

1.     CALL TO ORDER

President Scott Decker called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM

2.     ROLL CALL

Present were:             President Scott Decker, Vice President Robert Baer, Commissioner  
                                     Jason Fridrich and Commissioner Joe Ridl

Absent:                     None

3.     ADMINISTRATION

City Attorney Christina Wenko outlined the procedure for the hearing. City will present evidence through exhibits and testimony

- Property Owner may ask witness questions
- When City is concluded with each witness, Commissioners may ask witness questions
- When City is concluded, property owner shall present evidence
  - City Attorney may ask witness questions
  - When owner is concluded with each witness, Commissioners may ask witness questions
- Any mortgage/lienholders may present evidence/make a statement
  - City Attorney and Property Owner may ask questions
  - When owner is concluded with each witness, Commissioners may ask witness questions
- Closing Argument City Attorney
- Closing Argument Property Owner
- Commission discussion
- Commission vote

Attorney Wenko did state there is one property on the list for this date.

President Scott Decker swears in Mrs. Tiffany Stewart as Code Enforcement Officer II for the City of Dickinson.

**219 5th Street East, Dickinson, ND**

City Attorney Christina Wenko asks Ms. Stewart how long she has worked for the City of Dickinson.

Ms. Tiffany Stewart states she has been with the City of Dickinson for six years and is a certified property inspector. Her title is a Code Enforcement Officer II and her position is to enforce the City of Dickinson's Municipal Code and adopted building codes. City Attorney Christina Wenko asks Ms. Stewart what constitutes a dangerous structure requiring demolition. Pursuant to Code, a dangerous structure can be repaired, vacated or

demolished. Ms. Stewart states that if the structure is beyond repair, it then has to be demolished. She states the City would request bids for demolition. The City has the ability to assess the property for the costs.

Code Enforcement Officer Tiffany Stewart states the property at 219 5<sup>th</sup> Street East is owned by Riley Ridl and Patrick Ridl. There are no outstanding liens, but the taxes have been not paid at Stark County. She states there were numerous certified mailings, posters posted to the structure and emails to date of the potential demo. These letters indicated today's date and time of potential demo. Ms. Stewart states the City records dated back to 2001 saying the City had issues relating to this property in regard to debris and grass issues. This property was on the radar again in 2005 when the property had grass and weeds that exceeded 10". She states at that time standard letters were sent to the owner in regard to the grass. Follow-up letters were also sent in 2019 in regard to tall grass and weeds. Also, at that time there was junk items around the property, and this is a violation.

City Attorney Christina Wenko asks Ms. Stewart if there was any previous hearing set for the Ridl's to be held on December 18, 2024. This letter was also sent Certified Mail.

City Attorney Wenko reviews exhibits B which is the notification of hearing which was issued to Riley Ridl and was sent certified mail.

City Attorney Wenko reviews exhibits D1, D2 and D3.

Ms. Stewart states these where notices were sent to county which were received by the County. She states Mr. Ridl's letters were returned in the mail.

Ms. Stewart states these notices were posted at the property and were removed and left with utility billing and his girlfriend picked it up and handed it to him.

Attorney Wenko asks does Mr. Ridl knows something is happening to this property

Ms. Stewart states yes, we sent certified mail in regard to this property. She states the mail was sent certified and placed also on the property that there was going to be a demolition hearing is going today. Both certified mailings were left at the property.

Attorney Wenko presents exhibits F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6

Ms. Stewart states these are copies of the certified mailings to Mr. Patrick Ridl and the County and posted notice on property. Ms. Stewart states again a copy was posted at the property.

Attorney Wenko presents exhibits G1 and G2

Ms. Stewart states these were documents requesting the County to serve Patrick and Riley personally and neither gentleman could be located.

Attorney Wenko states that knowing that we were not personally able to serve Mr. Ridl did you take other steps.

Ms. Stewart states she published the notice in the local newspaper

Attorney Wenko presents exhibits H1, H2, H3 and H4 and states these are copies of what was posted in newspaper

Ms. Stewart answers yes

Attorney Wenko states that when the property owner is absent

Ms. Stewart states the City uses certified mail and posting structure is good enough service per city code.

Attorney Wenko talk about property specifically

Ms. Stewart states the City become involved in June, 2021

Attorney Wenko presents exhibit I which shows miscellaneous junk items that need to be cleaned up

Ms. Stewart states the City gave them 15 days to remedy and a follow-up notice to previous notice that cleanup was started and not complete and given an additional 7 days to clean up.

She states the next time he was notified was June, 2005. There multiple complaints about the condition of the property, electrical problems and no water. Follow-up correspondence was sent in July, 2005, follow-up letter request to do an inspection. And if the city was not notified within 5 days the property needed to be vacated.

Attorney Wenko states a letter was sent in March, 2006 copy notice property again in violation – broken window, rubbish and removal of all vehicles on property. Attorney Wenko asks if there was any other sent.

Ms. Stewart states in June, 2009. A copy of a notice that the grass and weeds exceeding 10”

Attorney Wenko asks if additional correspondence was sent after the 2009 correspondence Ms. Stewart states yes, a notice in regards to personal and recreational vehicles on property and in 2020 another notice noting the vehicles in violation as well as multiple miscellaneous junk items. There was junk, on property, parking violations, rubbish, disposal of rubbish.

Attorney Wenko states was there further correspondence

Ms. Stewart states yes, November, 2022 with furniture, tires, other misc. as well as vehicle without license plates. Additional correspondence was sent in January, 2024 and the property had unused appliances, tires, vehicles without license plates, etc.

Attorney Wenko asks Ms. Stewart that in January, 2024 was the property still out of compliance

Ms. Stewart states yes

Attorney Wenko presents photos of the property that was out of compliance with additional letters to that regard.

Ms. Stewart states there were inoperable vehicles, accumulation of items, unlicensed inoperable vehicles, tires, rubbish and garbage, appliances

Attorney Wenko asks Ms. Stewart if there has been any improvement from 2020-2024

Ms. Stewart states no

Attorney Wenko states after January, 2024 did you send any letters

Ms. Stewart states the property was deemed unfit with dangerous building in what year not sure. March, 2024, there were more re items and tires, fence, vehicle and siding dilapidated. At that time another violation letter was sent for tall grass and weeds notice.

After this letter Ms. Stewart sent a demolition notice. She presents a copy of the notice sent from the City that the property was dangerous and a nuisance and City is looking at demolish by August, 2024. Also placard property as dangerous property.

Ms. Stewart states she did send a notice to the Stark County Auditor of the intent to demolish 219 5<sup>th</sup> Street East. Showed photos.

Ms. Stewart states that in July, 2024 a pink dangerous notice, siding dilapidated, grass and weeds taller than fence and accumulation of items still there. Property was placarded and copy of notice was sent to property owner.

Attorney Wenko asks what is the purpose of the demolition notice

Ms. Stewart states this give the opportunity to the property owner to demolish prior to the City doing it.

Attorney Wenko asks if there were anymore inspections done.

Ms. Stewart states the City requested permission from the property owner to do inspection.

Attorney Wenko presents exhibits X1, X2, X3 which were certified letters to the property owner written by the law firm

Attorney Wenko presents X2, X3 copies to the letter sent by law firm via certified mail

Ms. Wenko asks if the property owner contacted the city to do an inspection.

Ms. Stewart states no.

Attorney Wenko asks if the City asked for a search warrant

Ms. Stewart states an affidavit to get a search warrant to search interior of the premises.

The search warrant was granted to the City by the district court and a copy of the warrant signed by Judge Rhonda Ehlis was presented.

Attorney Wenko asks how did you notice property

Ms. Stewart states the City posted on property and time that this would be conducted. This inspection was scheduled for October, 2024 internal and external inspection. Herself and 2 city of Dickinson officers inspected the property together, the interior and exterior of property.

Ms. Stewart explains the photos outside of structure showed dilapidation of siding, roof dilapidation and junk, vehicle. Primary structure. Additional inoperable unlicensed vehicle, grass and weeds very fall along with accumulation of furniture, old food, other items. Ms. Stewart states the interior had multiple items making it difficult to pass through, completely blocked on crawl space, hole in the ceiling, most of the doorways are blocked making it difficult to pass through, graffiti and extremely graffitied, blocking windows, drywall removed and installation exposed.

Attorney Wenko asks what was the determination after inspection

Ms. Stewart states unfit for human occupation and move forward with the process.

Attorney Wenko asks since 2020 has the City seen any improvement

Ms. Stewart states no.

Attorney Wenko asks where remedial measures provide maintenance to this property

Ms. Stewart states no

Attorney Wenko asks if there were any efforts to improve this property

Ms. Stewart states no

Ms. Stewart states exhibit AA is a copy of city of Dickinson municipal code.

Attorney Wenko deems to be applicable to this property in regard to dangerous structure

Attorney Wenko asks if this structure condition satisfies condition of #1

Ms. Stewart does apply

Attorney Wenko asks waling surface worn, warped and unsafe

Ms. Stewart does apply

Attorney Wenko asks if a portion damaged by cause and stability

Ms. Stewart does apply

Attorney Wenko asks if C 5 – portion

Ms. Stewart states the Building Department did not hire a structure engineer so no opinion.

Attorney. Wenko presents C6 – not sufficient strength or stability

Ms. Stewart does apply

Attorney Wenko presents C 7 – settled to extent structure

Ms. Stewart states they did not a pull a structure engineering

Attorney Wenko presents C8

Ms. Stewart did not pull structural engineer  
Attorney Wenko C 10 – exterior walls bubble

Ms. Stewart does apply

Attorney Wenko presents C 11 – 33% or more damage

Ms. Stewart does not apply

Attorney Wenko presents C 12 – fire wind

Ms. Stewart does apply

Attorney Wenko C 13 violation

Ms. Stewart states not to her knowledge

Attorney Wenko presents C 14 - 50%

Ms. Stewart that would not apply

Attorney Wenko presents C 15 – inadequate maintenance

Ms. Stewart does apply

Attorney Wenko presents C16 - obsolescence, inadequate

Ms. Stewart does apply

Attorney Wenko C17 - public nuisance

Ms. Stewart yes does apply

Attorney Wenko presents C 18 – portion of building remains onsite or abandoned for a period of 6 months

Mr. Stewart does apply

Attorney Wenko reiterate prior testimony when city makes determine whether structure is danger

Ms. Stewart vacated and demolish

Attorney Wenko states was there a lack of cleanup efforts and has the city exhausted all of efforts

Ms. Stewart states yes

Ms. Stewart states the City's recommendation is to demolish of property

Attorney Wenko and to assess the cost

Ms. Stewart states yes

President Scott Decker asks if there was any representative from the property or the property owner. No one represented the property

President Scott Decker asks if the Commissioners if they had any other questions for the witness. President Decker also asks if there were any further witnesses. There was neither of these.

President Scott Decker states the property owner may present evidence but since there was no property owner present, he asks if any mortgage or lien holder was present to present evidence or a statement in regards to the property. There was no representative.

Attorney Wenko states she will present findings in front of Commission 7/1/ 2025 outlining the testimony. If the Commission approved the findings, a copy will be sent to the property owner. He does have 30 days to appeal. Once that 30-day appeal expires and then the city staff will proceed. Cost of tear down will be assessed to the property pursuant to city code.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION BY: Jason Fridrich

SECONDED BY: Robert Baer

Adjournment of the meeting at approximately 9:45 A.M.

DISPOSITION: Roll call vote... Aye 4, Nay 0, Absent 0  
Motion declared duly passed.

OFFICIAL MINUTES PREPARED BY:

---

Rita Binstock, Assistant to City Administrator

APPROVED BY:

---

Dustin Dassinger, City Administrator

---

Scott Decker, President  
Board of City Commissioners

Date: August 5, 2025