

I received the June 23, 2017 NOTICE today regarding the Council's July 19 hearing on the proposed amendments concerning alarm permits. I am unable to attend but would like to submit the following comments.

As described in the NOTICE, it costs the City nearly ten times the amount collected for false alarms. While I appreciate the cost analysis presented (although \$500 per false alarm sounds a bit steep), I have been a permit holder for 15-20 years and I am not your problem. There is no cost to the city when there are no false alarms. Having an alarm system is a tool that the City should be encouraging in its overall efforts to reduce crime. I therefore strongly object to raising the fees on all alarm holders (and more than doubling the fee).

The NOTICE does not describe what other choices the Department of Safety and Inspections discussed, but here are some suggestions on increasing the false alarm fees:

- 1) Impose false alarm fees after one warning per year, rather than the existing two warnings.
- 2) False alarm fees could begin after two warnings in ANY twelve month period, rather than resetting to zero on January 1.
- 3) Remove the maximum of \$300 for the 8th false alarm. For example, the fees could double after each subsequent false alarm.
- 4) Do not "zero-out" a holder at the end of each year (my car insurance company doesn't do that). A bad false alarm record could carry forward so that the first fee in the following year could start at \$100 (as proposed) if a holder had, say, 5 false alarms in the prior year (or any other minimum the City chose).

Again, security systems should be seen as a positive thing for homeowners to have. Doubling the fees sends the wrong message. The City costs are due to false alarms and not due to permit holders who use their systems properly. I hope I have given you other options that the City could consider before raising everyone's fee.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alden Hoffman
St. Paul

July 7, 2017