

Dear St. Paul City Council Members,

First off, I am pretty sure this email will fall on deaf ears, but hear goes.

I have received your notice of a possible 107% increase, from \$28.00 To \$58.00, in my burglar alarm fees. Unfortunately, I am unable to attend your hearing. I am not a department store, bank, or office building. I am a home owner. I have had my home protected with an alarm system since 2004 at a personal cost of hundreds of dollars per year. ADT was my original vender and now Vivint. I am very thankful to our courageous police force for the difficult and thankless job that they do. However, I believe that I am doing the police a favor and you charge me a fee for it, which is bad enough, and now you want to double it. My alarm system, noted by the protected by sign in my front yard, is a deterrent to those who would break into my house. This certainly saves the city many police hours that they would have spent investigating the prevented burglaries. Besides all this, I have never in all these years had the police respond to a false alarm. When there is a question Vivint calls me first.

Even though I have never had a false alarm, logic tells me that \$400.00 per false alarm is quite high. Are they responding to Brainerd? I would be curious as to the bookkeeping connected to these numbers. I understand the necessity for nuisance penalties, but why should I be held accountable for those less responsible?

I have lived in and paid taxes to the city of St. Paul for 47 years. I am disturbed that our city, for what ever the reason, has found it necessary to turn into a government dependent on various incidental high fees to exist. You have a sanitary sewer fee, a storm sewer fee, a water fee, street maintenance fee as well as many others and now a police protection fee. I am also pretty sure a trash pickup fee is coming soon. The city can not do anything without some kind of fee. What in the hell do I pay taxes for? Are not my taxes for police protection as well as these other things. Is this going to evolve into a fee for calling the police. If I call the police and they find nothing are they going to charge me a fee. This is getting ridiculous.

I am a senior citizen on a fixed income and you people in government are feeing and taxing me to death. Let's get real and quit looking for bogus revenue streams.

If you need a revenue stream why not consider a bicycle fee since they are presently the beneficiary of significant tax money in the form of numerous bike trails, tunnels, specially constructed bike lanes and street access on par with automobiles and it doesn't cost them a dime.

Kenneth Kastner
690 Ohio St.
St Paul, MN 55107

From: Lagos, Heidi (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 12:00 PM
To: Moore, Shari (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Alarm permit changes

From: David Bohlander [<mailto:david.bohlander@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 11:59 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward6
Subject: Alarm permit changes

Councilmember Bostrom,

My name is David Bohlander, and I've been your constituent for the past six years in the Phalen Heights area of your ward.

I won't be able to attend tonight's hearing on alarm permit changes because I have to work, but I wanted to let you know my thought on the proposed changes.

I think the plan to increase the fees for repeat false alarms is reasonable. I think even slightly higher fees than proposed or a fee starting with the second false alarm in a year would be reasonable. I have an alarm in my home, and we did have problems with false alarms early on when it was installed. The glass break sensor was too sensitive and would go off based on large trucks outside or a cat knocking a radio off the table. I was able to work with my alarm company to reduce that sensor's sensitivity, and we haven't had a false alarm in years.

Responsible alarm owners should have a similar experience. There's no good reason for regular false alarms. Go ahead and charge these people more.

The proposed increase for an alarm permit, however, is unreasonable. \$58 is more than double the current fee and will be especially burdensome to residents in lower-income areas of St. Paul. Areas where alarms are often needed more. An increase to \$35 would seem more reasonable and would still be a significant increase at 25 percent more than the current fee.

In short: If the problem is a few permit-holders with multiple false alarms, then increase the fees for false alarms. Those of us with alarms that function correctly won't cost the city more money in the future than we're costing the city today. An alarm permit fee increase of more than 100 percent is unreasonable and unnecessary.

Thanks for listening.

-David Bohlander

It would seem fitting to charge the users for the costs by responders to all false alarms and appropriately pay for the increases incurred rather than to punish all alarm users with increased license fees. Please do not punish the innocent along with the guilty.

Dear Councilmember Noecker et al:

I appreciate the work that St. Paul police staff are doing on my behalf, as a St. Paul homeowner and alarm permit holder. I also agree that false alarms are an unfair taxpayer expense.

However, rather than increasing the annual alarm permit fee from \$28 to \$58/year:

- I believe a lower permit fee increase would be more fair for those of us who do not incur these costly false alarms.
 - Perhaps a fee increase from \$28 to \$40-45 per year?
- Then, the new fees for false alarms should be raised accordingly to cover the balance of the needed revenue.

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Laurie Mech
1xx College Avenue West
St. Paul, MN 55102

Concern regarding Alarms – Items No. 48 and 49 7/19 Council Agenda

This Foster Care Provider has to work and cannot attend the public hearing.

His concern is that he has 3 down syndrome clients as well as 1 with special needs

Who has early dementia. If this person comes in with the alarm in place he may make mistakes and add costs to their security system.

Dennis Morgan

5xx Michigan St. – Ward 5

Dear Saint Paul city council members,

Reference attached PDF letter to Alarm Permit Holder Dated June 23, 2017

I understand you are holding a hearing today at 1730 hrs regarding the proposed increase the fee amount for alarms and because I cannot attend I am emailing you with my comments.

1. The amount / average cost for false alarms \$2,618,476 listed in the above referenced letter is completely arbitrary and neither defines how it is accounted for nor separates businesses from private.
2. The alarm permit fee is double, even for those with no false alarms.
3. The Chief of police called the current gun shot related homicide crime in st. Paul a health crisis, this June. That said, are these increases punishing and perhaps preventing those tax payers that want alternative to having and using firearms rather than alarms.

Without going into further detail, because I am sure your time is limited, and with the above in mind, I ask that you please understand that I will not vote for anyone that is agreement with proposing my alarm fee is increased. In fact, I will make it my mission to endorse the appropriate opponent of such member who votes for increasing these alarm fees and I will do such with all my resources.

Thank you for you time.

Sincerely,
Joseph M. Sisson



CITY OF SAINT PAUL
Christopher B. Coleman, Mayor

375 Jackson Street, Suite 220
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101-1806

Telephone: 651-266-8989
Facsimile: 651-266-9124
Web: www.stpaul.gov/dsj

June 23, 2017

NOTICE:

Alarm Permit Holder,

The Saint Paul City Council will be holding a public hearing on July 19, 2017 for proposed amendments to Saint Paul City Ordinance Section 310.18 - *License fee schedule* and Section 329.02 - *Use of alarm systems*.

Over the last three years, on average, 5,000 of the alarm calls police responded to were false alarms. The first two false alarms are issued a warning. False alarm fees are imposed starting with the third false alarm. The current revenue for these fees was \$261,915 and the annual average cost to tax payers for false alarms is \$2,618,476. The proposed increase of the permit and false alarm fees is still below the funding needed to recover cost, however, the increase is seen as a means to offset costs to taxpayers and provide incentive for alarm holders to maintain their systems and use them properly.

The full proposed ordinance amendment language accompanies this letter.

The public hearings will be at 5:30pm in the Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, St. Paul City Hall (15 West Kellogg Boulevard). This is your opportunity to share your comments with the City Council before their consideration of these proposed ordinance amendments.

If you are unable to attend, or if you have any objections or questions regarding the proposed ordinance amendments, you can provide comments to: council@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Or mail to: Offices of the Saint Paul City Council
310 City Hall
15 Kellogg Boulevard West
Saint Paul, MN 55102

If you have questions, please call Meghan Quinn at 651-266-5545.

An Equal Opportunity Employer

I would just like to express my rights as a homeowner in the City of Saint Paul with an alarm system and ask: Why does everyone need to be penalized when we are not the ones who constantly have false alarms? My wife and I have lived in the City of Saint Paul for over 10 years with an alarm system, and the only time we had the police come out to our home for a false alarm, was over 9 years ago, the very first year we lived in our home.

To reiterate, in over 10 years, we have only had the Saint Paul Police come to our home twice for a false alarm. And a \$30 hike for an alarm permit for people who are on a budget, and follow the rules, as put out by the Police, is a bit steep.

Good Afternoon,

I would like to have the opportunity to address the possible increase in the alarm permit increase for the residents of St. Paul. I understand the public meeting was held yesterday but my husband and I were unable to attend. Please accept this email as our voice in this matter.

We, both Paul and Carey Wagner address of 1023 3rd St E, 55106 disagree with the increase. We believe the burden of false alarm charges should weigh heavily on those tying up the police officers time, efforts and resources.

We believe if the permit license fee increases this will cause many to discontinue their alarm services. Raising the fees to over double is an unacceptable suggestion. Rather than encouraging citizens to have alarm systems which detour criminals, this plan will discourage citizens.

We urge the City to come up with an alternative plan. This increase is unacceptable.

Thank you,
Carey and Paul Wagner

TO: Police Chief Axtell
Copy: Mayor and Council
Copy: Chamber of Commerce
SUBJECT: Modernizing Police Response To Private Alarm Systems

Avoid the temptation to simply copy the outdated false alarm legislation of neighbor cities. Instead research, update and modernize.

This note is sent as a professional courtesy to share nationwide research data.

What we know: ... false alarms drain public resources and dilute public safety ... most current false alarm legislative does not work following decades of experience... current "Model Ordinances" promoted by the alarm industry are self-serving Trojan Horses that carry costly disruption.... private security, when properly integrated, offers an important contribution to public safety.

The solution for unnecessary police response is quite simple.... Apply the nationally recognized 9.1.1 protocol for prioritizing calls from the public (including alarm monitoring firms).

EXCERPT "...Law enforcement response will occur, when requested by alarm system monitoring firms, after the alarm system alert has been confirmed by audio witness or visual witness to save a life, to report a fire, or to stop a crime..."

See attached three-page document, titled "***Talk Points to Modernize Interaction with Private Property Alarms***". It shares research for crafting local policy or ordinance that can halt unnecessary police response. Note the disclaimers.

More documentation and support available without cost of obligation....

Source: Lee Jones; Support Services Group

Mr. Mel Brown from 154 Lexington would like his opposition to the excessive doubling of alarm permit fees noted. There are other ways to raise revenue than charging seniors, etc.