

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
Ord 18-54	11/7/2018 8:39 PM	Eric Lein	For	Bureaucratic thinking boggles my mind: FIRST, raise garbage prices; NEXT, raise wages because people can't afford to live here. __ While considering this new minimum wage ordinance, please understand that recently-adopted garbage ordinances harm many low-paid workers who live in St. Paul. Despite vocal opposition by thousands of residents, only two councilmembers voted against skewed and oppressive garbage price increases that "rolled out" as of 10/01/2018. For garbage there is NO multi-year phase-in, NO sharing, NO opt-out, and there are NO exceptions (unless customers submit plane tickets or doctors' notes for review by the self-appointed garbage police). REALLY?!! __ Let's be fair to everyone by letting wages, and garbage prices, move to reasonable levels. REGARDING WAGES: Adopt a thoroughly-vetted plan when the time is right. REGARDING GARBAGE: On 11/14/2018, acknowledge that the citizens' petition on Garbage Ordinance 18-39, containing 5,541 valid signatures, is "sufficient."	+5
RES 18- 1922	11/8/2018 11:31 PM	Peter Butler	Against	See you in court!!	+26 -2
RES 18- 1922	11/9/2018 3:21 AM			How sad to see how little the City Council cares about so many thousands of us that took the time and energy to use the democratic process to help you lead and represent us. As both a citizen and an Ethics professional, I'm deeply disturbed to see that you entered into an agreement financially binding me and others to pay for something that you had no right to bind us to without our agreement. This is a	+15 -1

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/9/2018 2:43 PM	Bruce Clark	Against	<p>clear violation of social contract theory, at the root of determining the validity of all contracts. I hope you will seek ***istance from another attorney or even the state's Attorney General's Office to deal with the contract issue you feel stuck about with the haulers since it seems your attorney is unable to help you. The contract is not a valid excuse, as it is not valid if it is not legal. A rental agreement for example, even in writing, is not valid if part of it is illegal or if one party was not fully aware. Your mistake of allowing no exceptions needs changing.</p> <p>If the Council rejects our validated petition against Ordinance 18-39 (after rescinding Ordinance 18-40 !!) it will probably trigger a court case. When we EASILY FOUND thousands of people to sign our petitions to have you reconsider your flawed ordinance, how arrogant of you to dismiss our "legally sufficient" petition because in your narrow opinion, "the subject matter is not appropriate to submit to the electorate"!! I can understand the human impulse to save face when you've made a poor decision which imposes a one-size-fits-all mandatory trash policy without studying whether your ordinance actually improves collection in a cost effective manner. I could accept that if you fessed up, designed a better ordinance that recognizes the contribution made by zero wasters (opt-outs) and allowed neighbors and tenants to share trash carts. If you reject our call for a referendum, I will work to organize against your effort and will financially contribute to a court case.</p>	+14 -1

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/9/2018 4:20 PM	Rob Reiter	Against	<p>This should have been put to a vote in the first place. I am disgusted by the arrogance of this council. This controversial decision was made by the council before the residents of Saint Paul had any real say in the matter. The council did not put much weight in the overwhelming number of public comments that were against this proposal. Now it is the opinion of the council that "the subject matter is not appropriate to submit to the electorate"! Again, such arrogant behavior. Shame on you, this is not right.</p> <p>This issue needs to be put to a vote by the people this impacts. . Since the city mandated hauler program took effect I have spent over 5 hours on the phone with my new hauler trying to correct errors. 5 Hours out of my busy work day to try to correct issues that should have never happened. The price has gone up, and the customer service has gone way way way down. As a tax paying homeowner I should be able to make basic choices for my home, including who is hauling my garbage. I urge the council to bring this back to the people and let their voices be heard in a vote instead of forcing this onto us.</p>	+12 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/9/2018 5:17 PM	Debra Freytag	Against	<p>The ordinance was p***ed with seemingly no consideration for the citizens it would affect. For our duplex the cost of trash hauling, which we shared, was \$82.77 for two large carts. Under the new trash removal ordinance, the charges are \$500 per year more; most of which is born by the renters who are now required to have a separate cart. My rental unit was well within the "affordable" range. Under the new</p>	+13 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/9/2018 8:35 PM	William T Conlan	Against	<p>The ordinance was p***ed with seemingly no consideration for the citizens it would affect. For our duplex the cost of trash hauling, which we shared, was \$82.77 for two large carts. Under the new trash removal ordinance, the charges are \$500 per year more; most of which is born by the renters who are now required to have a separate cart. My rental unit was well within the "affordable" range. Under the new</p>	+10 -1

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/9/2018 10:53 PM	Eric Lein	Against	<p>trash hauling ordinance, the rent is 5% higher with no added benefit. Over the 5 year contract, this will be \$2500, again with no added value.</p> <p>This resolution determines a course into the future. Many citizens believe that parts of St. Paul's trash program range from unconscionable to unfair and unethical to possibly illegal. By amending Resolution 18-1922 before adoption, councilmembers have an opportunity to demonstrate that, unlike the City Attorney's opinion, they value PEOPLE more than they value an admittedly-flawed PROCESS. To choose PEOPLE is likely to cost all St. Paul taxpayers Millions of dollars if garbage haulers convince a court that their contract prevails. To choose PROCESS will cost a few thousand targeted garbage customers Millions of dollars, unless those customers convince a court that their cases prevail. There is no easy path out of this city-created mess. Now is the time to create a better future by acting in, and honoring, the best interests of all the people.</p> <p>I own and live in a duplex which I've used as a single family home for more than 30 years, I only fill one trash bag aprox. every two months and take too Twin City Refuse at a cost of \$ 3.50 that's \$ 1.75 per mo.I haven't had or needed a trash service for more than 15 years. Now comes your program and I'm being forced to pay TWO trash bills totaling more than \$ 50.00 a month----You think this is fair? I want OPTOUT! I don't get a newspaper each day, Believe it or not, I never heard about this unwanted expensive program until I got a card in the mail asking me to choose a cart. If there were public</p>	+8 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/10/2018 10:59 PM	Doug. Gast. 55107	Against	<p>for more than 15 years. Now comes your program and I'm being forced to pay TWO trash bills totaling more than \$ 50.00 a month----You think this is fair? I want OPTOUT! I don't get a newspaper each day, Believe it or not, I never heard about this unwanted expensive program until I got a card in the mail asking me to choose a cart. If there were public</p>	+9 -2

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 4:00 AM	Kristin Becker		Against	<p>meetings on this ,I never heard about it. This should have been super publicized before being enacted! I'm more willing to spend my \$ 50.00 a month to help support a legal action than to pay for a program that I feel is extortion!,</p> <p>I was inspired by hearing that "This Is OUR City" from the mayor, while being frustrated that after promising for years that there would be an opt out for Zerowasters, the city council suddenly dropped that and forced me into a very expensive contract for a service I do not need. I was shocked at how many low income people, including many elderly were going to suffer under this policy. I've met hundreds of people who had greatly reduced their trash through recycling, composting and reducing. They felt empowered by their efforts & imposing exorbitant fees for a service they don't need is not only deflating, but financially devastating. Elderly neighbors say they are already choosing between medicine & healthy food so they can stay in their homes; now the city is trying to force them out. During this petition, I heard at first anger, then hope that they could make a change. Making up excuses to throw out our petition is enraging us. You vote against us, we'll vote against you.</p> <p>Thank you Saint Paul City Council Members for making public health and hygiene a priority in the "most livable" city in the US. I am a low-waste resident who can see past my own cart to see how large system changes are beneficial. While I see several challenges with the contract, I do not agree with the petition or the misleading aggressive solititation of</p>	+13 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 4:45 AM	Kristina Mattson		Against	<p>Thank you Saint Paul City Council Members for making public health and hygiene a priority in the "most livable" city in the US. I am a low-waste resident who can see past my own cart to see how large system changes are beneficial. While I see several challenges with the contract, I do not agree with the petition or the misleading aggressive solititation of</p>	+5 -10

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
				the petitioners I personally encountered. Thank you for your leadership and for protecting and promoting our health and safety. I look forward working toward solutions to improve organized trash, through possible subsidies by the county, and creating a pathway for citizens to take, such as a MRC program, for residents who are low-waste leaders to pay-as-they-go or have a program that fits their needs. Sincerely, Kristina Mattson	
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 4:47 AM	Kristina Mattson	For	Please correct my position as “for” of not bringing this petition to a ballot. Thank you!	+4 -10
				I find the actions of the city council to be unforgivable in that they are ignoring the voices of the people of the city. The council has enacted a new policy that will hurt a good number of people, forcing them into contracts that they did not choose and in most cases would not have chosen if they where given the option. You are taking the rights of people to chose what they want and need away from them and that is not right and can't be legal. You are punishing those of us that are trying to cut back on their waste, trying to make the world a better place for us all by making us pay more than those that waste more. You are not giving people and option to share or opt out, taking it out on their property taxes. You should do the right thing and bring this to the people for a vote.	
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 4:48 AM	Reginald Johnson	Against		+6 -1
				Its easy to pay for a program you don't need when you are financially well off. But I care about the widowed, alone in their home, on a fixed income neighbors. This decision should include concerns for	
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 5:11 AM	Reginald Johnson	Against		+5 -1

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 5:25 AM	Jamie Karras		Against	<p>them, more so than the financially elite annoyed by the sounds of garbage trucks in their alley. Making trucks idle to pick up numerous trash cans where there used to be just one isn't really focusing on carbon footprint either. City council members who care about voters even when they are not rich, will chose to repeal this ordinance or allow the referendum to be put to a vote.</p> <p>Please consider putting this to public vote. This was pushed on the residents of St.Paul even though there was a great number of residents against it. If this is such a great deal the citizens of St.Paul will p*** it. If you deny the citizens the oppurtunity to vote, it will only show how the council doesn't listen to the people but only push the agenda that pads the city coffers. I have yet to hear from anybody that has benefitted from this, besides the haulers and city administrators. Personally my bill has increased by 20% plus my property taxes increased due to maintence fees.</p> <p>My parents and I live across the alley from each other and to save money we have in the past shared trash service and the cost. Now we are having to pay two bills. I am barely making ends meet and cannot afford to be paying almost a third more for the same service. The people have spoken. We acquired the required amount of petitions so our voice should be heard.</p>	+7 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 5:44 AM	Sally Johnson		Against	<p>The people St Paul have spoken and you are trying to silence them with your legal flim flam. This should have been brought to a vote in the first place and was forced on us in</p>	+7 -3

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 7:24 AM		Against	<p>socialist fashion. It is costly and has been proven to be much less efficient than other city systems. There are legitimate issues that need to be addressed. Vote to allow the referendum to proceed.</p> <p>The city's claim that Minnesota Statutes 443 applies is false if anyone reads the entire chapter. This section of law applies to cities of the first cl*** that operate a trash service as a city utility. Maybe some have forgotten but the city shut this down 40 years ago. This new program is not a city utility. The city would have to buy trucks and hire its own employees for it to be a city utility.</p> <p>The city's claim that they can organize trash collection and that this is unconstitutional interference between the city and the trash haulers is also false, thanks to the recent ruling by the Minnesota Supreme Court in the Bloomington case. The Court clearly ruled, overturning district court and the court of appeals, that the state's solid waste laws do not allow a city to void city charter provisions. Perhaps city council members should thoroughly read the Court's opinion on this. I doubt the Minnesota Supreme Court is going to overturn its own decision from this year because St. Paul asks.</p> <p>I am in favor of city garbage but not in the current form. There needs to be a zero waste option, cart sharing and dumpster sharing for multi units.</p>	+6 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 7:27 AM		Against	<p>The price should also encourage waste reduction. If this is suppose to stop the public dumping we need unlimited large item pick up. Please consider reworking the current deal.</p>	+5 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 2:35 PM	April Aegerter	Against		+7 -1

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 2:45 PM	Shawn		Against	Forcing garbage service on residents of the city won't make the city any cleaner, it's just so Saint Paul can get a cut of the money made by trash services and taking away our right to choose who, if any, we use for garbage service just lets the garbage companies get lazy because we can't pick someone else if they do a poor job.	+4 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 4:22 PM	Bob Craft		Against	I respectfully request that council member Noecker oppose preventing a referendum on the new trash system. In particular the unintended consequence of raising rents for people struggling for affordable housing indicate a need for change. The many flaws pointed out by my fellow citizens indicate I need to revise the contract. This petition should not come to a referendum. I'm thrilled that St. Paul is finally providing this basic municipal service to its residents-- thank you! Privately contracted trash hauling was a leftover from a time when most households burned their trash in backyard barrels and basement incinerators, and what they couldn't burn they hauled to the city dump. I wish the time and energy of the anti-trashers could be directed to something useful in our civic life. Since the new system was something of a compromise to satisfy many stakeholders, I hope the council will do a thorough review after it's been in place for awhile and tweak it where necessary. No opt-out and no caving to the whining of "legal" duplex owners who want to live in a single family home but maintain the investment value of a duplex (wouldn't we all?), but maybe some need-based or age-based financial	+4 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 5:59 PM	TM		For		+4 -12 1

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 6:21 PM	Pat	Against	<p>help, and minimum or special-sized barrels for 2-4 family buildings. And eventually billing through property taxes.</p> <p>Thanks to Councilmembers Bostrom and Prince for their votes on RES 17-1776, the city's last opportunity to do this correctly. A year ago this month, when this matter was extremely appropriate to submit to the electorate, Bostrom and Prince voted against final approval. Please think kindly of them when filling out your ballots in 2019. It is the Councilmembers of Wards 1, 2, 3, and 5 who signed us onto a deal which takes away contracts rights, destroys a market, and gives most residents a bad deal, yet amazingly, still manages to be bad for the environment and the poor. It is impressive, how completely they sold the public down the river. Even this resolution is basically saying, "We really *****ed this one up too badly." Please agree with them next year and find new Councilmembers.</p> <p>I sent an email to Dai Thao when this first came up registering my disapproval of this. One thing i mentioned is that garbage haulers will now have a big incentive to donate to clowncil members to retain their routes. It will be interesting to see contributions in the next elections. Aside from this, i am perfectly capable of choosing my own garbage hauler and do not need the city clowncil forcing this on me. If i am dissatisfied with the service i cannot move to another hauler. i really do not understand why they think they have the authority to make these decisions.</p>	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 6:40 PM	Betty	Against	<p>help, and minimum or special-sized barrels for 2-4 family buildings. And eventually billing through property taxes.</p> <p>Thanks to Councilmembers Bostrom and Prince for their votes on RES 17-1776, the city's last opportunity to do this correctly. A year ago this month, when this matter was extremely appropriate to submit to the electorate, Bostrom and Prince voted against final approval. Please think kindly of them when filling out your ballots in 2019. It is the Councilmembers of Wards 1, 2, 3, and 5 who signed us onto a deal which takes away contracts rights, destroys a market, and gives most residents a bad deal, yet amazingly, still manages to be bad for the environment and the poor. It is impressive, how completely they sold the public down the river. Even this resolution is basically saying, "We really *****ed this one up too badly." Please agree with them next year and find new Councilmembers.</p> <p>I sent an email to Dai Thao when this first came up registering my disapproval of this. One thing i mentioned is that garbage haulers will now have a big incentive to donate to clowncil members to retain their routes. It will be interesting to see contributions in the next elections. Aside from this, i am perfectly capable of choosing my own garbage hauler and do not need the city clowncil forcing this on me. If i am dissatisfied with the service i cannot move to another hauler. i really do not understand why they think they have the authority to make these decisions.</p>	+3

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 7:29 PM	Andrew	Against	We acknowledge the need for the city to provide garbage removal services to its residents. However, the current ordinance was made with little input from Saint Paul citizens and does not provide sufficient flexibility for different types of residents, allowing, for example, zero waste options or dumpster sharing for homeowners ***ociations. Thus, the residents of the city should have a right to vote to repeal this ordinance such that it can be replaced by one that is more appropriate for the diverse residences that exist in Saint Paul, as stated by the city's charter.	+5
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 7:41 PM			The people have spoken. It's your job, not to determine whether YOU agree with it, but to honor the process that is put in place and was satisfied. Either put it up for a vote, as required by the process, or rescind the ordinance as over 6k people have asked.	+7 -2
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 7:59 PM	Kristin	Against	The new system seems to encourage increased trash generation, rather than encourage waste reduction. It also places financial burden on households. Sharing trash service with a neighbor supports decreased waste, and allows individuals to not pay more for service than needed.	+4
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 8:30 PM		Against	shame on the city council for not thinking this mandated trash collection through better... You obviously think your untouchable with your decisions... I guess everyone needs to head to the voting polls next election to prove our point! Adios to you all... Time for some serious change and get council members in there that truly care about the people they represent!	+3

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 10:18 PM	Eric Lein (again)	Against	<p>This resolution cites MN Statutes 443.28 as authority to deny St. Paul citizens a city-wide referendum on Ord 18-39. Did anybody actually read 443.28 where it says, in part: "...rates shall be as nearly as possible just and reasonable, taking into account the character, kind, and quality of service, of rubbish and method of disposition, the number of people served at each place of collection, and all other factors that enter into cost of service..."</p> <p>QUESTION -- Does forced payment for empty & unused trash carts qualify as Just and Reasonable?</p> <p>QUESTION -- The trash program mandates skewed garbage rates that target multi-family, we-share, and "low-waste" households. I wish garbage rates for my tri-plex had "ONLY" doubled. Instead, our price increased by FIVE times. Is this Just and Reasonable - or unconscionable?</p> <p>Our townhome ***ociation was blindsided when we discovered our long-standing collective trash arrangements would be broken up by the compulsory inclusion of only part of our ***ociation in the city program. Public works would only respond to our objections with an unsympathetic "no exemptions, no appeals" policy, and our initial contact with our city council office went without meaningful response (some slack cut here for the ward 4 transition). The petitions became the last remaining method available for citizens to combat the worst shortcomings of these ordinances (no sharing, no opt-out). We were eventually told by Councilwoman Nelson and her aide that the city</p>	+4
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 10:35 PM	Scott Jensen	Against	<p>Our townhome ***ociation was blindsided when we discovered our long-standing collective trash arrangements would be broken up by the compulsory inclusion of only part of our ***ociation in the city program. Public works would only respond to our objections with an unsympathetic "no exemptions, no appeals" policy, and our initial contact with our city council office went without meaningful response (some slack cut here for the ward 4 transition). The petitions became the last remaining method available for citizens to combat the worst shortcomings of these ordinances (no sharing, no opt-out). We were eventually told by Councilwoman Nelson and her aide that the city</p>	+7

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 10:47 PM	ward 4		Against	<p>council has been made quite aware of the problems with the trash collection rules and is seeking a remedy, but if they approve this resolution and toss out the petition without also reaffirming a commitment to fixing this mess in a timely manner (i.e. not waiting for the next 2-year contract), we will be deeply disappointed.</p> <p>I am appalled that our elected officials have the gall to tell us that we, the voters, are not competent to make decisions or even to vote on an issue. Ms. Brendmoen, it is not within your remit to govern by fiat. Your program is horribly designed and favors those who are the most wasteful while penalizing those who are the most environmentally responsible. Yet you gleefully say that we must abide by your choice.</p> <p>Owner occupied 4plex with 3 taped shut bins that I am required to store. I participated in surveys and showed up at conversations. After being told repeatedly all had been heard. Once again the city creates a system that works for few. I just got done with my corner 4plex tax (and the fact the city did not follow own ordinance overcharging me by 540 annually- i can sue for refund) I am sick of being a CI*** A landlord-You are encouraging responsible owners to sell out to bigger owner groups- which generally end up being your problem landlords. It is time for the city of Saint Paul to learn about human-centered design model. My building uses .5 to .75 of a 64 gallon weekly. As the mayor is trying to increase the number of affordable housing units- this is not the way- as my trash bill for 1 quarter was</p>	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 11:01 PM	Lynda Rhodes		Against	<p>Owner occupied 4plex with 3 taped shut bins that I am required to store. I participated in surveys and showed up at conversations. After being told repeatedly all had been heard. Once again the city creates a system that works for few. I just got done with my corner 4plex tax (and the fact the city did not follow own ordinance overcharging me by 540 annually- i can sue for refund) I am sick of being a CI*** A landlord-You are encouraging responsible owners to sell out to bigger owner groups- which generally end up being your problem landlords. It is time for the city of Saint Paul to learn about human-centered design model. My building uses .5 to .75 of a 64 gallon weekly. As the mayor is trying to increase the number of affordable housing units- this is not the way- as my trash bill for 1 quarter was</p>	+5

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/11/2018 11:08 PM	Lynda Rhodes (2nd)	Against	<p>greater than my entire prior year of services- rents will be raising as I cant absorb 5 years of this. Also have already had billing issues, customer service horrid and I cant quit them.</p> <p>I am against the current system in place- sharing is nice; and after the most recent billing issue and the 3 hours it took to get some resolution (i will know if I am ***essed funds on my taxes, as the company will not confirm in writing) To get any traction, it involved my city council person and Kathy Lantry's support. The company continued to state they needed to follow the contract in place. Is this how you all want to be spending the next 5 years? Fix it now!!</p> <p>Saint Paul does not plow its alleys in Winter - the property owners do. The property owners have reduced their trash stream to the point that trash bins do not pile up in alleys and they get plowed so we can get to work, earn a wage and pay our taxes. Clogging alleys with 30%-75% more trash bins will prevent them from being plowed properly - making them imp***able. Residents will become stuck in the alleys - doctor's appointments will be missed - people may die; getting to work will become impossible - people may get fired; the list goes on. Let's do the smart thing Lets do the right thing Lets rethink this whole process and do what makes sense. A LOT of people are willing to go to Court to make this right or at the least, sign on to a cl*** action law suite. Is that really what you want????</p>	+5
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 2:09 AM	Kevin Sweeney			+3

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 3:02 AM	West Side		Against	I most definitely feel a vote is required	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 3:09 AM	MHays		Against	Are you really going to waste even more money on this failure of a project by forcing us to take this to court?	+5 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 5:44 AM	Ken Rowe		Against	Easy solution. Let the referendum take place. If it loses, collection continues. If it passes, collection continues until the City's current contract with the haulers expire. Don't renew the contracts.	+2
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 6:12 AM			Against	Not accurate Ken, and not so simple. When found sufficient and a referendum is to be scheduled, the ordinance and its trash plan will be suspended pending the voters' decision to accept or reject Ordinance 18-39. While suspended, and if rejected, the new trash plan along with the haulers' contract will not be operative. That's likely to attract a lawsuit by Haulers. If this resolution is adopted as currently drafted, that's likely to attract a by Citizens. Neither is simple. Either will drag on for many months or years.	-1
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 2:02 PM	Shawn		Against	Unbelievable. Since you made a mistake and are afraid to face the consequences, you'll deny the people their right to petition. History has shown that when government decides to dictate the lives of others instead of working for the people, serious consequences ensue. This plan was terrible from the beginning and you knew it. You didn't care to listen to your constituents, you wanted power and control. That's not how this works. Tyranny has tried to govern this country before, now it's showing its ugly face in the form of	+3

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 2:15 PM	WTN	Against	socialism. We the people will not stop fighting, we never have since 1776. Do the right thing, or we will. I signed the petitions against the garbage program because I got higher prices and an second, unwanted garbage bin for my property which my wife and I own and live in as a single family dwelling. I have received no ***urances from my city council person, the Public Works Dept. or my new hauler that I can go back to one cart. I am very upset by the inflexibility of this program to people's individual needs and believe that the council needs to accept the petition, allow a vote and allow opt-out.	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 2:41 PM	David Eggenberger		Is this government of the people, by the people and for the people or something else like a ridiculously disguised tax increase and wholly inefficient new system. It makes me wonder where the payoff is?	+4 -1
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 5:56 PM	Reuben S	Against	I'm against this new garbage program.	+1
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 7:12 PM	Rick Otten	Against	Quite frustrating that our government, that professes to be for us, the people, somehow feel empowered to mandate additional expense and inconvenience to the very people they say they're for. Providing a "service" that is not wanted or needed and removes all free market influence. I think Ronald Reagan was right when he said that the 8 most feared words one can hear are: "We're from the government. We're here to help." Please stop this illogical intrusion!	+9

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 7:40 PM	Catherine Spaeth		Against	The City Council needs to reconsider and allow this resolution. St Paul residents are telling you they want to be able to share garbage service. It's time you listened!	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 8:11 PM	Dennis Simonson		Against	I am passionately against the assertion by the city Council that the masses of St. Paul need the assistance of an "enlightened" ruling body to assess their needs and assert their wishes. No vote? No referendum? Do you assume we are subclerk thinkers? Sufficient signatures amassed – no matter – just assure the passive sheople voting is not necessary and that you'll proceed on canvassing the voters feelings. What a criminal assault on our rights and a trespass of your mandate. Minnesota Statutes 443.28 – Powers of Council - Y'all read this? The council of any such city is authorized to employ present facilities, and to provide additional facilities, for rubbish disposal. Rates for such rubbish disposal, together with regulations incident thereto, shall be established by ordinance. Such rates shall be as nearly as possible just and reasonable, taking into account the character, kind, and quality of service, of rubbish and method of disposition, the number of people served at each place of collection, and all other factors that enter into cost of service, including interest on principal, investments, amortization of principal, depreciation, and other overhead charges upon facilities now owned and operated by any such city, or hereafter acquired for such use. Said rates when fixed may be billed in such manner as the city council may determine, or added to and	+4
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 8:46 PM	ward 1		Against	service, of rubbish and method of disposition, the number of people served at each place of collection, and all other factors that enter into cost of service, including interest on principal, investments, amortization of principal, depreciation, and other overhead charges upon facilities now owned and operated by any such city, or hereafter acquired for such use. Said rates when fixed may be billed in such manner as the city council may determine, or added to and	+3

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 8:48 PM	Kate Hunt		Against	collected with water bills and bills for sewage disposal rendered Please vote to put trash collection ordinance 18-39 on the ballot for city wide vote. The preemption argument from the city can be challenged because this argument was defeated in the Jennissen v City of Bloomington decision. What it will take for the City Council members to listen to the constituents they represent? Council Member Dan Bostrom is right, if the current ordinance is so great, what do you have to worry about if it's put to the ballot? Vote to allow ord. 18-39 to be put on the ballot for citizens to decide not special interests. The state law, preemption argument that the city is using to thwart the petition was decided and defeated. Please put citizens interests ahead of those of special interests.	+5
RES 18- 1922	11/12/2018 8:57 PM	Charissa		Against	I am against this garbage program. Maybe it's because I don't drink fluoridated water, but I take issue with the government forcing me to pay for more garbage cans than I need and at a higher cost than I was paying, with no option to opt out or share cans with neighbors. I am conscientious to recycle and restrict my garbage output and don't want to be part of this government takeover of a freedom I once enjoyed.	+3
	11/12/2018 9:21 PM				I am against the new trash hauling program and demand the right to vote on it. I am and have always been perfectly capable of choosing my own trash hauler. If that's what the majority wants, let it be but give us a chance to vote on it.	+1
	11/12/2018 10:21 PM	Scott Stern		Against	My garbage costs have more than doubled for the triplex I've owned for	

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
--------	------	------	------------------	---------	--------

the past twenty years. A well taken care of property with no police calls or building violations.t The comments by Russ Stark about making St. Paul a cleaner and safer city are just not true, dumping will still be an issue as suburban nere' do Wells haul stuff here for free disposal. I talked to Mr. Stark in September, he was kind enough to return my call, and admitted to me that it was a bad plan. He could not explain why he voted for it, though. The council got out negotiated by a bunch of garbage men and now don't have the courage to fix a badly flawed ordinance. Elections coming up soon, time to get some fiscally responsible representatives elected to replace the clown show currently in office.

11/12/2018
10:52 PM

Scott Stern

Against

Sorry to throw ex council man Russ Stark under the bus along with the other council members, but I and thousand of city residents are exceedingly **** off. This issue is not going away, I'm willing to throw in my hard earned cash for lawsuit to get this resolved so it's equitable to all citizens. In my conversation with Russ I found him intelligent and kind, the type of person that can be a good representative of the people, as I'm sure others on the council are. That being said; the new garbage plan should have these elements. Sharing of containers, 2-4 unit buildings choose size and # of bins, city admin fee per building (not address), and eliminate the no opt out clause. Thanks

RES
18-
1922

11/12/2018
11:53 PM

Pat

For

Thank you for not caving in to all this "we the people" and "we have RIGHTS" ****. Most people are basically clueless and really do need

+3 -6
3

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 12:23 AM	JC	Against	<p>those with vision to direct them. I commend you for using the power that has been granted you to plow through the ignorance and the ignorant. Adolf Hitler had his issues BUT he was the TIME magazine person of the year in 1938 precisely because he knew how to get things done in the best interests of Germany and knew how to keep his power from being challenged. I wish every level of government knew how to use their power to protect people from themselves like our Saint Paul city council. You guys have finally seen the Big Picture.</p> <p>The November 14, 2018's agenda item #17 for discussion regarding Resolution 18-1922 purports to find the petition for referendum "preempted" by state law. The preemption argument was explicitly rejected by the Minnesota Supreme Court in June 2018, when it ruled on the issue in Jennissen v City of Bloomington.</p> <p>The mandatory, inflexible nature of the new trash ordinance makes it a flawed, amateur piece of legislation. It has no provisions for normal contingencies such as one family living in both sides of a duplex, sharing of trash cans, citizens with minimal trash collection needs, etc. There is a mechanism for 'snowbird' trash vacations, but the haulers are intent on making it difficult. Moreover, the prices of the minimal collection options are very high and the city's unwillingness to advocate for better terms, missed contingencies and unusual cases is misdirected: elected officials should be looking out for us citizens, not the trash haulers. Overarching question:</p>	+1
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 12:50 AM	Dan Z.	Against	<p>The mandatory, inflexible nature of the new trash ordinance makes it a flawed, amateur piece of legislation. It has no provisions for normal contingencies such as one family living in both sides of a duplex, sharing of trash cans, citizens with minimal trash collection needs, etc. There is a mechanism for 'snowbird' trash vacations, but the haulers are intent on making it difficult. Moreover, the prices of the minimal collection options are very high and the city's unwillingness to advocate for better terms, missed contingencies and unusual cases is misdirected: elected officials should be looking out for us citizens, not the trash haulers. Overarching question:</p>	+4

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 1:03 AM	Vito Sauro		Against	<p>how is it that despite giving the haulers a monopoly, the prices and rules so favor the haulers? Finally, to suggest that a lawfully executed petition to reconsider the measure has no standing puts our city council members in yet an ever worse light.</p> <p>I can see the benefits to coordinated collection. While this could be great for the city as a whole, there needs to be a zero waste option. I produce no waste, and cannot afford to pay for a service I do not use. I need to be able to opt-out or receive a subsidy from the city that covers the full cost of the service.</p>	+6 1
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 1:06 AM	Anita		Against	<p>I can see some positive aspects to this program since it seems more efficient, and we can have large items removed several times a year, but the fact that you don't allow sharing and want to clutter our alleys with extra carts makes me wonder - perhaps you don't have our best interests in mind! And why is this costing us more money? Shouldn't it be more cost efficient?</p>	+4
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 1:31 AM	Charles		Against	A solution looking for a problem . . .	+3
Ord 18-54	11/13/2018 1:58 AM	Eric Lein (continued)		For	<p>... And, APPROPRIATE for submission to the electorate.</p> <p>The petition needs to be found sufficient and we need to allow the people of St. Paul to decide whether the ordinance stand or not. There's a process to challenge things, it has been followed. Enough signatures were collected. The only logical step is to now let the people who live in the city and are directly affected vote to see what they really want. I believe we will find that people would like to retain the right to make</p>	+1
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 3:18 AM	Jeff		Against	<p>The petition needs to be found sufficient and we need to allow the people of St. Paul to decide whether the ordinance stand or not. There's a process to challenge things, it has been followed. Enough signatures were collected. The only logical step is to now let the people who live in the city and are directly affected vote to see what they really want. I believe we will find that people would like to retain the right to make</p>	+2

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 4:08 AM	Cathy		Against	<p>basic household decisions for their own budget and not have city Council members decide for them.</p> <p>It appears that this new trash collection system was not thoroughly researched. It was poorly planned and hastily implemented. Sometimes you just have to admit you made a mistake and start over. I think residents will remember come election time.</p>	+6
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 4:21 AM	WARD 1		Against	<p>City council members are elected to represent us, not to rule. Denying the petition to put the citywide trash program on the ballot is an affront to democracy. Even citizens who had planned to vote for the trash program, should be concerned. Blocking a democratic process is a dangerous slippery slope that St Paul should not embark on. Better to admit a mistake then to go down in St Paul history as the council that tried to block democratic processes.</p>	+2
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 4:48 AM	Fred Warneke		Against	<p>Why do the largest garbage producers get the best rate from this plan? Where is the incentive to reduce? I would be more in favor of this plan if there was even a p***ing attempt to incentivise waste reduction.</p>	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 5:28 AM	WARD 1		Against	<p>City council members are elected to represent us, not to rule. Denying the petition to put the citywide trash program on the ballot is an affront to democracy. Even citizens who had planned to vote for the trash program, should be concerned. Blocking a democratic process is a dangerous slippery slope that St Paul should not embark on. Better to admit a mistake then to go down in St Paul history as the council that tried to block democratic processes.</p>	+3

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 5:33 AM	Dr. Kristin Becker	Against	<p>I'm alarmed to hear the last few days that people have decided to throw everything in their trash now and stop recycling, donating to Goodwill and composting. I heard, "the city doesn't care, why should I?" A city program should create incentives to reduce, recycle & rot (compost)! Please look at Olympia WA's trash plan for a progressive city plan. I've also heard in effort to reduce costs, people chose smaller carts, they have increased dumping while Zero & Low wasters are still paying to have a truck idle behind their homes to pick up empty garbage cans!</p> <p>My greatest concern is for low income residents who desperately need help paying for their trash bill. Will the city council work to provide a subsidy for these folks, whether they are zero wasters or not? I'm not personally up in arms about the organized trash collection, but I do understand several community members are negatively impacted, which is also valid. I would love to see some community forums provided by some of these zero wasters to educate the m***es on how to reduce, reuse, recycle more effectively going forward whereby lowering our trash costs and helping to preserve mother earth.</p>	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 6:05 AM	Karen J Larson		<p>Your teammate in the work ahead. Let's move forward, together - and build a Saint Paul that works - for all of us. Mayor Melvin Carter.</p>	+4
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 6:58 AM	Mayor Carter		<p>Mayor--Glad to see that you have taken an interest. Now is your chance to show true, independent leadership and either repeal Ord 18-39 or put it to a vote by the citizens of St. Paul.</p>	+3 -3 1
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 1:20 PM		Against		+3

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 4:07 PM	Alisa Lein	Against	<p>Many thousands of trash customers in St. Paul have not received equitable treatment by their elected representatives and are not likely to walk away if told that their "subject matter is not appropriate to submit to the electorate". Please honor the charter and put the new trash program to a vote. 5 years is too long to wait. 90 days is too long to wait and hope the haulers maybe come to the table to negotiate. If waiting a year for a public vote is too long, then this is your golden ticket, repeal Ord 18-39 and let's have real conversations across the entire city (not just Mac-Groveland) and figure out a successful organized trash program with flexible and reasonable contract terms.</p>	+7
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 5:55 PM	Brenna Gray	Against	<p>True democracy is government by the people exercised through elected representatives and it is clear that in order for democracy to be upheld in this instance either a repeal of Ord 18-39 or putting it to a vote is what the people are calling for and should by right be granted. As a landlord please help me ensure that my rental units are not financially and environmentally wasteful. I also feel responsible to speak on behalf of my residents to ensure that the city is being responsible with their utilities to do their part to keep rents from unnecessarily rising. Also note that I am not opposed to responsible city organized trash collection.</p>	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 6:18 PM	Eli Gray	Against	<p>This system is financially bad for basically all citizens of St Paul, but especially those who rent from or to people and for people who generate so little garbage that they don't need separate service. It is making the city</p>	+2 -1

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 6:46 PM			<p>more financially prohibitive to live in.</p> <p>Organized Trash Collection in Saint Paul: Report on Community Input and Draft GOALS and OBJECTIVES; Saint Paul Public Works; June 1, 2016. Hauler Comment •"Most of the haulers agree that there can be increased efficiency for them in having an organized route(s) within the city. Several of them have made efforts to consolidate their business within certain neighborhoods in the city to reduce costs." • OUTCOMES, November 2018: Hauler Efficiency, up; Hauler Costs, down; City-wide Prices, UP; Prices for Select Customers, WAY WAY UP. City/Hauler message: Let's move on – sharing is sooo p***é.</p>	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 7:03 PM	Therese C.	Against	<p>I am so frustrated and tired of having the City of St. Paul exhibit the power and the ability to spend my money before I can!!! I voiced my objections as MANY others did in regards to the trash removal system but obviously we never seem to get heard!!</p> <p>There seems little dispute that this contract is detrimental to St Paulites. Therefore, I urge councilmembers to vote no on resolution 18-1922 authorizing the city to ignore the valid citizen petition seeking a referendum on Ord. 18-39 regarding city centrally controlled trash hauling services. Instead, create an alternative resolution to accept this petition and thereby put this entire matter up to a citywide vote. Despite a Minnesota Supreme Court ruling to the contrary (Jennissen, et al. v. City of Bloomington, A17-0221), the city</p>	+1
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 7:42 PM	Mark Schroepfer	Against	<p>There seems little dispute that this contract is detrimental to St Paulites. Therefore, I urge councilmembers to vote no on resolution 18-1922 authorizing the city to ignore the valid citizen petition seeking a referendum on Ord. 18-39 regarding city centrally controlled trash hauling services. Instead, create an alternative resolution to accept this petition and thereby put this entire matter up to a citywide vote. Despite a Minnesota Supreme Court ruling to the contrary (Jennissen, et al. v. City of Bloomington, A17-0221), the city</p>	+2

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 8:25 PM	Caitlin Stollenwerk	Against	<p>***erts the voters have no direct say in this matter. By extension, neither has the city council, the elected representatives of the citizens of St. Paul. By adopting resolution 18-1922, this city council is relinquishing its oversight powers. A yes vote supports bureaucratic autocracy rather than good governance. Why get mired in a court battle now? Let's see if the city can persuade its voters of the merits of its trash contract.</p> <p>I can imagine that trying to serve a whole city of constituents must be difficult, but your citizens have done everything within their legal power to force you to hear them on this issue. It is exhausting to live in a city where elected officials consistently act as though they know better than the citizens themselves. You have an incredible opportunity to show St. Paul that our voices matter, and to bring this invasive, unasked-for, defective trash-hauling initiative before the people themselves. Hiding in your ivory towers to avoid a vote on such an awful contract is a mistake, and it is time that the City owns up to the utterly inadequate process that has once again silenced the people of St. Paul.</p>	+4
RES 18- 1922	11/13/2018 10:47 PM	James Heaney		<p>I grew up in Saint Paul and lived there for a quarter-century before I became fed up with the city's hideous maladministration, its indifference (bordering on hostility) toward citizen petitioners, and grossly deficient services, all in exchange for... much much higher taxes than in neighboring municipalities? How's that work? Now I live in a much better place. (Our streets are plowed *every time* it snows heavily!) I</p>	+2

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 3:03 AM	Dave B	Against	<p>miss my hometown, but couldn't be happier with where I am now. Getting to choose my own (cheap) trash hauler feels like living in a free country again. (Since I'm no longer a Saint Paul resident, I've marked myself Neutral on this absurd resolution.) Those of you upset with the city's decision to ignore its voters, its charter, and (apparently) Jennissen v. Bloomington... why not vote with your feet and get out of there? West St. Paul, South St. Paul, North St. Paul, and Falcon Heights are all within spitting distance, and are largely run by people who don't hate you.</p> <p>The city's trash program is deeply flawed, yet the city council claims they must press on or risk breaching the trash cartel's contract. That contract should never have been written without a contingency clause permitting our city council to resolve issues as they arise or void the contract, without fear of breach. Lacking such an escape mechanism, the trash cartel now controls our city council. Expect no mercy from the cartel, just continued absurdity. Please repeal Ordinance 18-39 or place this issue on the next ballot and let the vote of our citizens speak!</p>	+1
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 7:33 AM	Democracy	Against	<p>Time to step up to the plate, Mayor Carter. Don't let the city council stomp over democracy. You said this is OUR city and we've shown it through our petition. Stand behind your words please and support us!</p>	+3
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 12:06 PM	Eric Lein (yet again)	Against	<p>The city/hauler contract does have an escape clause. Contract Sec. 13.6 - FORCE MAJEURE. "The City...shall not be held responsible for performance if its performance is</p>	+2

File #	Date	Name	District Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 2:44 PM	Jessica Faulken		<p>prevented by acts or events beyond the party's reasonable control, including, but not limited to: ...legislative, judicial, or executive acts..." It seems to me that at least two Force Majeure Events have occurred: (1) MN Supreme Court ruling Jennisson v Bloomington [June 2018]; and (2) Citizens' legally sufficient petition for a referendum on Ord 18-39 [October/November 2018]. Maybe there is a simple answer. Avoid court, and financial liability, by setting a date for the referendum on Ord 18-39. Or, go ahead (as with Ord 18-40) and "ask" the City Attorney to draft an ordinance to repeal Ord 18-39. Voila! Happy customers. Balanced budget. Mendable fences.</p> <p>I am FOR the city-wide trash haul. Before it went into effect my alley had a minimum of 7 different trash haulers that would drive down on a weekly basis. The other side of my street does not have an alley, they have driveway. So not only did we have several trucks driving down the alley but also down the street. I'm very happy with the reduction of traffic. I also am pleased with the pricing. I think many people have been frustrated because perhaps they were locked into a price and did not see a price increase in years. Our price is very close to what we were paying before.</p> <p>We the people have spoke. Have enough signatures for a referendum it needs to be honored. The current plan is flawed at best. People have the right to share a can. We have a right to negotiate prices. The council members don't have the right to ignore our voices.913393</p>	
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 2:48 PM		Against		+1

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 2:51 PM	Theresa Basting		Against	Remember the election next year is coming up. Do the right thing save face Centralized, organized trash collection is the mark of a sustainable city. Honoring legal contracts is the basis of a functioning society. If this contract is rescinded, what's to prevent ALL city contracts from being questioned? Surely there is a way out of this dilemma that is responsive to the legitimate concerns of those who want a referendum. Can't the contract be amended in a year or two?	+1
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 4:37 PM	Patricia Ohmans			DO OUR LEADERS CARE MORE ABOUT MONEY THAN ABOUT HOW THE PEOPLE THEY (supposedly) REPRESENT ARE TREATED? I keep hearing,	
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 4:42 PM	Eric		Against	"minimize the city's liability" when we are saying, "my elderly neighbor needs to borrow money for medicine, how do they pay for trash?" Wait 5 years? Someone cannot skip their medication for 5 years. A win-win for the city AND the citizens?. This petition becomes the "Way out" rather than the obstacle for the city council. On page.48, 13.6 of the contract, there is a Force Majeure clause which states that parties..."shall not be held responsible for performance its performance is prevented by acts or events beyond the party's reasonable control, including"...legislative, judicial or executive acts." The Force Majeure, or unforeseen circumstance, in this case is the successful citizens' petition to place the contract on the ballot as a referendum. Clearly, this was unforeseen by the city council when they signed the contract and	+1
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 4:54 PM	Kristin Becker		Against		

File #	Date	Name	District	Opinion	Comment	Action
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 5:43 PM	Democracy		Against	<p>would be a sound legal reason to halt the contract until its put to a vote by citizens. This is when the haulers would be most motivated to renegotiate a good contract that would allow for cartsharing and opt out options for Zerowasters as well as truly reasonable rates with incentives to reduce trash, instead of discounts for the largest wasters.</p> <p>To answer Patricia's concerns about contracts: its essential that the city gathers information carefully and thoroughly from citizens before signing a contract. A well written contract would not attract 6000 signatures so quickly & easily. It is VERY dangerous to give so much power to a governing force without a pathway to balance that power by citizens. We would hope that we always elect politicians who care, but if we remove our right to hold them accountable to us, we would lose avenues to prevent corrupt politicians from choosing to sign contracts that benefit themselves. Both our city's past and our country's present have clear examples of this.</p> <p>One way to develop a great contract is to create a referendum before signing a contract that will so deeply affect so many of us. There are cities that commonly have 5-10 referendums on a ballot and are able to democratically make even greater improvements than St Paul has managed.</p>	
RES 18- 1922	11/14/2018 5:44 PM	Democracy		Against	<p>One way to develop a great contract is to create a referendum before signing a contract that will so deeply affect so many of us. There are cities that commonly have 5-10 referendums on a ballot and are able to democratically make even greater improvements than St Paul has managed.</p>	