

## Mai Vang

---

**From:** Ryan Quincy <ryanquincy@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 13, 2023 9:59 AM  
**To:** \*CI-StPaul\_LegislativeHearings  
**Cc:** Emily Kurtz  
**Subject:** Re: Written Objection to Excessive Use Assessment  
**Attachments:** image001.png

Hi Mai,

Sure thing! Our address is  
1549 Dale St N  
St Paul, MN 55117

Best,  
-Ryan

On Wed, Sep 13, 2023 at 7:34 AM \*CI-StPaul\_LegislativeHearings <[LegislativeHearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us](mailto:LegislativeHearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us)> wrote:

Hello Mr. Quincy,

Please provide a property address so I can put a file together for the hearing.

*Mai Vang*

(She, her)

*Legislative Hearing Coordinator* | Legislative Hearings/City Council

M: (651) 266-8585 ; D: (651) 266-8563

310 City Hall, 15 W. Kellogg Blvd, St Paul, MN 55102



---

**From:** Ryan Quincy <[ryanquincy@gmail.com](mailto:ryanquincy@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 12, 2023 9:59 PM  
**To:** \*CI-StPaul\_LegislativeHearings <[LegislativeHearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us](mailto:LegislativeHearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us)>  
**Cc:** Emily Kurtz <[kurtz217@umn.edu](mailto:kurtz217@umn.edu)>  
**Subject:** Written Objection to Excessive Use Assessment

Dear Legislative Hearings Mailbox,

I'm writing to formally object to the excessive use fine directed at my household earlier this year.

For context, we were served a notice that our sidewalk was in violation of Chapter 113 of the Legislative Code in January this year. A month later, we received another piece of mail charging us \$124 under Section 32.24 for Excessive consumption of city services.

My first objection is one of compassion. January started out with a significant winter storm that set daily snowfall records, and the city and its citizens both had trouble getting roads and walkways back in working order afterwards. I find the fact that the city wasted resources sending inspectors out to fine its residents for not clearing their sidewalks fast enough (while taking over a month to get our side roads into acceptable shape) callous and uncaring.

My second objection is one of evidence. Upon receiving the initial notice, I spent my next two evenings clearing my sidewalk. This was as fast as I could reasonably do this, since it took 4-6 hours overall and I work full time. I then spent the rest of the winter being very careful to clear the sidewalk immediately after any snowfall to stay in compliance with Chapter 113. As such, I was shocked to receive the Excessive use fine in the mail. What evidence does the city have that I failed a subsequent assessment?

My final objection is one of procedure. Chapter 113 is focused on Snow and Ice on Sidewalks, and lays out a very specific process by which violators will be notified and penalized. Specifically, the city will first (113.04) serve notice if a property is in violation of Chapter 113, then (131.07) re-assess the property, and if the issue hasn't been abated then the city will cause the issue to be abated and charge the cost of abatement to the owner. The city did not clear my pathway, so it seems like we must have passed the re-assessment. It is unclear why Section 32.24 (which we were fined under) was even relevant.

Overall, this whole thing stinks of the city trying to profit over the collective hardship of this winter's storms. We were tolerant of how long it took you to get the roads working again, so I ask you not to burn this goodwill by fining me and my neighbors.

Thanks

-Ryan Quincy