From:	Leaha Jackson
Sent:	Wednesday, May 7, 2025 10:32 AM
To:	aduckhunter1@q.com; Admin Assistant
Subject:	RE: City of Hinckley Inspection Process

Good Morning,

Thank you for reaching out with your concerns. I will share this with the Mayor, Council Members, and staff here at City Hall, and get back to you with a response.

Thank you,

Leaha Jackson
City Administrator
City of Hinckley
320.384.7491
cityadmin@cityofhinckley.com

From: aduckhunter1@q.com <aduckhunter1@q.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 7:03 AM
To: Admin Assistant <adminassist@cityofhinckley.com>; Leaha Jackson <cityadmin@cityofhinckley.com>
Subject: City of Hinckley Inspection Process

> **Caution:** This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mr. Mayor, and Members of the City Council,

According to the city of Hinckley's advertised bylaws they follow the 2015 MN Building Code 1300.0120. This code requires that a permit be pulled when a roof is redone, among a plethora of other things. By law, the city is then required to enforce these building codes. The cost for funding this code enforcement program, is said to be supported by the building, and other permit fee's. The purpose of the building codes is to provide minimum standards to safeguard life and limb, health, property, and public welfare by regulating and controlling the design, construction, and quality of materials, among other things. The city of Hinckley seems to be missing the goal, but more than willing to take the money, for the permit.

St. Paul's experience with this process in the last 2 roofing projects, plus a steeple repair, are as follows. The 1st roofing company improperly laid ice and water, and tar paper. In some spots it was even non existent. The flashing at the base of the steeple was missing in spots as well. These shortcomings, along with poorly finished valleys, led to many incidents of water intrusion, on all 4 corners of our sanctuary, in our narthex, and furnace room. These jobs had passed inspection from the city of Hinckley. Last week we

once again had our roof redone, by a different roofing company, and to my knowledge the inspector never even came to the site, until 3 days after completion.

I am writing to you because the city of Hinckley has required permits to be pulled, and paid for, on St. Paul's behalf. In return the responsibility of the city was to assure proper procedure, and materials. Please explain to me how an inspection on a completed roof will reveal faults under the shingles. In my opinion, Hinckley's inspection process is much like our 1st new roof, it cost us dearly, but has failed. I have pictures of the prior installation during the recent teardown process, to prove my complaint. The water in the church over the last 5 years would be a testament to that as well. Why doesn't the city need to fulfill their expectations in a reasonable manner? How can you enforce if you don't even truly inspect? If the city had inspected, and enforced the MN State Building Laws the 1st time, St Paul's should have saved a good sum of money, and time. The goal is to protect property, and welfare. The results show that we completely fell flat, actually worse. Hinckley's inactions protected the contractor in this case, rather than its resident.

I appreciate your concern, and look forward to your insight and explanations. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully yours,

Aaron Peterson