He explained that an agreement was made with the applicant that the house would not be put on the demolition list if the property at 1620 Lake Street was completed and rented. He indicated that it was not even partially completed. He recommended that the appeal be denied and added to the next demolition list.

There was a brief discussion about when the appeal was filed.

Mr. Palu moved to DENY the appeal. Mr. Ehler seconded the motion.

AYES: Ehler, Palu, Richard, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-09 (Layover from 5/7/20)</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
<th>APPEAL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clifford D. Thomas</td>
<td>2004 Binney St.</td>
<td>Notice dated 3/31/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902 Avenue A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Bluffs, IA 51503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on June 4, 2020, the applicant failed to appear before the board. Todd Shearer appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer stated that the applicant had made significant progress on this property. He indicated that he had spoken to Mr. Thomas and learned that the existing, deteriorated garage would be torn down and replaced with a two-car garage. The applicant was having a hard time finding a plumber who would pull a permit since the previous plumber refused to do so. He mentioned that the applicant also owned the home at 3716 Lake Street which was on the meeting agenda. Mr. Shearer recommended a six (6) month extension since the applicant had pulled the proper permits and was having the work done correctly.

Mr. Palu moved to GRANT a six (6) month extension. Mr. Richard seconded the motion.

AYES: Ehler, Palu, Richard, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0.
Mr. Lane requested that this case be heard next due to time constraints.

| 20-12 | LOCATION: 6315 N. 36th St. |
| George Blazek & John Farrell | APPEAL: Notice dated 3/12/20 |
| Ellick, Jones, Buelt, Blazek & Longo, LLP |
| 9290 W. Dodge Rd. #303 |
| Omaha, NE 68114 |

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on June 4, 2020, John Farrell appeared before the board on behalf of the property owner. Mike Champion, Housing Inspector, appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Champion stated that he had spoken with the property owner, Gail Thompson, on several occasions. Ms. Thompson indicated that she could not afford to board up the home and she added that the neighbors stated that the home would continue to be broken into even if it was secured. He indicated that OPPD had cut power to the home since homeless individuals had hot-wired the meter. Electricity needed to be restored to the home, the windows needed to be repaired and it needed to be inspected. He clarified that no current permits had been pulled for this property. Mr. Champion recommended 30 days for the owner to obtain permits, have windows installed and inspected and electricity restored.

Mr. Farrell submitted an affidavit from his client, Ms. Thompson (Exhibit B). He explained that the owner had used a management company, Fontenelle Realty, to take care of the property since she was an absentee owner. She realized upon returning to Omaha in 2019 that the management company had not been taking care of the property. Mr. Farrell indicated that the property had been cleaned, boarded up and secure. He explained that OPPD removed the entire meter which would need to be reinstalled.

Mr. Farrell indicated that he was waiting to hear back from individuals who were interested in purchasing the property. He requested at least 3 months so that it could be determined what the owner wanted to do with the property and so that other issues could be taken care of.

Mr. Reimer stated that he could support at 90-day extension as long as there was a plan for the property.

In response to Mr. Standerford, Mr. Farrell stated that if an extension was granted he would ensure that the property was continually maintained.

Mr. Reimer moved to GRANT a 90-day extension. Mr. Palu seconded the motion.

AYES: Ehler, Palu, Richard, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0.
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on June 4, 2020, the applicant failed to appear before the board. Steve Andersen, Housing Inspector, appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Andersen stated that he had recently spoken with the property owner. The owner had indicated to him that he was done working with the insurance company regarding the fire that occurred at this property. The owner continued to work on repairing the structure, including other issues not related to the fire. Mr. Andersen stated that all of the adjacent apartments, including those above and below were vacant and they all had minimal to no damage to them. He stated that the owner had followed through on everything he indicated would be done. Mr. Andersen recommended a 6 month extension.

Mr. Reimer moved to GRANT a 6-month extension. Mr. Ehler seconded the motion.

AYES: Ehler, Palu, Richard, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0.

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on June 4, 2020, the applicant failed to appear before the board. Todd Shearer, Housing Inspector, appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer stated that the retaining wall for this property had been permitted, repaired and inspected. Plans for this property had been turned into the City but were not yet approved so a permit had not been issued. He stated that there were so many other issues with the property that he was not sure if it would be repaired.

Jared Dean, City Law, explained that this case had been in the courts under a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO). He stated that he had been working with the applicant to provide them with exactly what was required to obtain the permit but here continued to be issues. He stated that because this had been in the court system for so long, the Judge decided that he was not going to give more time. Mr. Dean suggested to the applicant that they appeal to the board. He advised the board that the permit was still pending for this property.

Mr. Shearer noted that two permits had been pulled in 2019 that included the one for the retaining wall. He mentioned that the applicant also wanted to change the use of the property from Office Space to Storage, which further complicated matters.

In response to Mr. Palu, Mr. Shearer stated that the property was gated and that there was a daycare adjacent to the property.
In response to Mr. Reimer, Mr. Shearer stated that this owner owned multiple properties and had obtained legal representation for this property. Mr. Reimer explained that he felt that the applicant should be held to higher standards with regards to the repair of his property.

Mr. Reimer moved to DENY the appeal. Mr. Standerford seconded the motion.

AYES: Ehler, Palu, Richard, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0. Appeal denied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian M. King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379 S. 137th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, NE 68144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPEAL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2214 Florence Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice dated 5/1/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on June 4, 2020, Brian King and Melvin Sudbeek (Contractor) appeared before the board. Todd Shearer, Housing Inspector, appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer explained that the property was not owned by Mr. King when the notice was issued. The applicant had applied for a Temporary Restraining Order since the Planning Department had sent the property out to bid for demolition. The applicant had since cleaned up the property and boarded it up. Because the property is considered to be historic, it was more of a challenge to do repairs; however, he stated that he had previous positive experiences with the applicant and he had confidence that the home would be repaired. He mentioned that this was a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and tax credit project that would require some time. He recommended a 6 month layover although he knew more time would more than likely be needed.

Mr. Reimer stated that if a 6 month layover was granted, it would give the applicant the opportunity to come back and update the board on the progress of the project. In the meantime, the property would need to remain clean, safe and secure. He acknowledged that multiple, 6-month layovers may be required.

Mr. Reimer moved to LAYOVER for 6 months until the December 3, 2020 meeting subject to the property remaining clean, safe and secure. Mr. Palu seconded the motion.

AYES: Ehler, Palu, Richard, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0.

IV. Discussion

There was some discussion about an email sent by board member Steve Andersen which inquired as to whether he would be able to participate in the meetings without attending in
person due to concerns he had about the current Covid19 situation. Mr. Dean, City Attorney, stated that the City Law Department believed that the Governor did not have the ability to waive the Open Meeting Act for any public entity. The Law Department concluded that having a member appear by Zoom, teleconferencing or some other similar means, would result in that member not being able to vote or contribute to the meeting as a voting member. He added that the distancing restrictions did not apply to public entities though the City did take steps to keep members of the board and the public safe.

V. Adjournment

It was the consensus of the board to adjourn the meeting at 1:46 p.m.