

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
9/5/2018 6:04 AM	Eric Lein (again)	Against	The overall cost of city-wide organized collection should be cheaper, NOT more expensive. But, the total price to be paid by consumers is up, not down. After looking at data collected and distributed by St. Paul's Department of Public Works, one local analyst (John Genereux) calculates that approximately 73,000 affected St. Paul households will be forced to pay an excess cost of about \$11.6 million per year (or more), for a total of \$58 million (or more) during the city's five-year garbage contract. Instead of benefiting from touted savings (via energy and efficiency of geography), consumers city-wide will pay MILLIONS of DOLLARS more each year. To more than a few voters, this is way beyond "frustrating."	
8/29/2018 2:42 AM	Gerald	Against	"the leanest service option costs \$9.36 per collection, or 27 cents per gallon, while the 95-gallon cart costs \$7.88 per collection, or 8 cents per gallon." I'd quit recycling to get my money's worth of my 35 gallon every other week service but then you will increase the property tax ***essment for recycling due to lower volume. Please don't force us to subsidize the "wasters" by adopting this unfair pricing structure.	+2
8/13/2018 8:25 PM	Jon Gibney	Against	I've been against this whole plan ever since I heard it was being considered. I don't find any of the purported benefits of a centralized system to be at all compelling, and I am very happy with my current trash pickup service. W-3 P-12	+1
8/13/2018 4:33 PM	Michael Marcotte	Against	I am not happy with the new trash collection plan. As a conscientious recycler and minimal trash generator I want the option to opt out and/or share containers.	+1
8/13/2018 12:42 AM	Debbie	Against	I support the idea of coordinated trash collection, but this specific plan as written should be s****ped. We generate only 1-2 gallons of trash per week for a 3 person household. Even with 35 gallon service every other week, we'll be paying for service we don't need and subsidizing big trash producers,	+2

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
8/6/2018 6:16 PM	Nora Fitzpatrick	Against	<p>as the pricing provides a perverse incentive. Why are we giving volume discounts to generate more waste? There is an easy fix that would make people conscious of the trash they produce and encourage them to produce less: charge by straight volume from the first gallon, no bulk discounts. Our household does not use Christmas tree disposal, and will be subsidizing those who do. We also do not discard 3 bulky items per year. Again, there is an easy and equitable fix: consider the tree a large item, and let households choose to purchase large item disposal, either per item or per year.</p> <p>I am concerned and frustrated over the new requirement that each household within a 2-4 family building have a separate garbage can. We are a duplex and our family lives in both units, no tenants. Due to efforts to compost and recycle, we never fill our bin. We DO NOT NEED two bins. I was truly excited by the prospect of centralized garbage pickup and supported it . I never heard about this specific requirement and object to the lack of transparency on this very important point. Our costs of garbage pickup will increase significantly. The trucks will double their work and with two recycling bins and two garbage bins, there is the very real potential of alley obstructions because of the increased clutter. Please consider the negative impact this will have on the neighborhood and vote NO.</p> <p>The City Wide Trash Collection effort is garbage -- pun intended. If this is to be so much more efficient by having less trucks, less overlapping routes, etc -- then how come my bill is doubling? I can tell you why -- the requirement to have each dwelling unit have their own bin is absurd. It encourages more waste, both physical garbage and money being ransacked from residents. Get rid of the bin per dwelling requirement at minimum. Better yet, get rid of the whole organized collection and go back to private collection.</p>	+2
8/6/2018 3:56 PM	Drew	Against	<p>The City Wide Trash Collection effort is garbage -- pun intended. If this is to be so much more efficient by having less trucks, less overlapping routes, etc -- then how come my bill is doubling? I can tell you why -- the requirement to have each dwelling unit have their own bin is absurd. It encourages more waste, both physical garbage and money being ransacked from residents. Get rid of the bin per dwelling requirement at minimum. Better yet, get rid of the whole organized collection and go back to private collection.</p>	+1

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
8/3/2018 7:14 PM	Jonathan Shuster	Against	As a Saint Paul Homeowner for 20 years, and owner of a two-unit home, I request a NO vote to Organized Collection as planned. Especially since two-unit homes are being made to pay for 2 services ( more then doubling my monthly trash bill) when 1 receptacle already meets the needs of the residents. No options for the public to reduce costs. A terrible plan as is. excessive costs, and, as I understand the pricing, this violates some city ordinances related to Trash. Include a every other week, or a discount for less waste. Either all residential housing -including 4+ units buildings being exempted under this plan - or free choice for all property owner.	+1
8/2/2018 10:25 PM	Linda Barnett	Against	I am against not being able to share trash collection with my neighbors. Four neighbors share trash now and we never fill our container. We all recycle and do organic recycling so we have very little trash. No one should be forced to have trash collection if we don't want it. Also the cost you are charging us is outrageous.	+2
8/1/2018 10:14 PM	Tim Harwig ward 4	Against	While favoring centralized pick up, I oppose the structure of the agreement requiring separate bins - and extra charges - for each household in small multi family units. It's not reasonable to place the burden of extra maintenance and a tripling of existing rates. The City's stayed position that this was necessities placate the desires of trash haulers is both preposterous and out of touch with the needs of its constituents. I'd rather maintain our current structure, however ridiculous,	+1
8/1/2018 7:38 PM	Kate Leisses	Against	I am concerned and frustrated over the new requirement that each household within a 2-4 family building have a separate garbage can. We are a triplex and have been served by a single 95 gallon can for the past 20 years. I was truly excited by the prospect of centralized garbage pickup and supported it publicly in the neighborhood. At no time did I hear about this specific requirement and worry about the lack of transparency on this very important	+1

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
8/1/2018 2:42 PM	Jennie Ross	Against	<p>decision. Our costs of garbage pickup with nearly triple – from \$30 per month to \$75 per month. Unfortunately, we can't absorb this monthly increase and will have to pass it on to our tenants. That's a \$25 per month / \$300 per year increase for each tenant. The trucks will triple their work and the duration at the garbage station and there is the very real potential of alley obstructions because of the increased clutter. Please reconsider the negative financial impact this will have on the neighborhood residents.</p> <p>I support the concept of organized pick-up, however I think the no-opt out and no sharing is contrary to the intent of waste reduction. I currently share with my neighbors in trash removal services, since my average trash generation is less than one grocery-size bag of trash every 2 months because I reduce, reuse, recycle, donate and compost. Your current plan will substantially increase my costs for trash disposal and, more importantly, will discourage me and others from reducing our trash volume. I ask that you consider the 'message' that you are sending to the public about trash generation/disposal by not providing for container sharing and/or opt-out for those who are moving towards zero-waste. Please do not adopt the ordinance as it is now, but amend it to provide accommodations for container sharing and/or opt-out.</p>	+3
8/1/2018 1:54 PM	Joe Downes	Against	<p>Although I support the concept of organized pick-up, I think the no-opt out, no sharing and multiple bins for duplexes doesn't make sense and is contrary to the intent of waste reduction</p>	+3
7/30/2018 8:06 PM	Mary Erjavec	Against	<p>I am opposed to the contract that you have made with the trash haulers for the new city trash hauling plan. I am close to being zero-waste, currently average one grocery-size bag of trash monthly( 8 gallons)—usually under 10 lbs/month. I reduce, reuse, recycle, donate and compost. All of the things we've been encouraged to do. Your plan, for every-other week will have a net cost of \$22.33. : 70</p>	

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
7/30/2018 8:05 PM	Mary Erjavec	Against	<p>gallons @ \$.32/ gallon. ( my cost about \$2.78 per gallon for what I discard in trash) I currently take my trash to the transfer station every several months and pay \$4.00. Additionally, the costs are appallingly regressive. EOW 35 gallon \$ .32/ gallon/mo (NB, truck needs 2 fewer stops each month) Weekly 35 gallon \$ .18/ gallon/mo Weekly 65 gallon \$ .13/ gallon/mo Weekly 95 gallons \$ .095/ gallon/mo I have heard the argument about much of the cost being for the stop. Obviously that argument is based on false reasoning—the greatest costs to the hauler are</p> <p>I am opposed to the contract that you have made with the trash haulers for the new city trash hauling plan. I am close to being zero-waste, currently average one grocery-size bag of trash monthly( 8 gallons)—usually under 10 lbs/month. I reduce, reuse, recycle, donate and compost. All of the things we’ve been encouraged to do. Your plan, for every-other week will have a net cost of \$22.33. : 70</p> <p>gallons @ \$.32/ gallon. ( my cost about \$2.78 per gallon for what I discard in trash) I currently take my trash to the transfer station every several months and pay \$4.00. Additionally, the costs are appallingly regressive. EOW 35 gallon \$ .32/ gallon/mo (NB, truck needs 2 fewer stops each month) Weekly 35 gallon \$ .18/ gallon/mo Weekly 65 gallon \$ .13/ gallon/mo Weekly 95 gallons \$ .095/ gallon/mo I have heard the argument about much of the cost being for the stop. Obviously that argument is based on false reasoning—the greatest costs to the hauler are</p> <p>I am opposed to the contract that you have made with the trash haulers for the new city trash hauling plan. I am close to being zero-waste, currently average one grocery-size bag of trash monthly( 8 gallons)—usually under 10 lbs/month. I reduce, reuse, recycle, donate and compost. All of the things we’ve been encouraged to do. Your plan, for every-other week will have a net cost of \$22.33. : 70</p> <p>gallons @ \$.32/ gallon. ( my cost about \$2.78</p>	
7/30/2018 8:05 PM	Mary Erjavec	Against	<p>gallons @ \$.32/ gallon. ( my cost about \$2.78 per gallon for what I discard in trash) I currently take my trash to the transfer station every several months and pay \$4.00. Additionally, the costs are appallingly regressive. EOW 35 gallon \$ .32/ gallon/mo (NB, truck needs 2 fewer stops each month) Weekly 35 gallon \$ .18/ gallon/mo Weekly 65 gallon \$ .13/ gallon/mo Weekly 95 gallons \$ .095/ gallon/mo I have heard the argument about much of the cost being for the stop. Obviously that argument is based on false reasoning—the greatest costs to the hauler are</p> <p>I am opposed to the contract that you have made with the trash haulers for the new city trash hauling plan. I am close to being zero-waste, currently average one grocery-size bag of trash monthly( 8 gallons)—usually under 10 lbs/month. I reduce, reuse, recycle, donate and compost. All of the things we’ve been encouraged to do. Your plan, for every-other week will have a net cost of \$22.33. : 70</p> <p>gallons @ \$.32/ gallon. ( my cost about \$2.78</p>	+1

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
7/30/2018 6:30 PM	Jennifer Stewart	Against	<p>per gallon for what I discard in trash) I currently take my trash to the transfer station every several months and pay \$4.00. Additionally, the costs are appallingly regressive. EOW 35 gallon \$ .32/ gallon/mo (NB, truck needs 2 fewer stops each month) Weekly 35 gallon \$ .18/ gallon/mo Weekly 65 gallon \$ .13/ gallon/mo Weekly 95 gallons \$ .095/ gallon/mo I have heard the argument about much of the cost being for the stop. Obviously that argument is based on false reasoning—the greatest costs to the hauler are As one who has consciously worked to reduce their "consumption" and "waste", I oppose the trash collection plan as it is currently. Over many years of increasing both my recycling and backyard composting (after participating in the Mac-Groveland neighborhood Zero Waste workshop programs and home compost collection trial), I have no need for regular trash collection service at my home. By my own efforts, I have been able to minimize my trash collection cost over many years; in fact, I've been an 'as needed pick-up customer' (by calling hauler at beginning of week) with my hauler of 21+ years. As St. Paul was exploring the possibility of organized collection across the city, I attended several neighborhood meetings and also one in a different neighborhood, just to see how the folks in another area felt about this. I liked the idea of organized collection, and I spoke up for myself and others who have worked to minimize their trash output and who need very few annual trash pick-ups.</p>	+1
7/27/2018 10:48 PM	Alisa Lein	Against	<p>Please vote NO on this ordinance. Not allowing multifamily units to share a cart(s) is unreasonable. No allowing residents who actively work to lower waste pay more per gallon to dispose of their waste is unreasonable. No allowing zero waste residents to opt out of a monthly trash bill is unreasonable. Many fine details were missed in the 5 year contract between the City and the Haulers. Please vote no on this ordinance and</p>	+1

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
7/27/2018 1:31 PM	Daniel Brown	Against	<p>re-negotiate a better contract for all stakeholders. Have the organized trash program be a successful and positive rollout for St. Paul, not a "let's roll it out and fix all of the problems later".</p> <p>This City of Saint Paul Ordinance will double, triple, or even quadruple garbage collection costs for multi-family dwellings (rentals and condominiums). I have lived in my duplex for 25 years and have managed very well with one large garbage can that I share with my tenants. This arrangement has always been efficient and effective. This ordinance will now require me to have two cans, effectively doubling the cost of garbage collection. This ordinance will also litter our alleyways with unneeded garbage cans, drive up rental rates across the city and force thousands of St. Paul residents to pay for garbage cans they do not need or want.</p>	+2
7/14/2018 5:46 PM	Peter Butler	Against	<p>The new trash program is giving haulers a \$2-\$3 million-dollar yearly windfall by requiring residents who currently share to have their own service and for landlord to provide each rental unit its own cart. The Council is putting the haulers' interest first, supposedly in the name of helping small family businesses. Only one of the city's 11 licensed haulers is a family business LOCATED in St. Paul. The other small haulers are located in Hugo, West St. Paul, Mendota Hts, Inver Grove Heights, Newport and Forest Lake. Residents first!</p>	+4
7/12/2018 10:08 PM	Eric Lein	Against	<p>REGARDING "Skyrocketing Rents" --- Please note that St. Paul's new "NO SHARING" trash contract (negotiated with almost zero public transparency and little or no opportunity for public input) will raise rents by \$15 to \$20 PER MONTH per apartment for more than a few tenants in 2-, 3-, and 4-unit buildings. This time, it is NOT the landlords' fault. Local politicians, bureaucrats and little-guy trash haulers are 100-percent responsible for mandating this unreasonable increase.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT ADOPT THIS ORDINANCE AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN.</p>	+3

Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
			PLEASE ALLOW "SHARING" OF CARTS AND GIVE SIGNIFICANT CREDIT FOR "ZERO WASTERS" WHO GENERATE LITTLE OR NO TRASH.	