

Subject: Final Statement on Jackie's Case

Dear Mr. Cosley,

I'm providing a factual record and then closing my involvement.

From day one, my request to Inspector Lovato was simple: put in writing the specific reason for his inspection. He identified the "tarpred structure" verbally, but never reduced it to writing. As of around 1 p.m. on the scheduled inspection day, documented and timestamped approval to inspect was available; the inspection did not occur.

Two process defects stand out, to the best of my knowledge and based on the materials available:

- The paperwork is boilerplate—template language, not property-specific findings. The phrases in the Notice/Correction List match the City's generic examples verbatim, with nothing unique to Jackie's property.
- There is no documented homeowner authorization on file to communicate with me or with Karin as third parties, yet we were included in case discussions. Advancing a case without written homeowner consent to involve third parties is a procedural flaw.

Good-faith note: Draft letters I prepared to the Mayor and City Council were never sent. My intent has not been to place you or the department in a bad light, only to ensure the record reflects case-specific facts, proper owner notice, and lawful procedure.

Additional factual points for the record:

- On the day in question, Jackie did not provide owner consent for backyard entry.
- Karin sent a text to reschedule; the read receipt on Karin's phone reflects it was received. In CCTV footage—with you present—Inspector Lovato states he never received the message. Later, he stated he did not see it until the next day because it was his work phone. These statements conflict with the read receipt and video record.

Relevant emails and printed documentation are retained by Karin. When I finish compiling media from security cameras, I will leave those with her as well. If your office needs anything, please coordinate through Karin—not me.

A case built on boilerplate, lacking a written, property-specific basis, and involving third parties without documented consent undermines the program's integrity. You, as Principal Building Inspector, have the ability to ensure any action rests on case-specific facts and proper owner notice.

This is my last word. I will not be engaging further.

Respectfully,

Christopher Foley

A) “Permits—Required” language is pasted from City sources

FACT (case paperwork)

= Violation header/theme shows “BUILDING – Permits Required (SCC 8.100.190)” and uses this sentence as the Full Violation:

“No person, firm, or corporation shall erect, construct, enlarge, alter, repair, move, improve, remove, convert, or demolish any building or structure... without first obtaining a separate building permit...”

FACT (official City Code host)

= The same sentence appears verbatim in **SCC § 8.100.190 (“Permits—Required”)**. [S1]

FACT (public City case portal)

= City Code Enforcement pages display that § 8.100.190 sentence as the **Full Violation** on example cases, with stock “Comments.” [S2]

B) “Comments” block is standardized (appears across unrelated City cases)

FACT (case paperwork)

= Comments include exact phrases such as:

- “Provide access for complete inspection.”
- “This is not a complete inspection / not a complete Violation List...”
- “Other building structural, electrical, plumbing or mechanical code violations may be identified upon further inspection.”
- “Permit required for repairs and rehab...”
- “The property is required to remain secured and maintained at all times.”

FACT (official City records)

= The **same phrases** appear word-for-word on other City case documents (unrelated addresses) in the City’s **records.cityofsacramento.org** repository. [S5] [S6] [S7] [S8] [S9] [S10]

(A + B = the Notice text is boilerplate, not property-specific findings.)

C) What a valid **Notice and Order** must contain (City Code standard)

FACT (City requirement)

= A Notice and Order must include:

- “a brief and concise description of the conditions found to render the building substandard,”
- the **specific** corrective action required, and
- appeal/fee framework tied to the Notice.

FACT (official City Code host)

= These requirements are set out in **SCC § 8.100.720 (“Notice and order—Issuance—Contents—Fee”)**. [S3]

*(C = the City expects concise, **property-specific** written findings—boilerplate is insufficient.)*

D) Owner Consent & Third-Party Authorization — Official Basis

Entry/Inspection requires consent or legal authorization

- **Rental Housing Inspection Program ordinance (City .org)**: “It shall be the responsibility of the owner and the local contact representative to obtain the consent of the occupants... or otherwise obtain legal access.” (**SCC § 8.120.110 Entry**). [S12]
- **Tenant Consent to Inspect form (City .org)**: Signed consent for inspectors to enter a unit. [S13]
- **Residents’ Rights sheet (City .org)**: Notes inspections occur with consent (or court authorization). [S14]

Third-party acting for the owner requires owner authorization (City practice)

- **Agent for Owner Authorization (CDD-0204) (City .org)**: Required when a non-owner represents the owner in Building/Permitting. [S4]
- **Electronic Plan Check Submittal Guide (City .org)**: Lists **Agent Authorization for Owner (CDD-0204) required** when an individual represents the owner. [S11]
- **Building Permit Application (CDD-0200) (City .org)**: May be signed by owner or an **authorized agent**; owner-builder acknowledgement required. [S15]

Notice/service runs to the owner/responsible person (not to third parties)

- **Method of service (general) — SCC § 1.04.100** (service by personal service, certified mail, etc., when a notice and order is required for enforcement). [S16]
 - **Housing Code service provisions — SCC § 8.100.730–.750** govern service & proof of service for Notice and Order (service directed to persons entitled thereto—i.e., the owner/responsible person). [S17] [S18]
 - **Right of Entry (legacy text, City .org record) — “may enter... to the extent authorized by law,”** reinforcing consent/warrant principle. [S19]
-

E) Third-party email record (owner-supplied; FACTS ONLY)

Source: Owner-supplied emails on file (8/22/2025 and 8/25/2025). Presented to show communication routing and supervisory visibility.

- **8/22/2025, 12:50 PM** — Email from **Paul Lovato** to **Karin Owens** (subject: *Inspection at 4800 T ST*). States he attached photos of electrical violations and: *“Yesterday talking with our principal and owner of property, he will allow the electrical work to be done without permits due to the danger of fire... would still like me to inspect after the work is done.”*
Owner note: Jackie reports **no such owner authorization** was given; **no signed consent** is on file.
- **8/25/2025, 9:24 AM** — Email from **Paul Lovato** to **Karin Owens**, cc: **Bo Cosley**. *“I have attached our principal building inspector to our emails. He would like to be involved in any conversations, progress to the property when clearing the violations...”*
Observation: Communication is directed to a **third party** rather than the **owner**; supervisory visibility begins **after** this date when Bo is cc'd.

Compliance implications (ties to sources already cited): Third-party emails do **not** substitute for (i) **owner-served** notices (**S16–S18**) or (ii) **documented owner authorization/consent** (**S4, S12–S14**). To ensure clean supervisory oversight and due process, communications and directives should be **owner-directed**, with any emergency authorization documented in writing.

Sources (official City & City-hosted; print this block)

Primary City-hosted (.org) records and forms

S4 — Agent for Owner Authorization (CDD-0204) — City form

https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/content/dam/portal/cdd/Building/Forms/CDD-0204_Agent-for-Owner-Authorization-Form.pdf

S5 — City record (unrelated address): “Owner is to provide access to interior for complete inspection...”

<https://www.records.cityofsacramento.org/ViewDoc.aspx?ID=s6tFBnt4W+KnuAFgY9JTMO/oiAaMzpvY>

S6 — City record: Case checklist with boilerplate phrasing (§ 8.100.190 text inside “Comments”)
<https://www.records.cityofsacramento.org/ViewDoc.aspx?ID=s6tFBnt4W+li02rwkQGug2vT8nlZqj61>

S7 — City record: “Not a complete inspection...” language (another case)
<https://www.records.cityofsacramento.org/ViewDoc.aspx?ID=s6tFBnt4W+lZJiPpN/0wtn5h/uj9dbdE>

S8 — City record: “Provide access... complete inspection” (another case)
<https://www.records.cityofsacramento.org/ViewDoc.aspx?ID=s6tFBnt4W+LFiJ9BPNlnWDL4lmXYvV0>

S9 — City record: “Provide access to all units for inspection” (another case)
<https://www.records.cityofsacramento.org/ViewDoc.aspx?ID=s6tFBnt4W+JmwdfCO0lZ4gt29Jq9j2v7>

S10 — City record: “access to complete his inspection...” (another case)
<https://records.cityofsacramento.org/ViewDoc.aspx?ID=s6tFBnt4W+IPW7QoTGwbi7fOh+WtwDvf>

S11 — Electronic Plan Check — Agent Authorization for Owner (CDD-0204) required (City guide)
<https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/content/dam/portal/cdd/Building/Plan-Review/Electronic-Plan-Check/EPC-Submittal-Guide-Full-Version.pdf>

S12 — Rental Housing Inspection Program ordinance (City .org) — Entry/Consent (SCC § 8.120.110)
<https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/content/dam/portal/cdd/Code-Compliance/Programs/Rental-Housing/Rental-Housing-Inspection-Ordinance-5-28-2013.pdf>

S13 — RHIP — Tenant Consent to Inspect (City form)
<https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/content/dam/portal/cdd/Code-Compliance/Programs/Rental-Housing/RHIPTenantConsent2-7-2012.pdf>

S14 — Residents’ Rights & Responsibilities (City sheet)
<https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/content/dam/portal/cdd/Code-Compliance/Programs/Rental-Housing/ResidentsRightsandResponsibilitiesForm.pdf>

S19 — Right of Entry (legacy Dangerous Buildings ordinance text, City record)
<https://www.records.cityofsacramento.org/ViewDoc.aspx?ID=s6tFBnt4W+LEu7XxXo7JFtY8T3Vlif8z>

Official City Code host (amlegal) & public case portal

S1 — SCC § 8.100.190 “Permits—Required”
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sacramentoca/latest/sacramento_ca/0-0-0-18903

S2 — City of Sacramento Code Enforcement public case (example showing § 8.100.190 pasted as “Full Violation” + stock “Comments”)
https://www.citizenserve.com/Sacramento/CitizenController?Action=ListSacViolations&WorkOrder_ID=76941787

S3 — SCC § 8.100.720 “Notice and order—Issuance—Contents—Fee”
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sacramentoca/latest/sacramento_ca/0-0-0-19090

S16 — SCC § 1.04.100 Method of service of notice and orders (general enforcement)
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sacramentoca/latest/sacramento_ca/0-0-0-866

S17 — SCC Chapter index (locations for §§ 8.100.730–.750 service/proof of service)
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sacramentoca/latest/sacramento_ca/0-0-0-18718