

From: astever@comcast.net [mailto:astever@comcast.net]

Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 12:28 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: License Fee, Use of Alarm Systems

Dear council members,

I today received your notice of proposed increase for alarm system license fees, and have to say I find it ridiculous in the extreme. This fee is DOUBLING!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Your reasoning for this MASSIVE increase is that some users trigger false alarms, but rather than charging those users directly, you are instead demanding that responsible users pay extortionate amounts in fees "as an incentive for alarm holders to maintain their systems and use them properly".

What is the benefit for maintaining my system and using it properly if I am charged the same amount whether I do or not? I have not had a single false alarm at my residence in well over 5 years.

This fee increase is absolutely ludicrous. If users are irresponsible, then CHARGE **THEM** MORE.

If this increase goes through I will do everything in my power to make sure that every single member of the council is voted out of office.

With this ridiculous notice, combined with your idiotic plan to take over garbage hauling contracts, you have all proven yourselves singularly unfit for office.

Seriously, the lack of leadership is going to drive working people out of this city. You are right on track for turning a once lovely and prosperous city into Detroit.

From: Paul Wulterkens [mailto:gerrit21@comcast.net]

Sent: Friday, July 7, 2017 7:31 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Alarm Fees

We should consider separate fees for residences and businesses. According to http://www.protectamerica.com/home-security-blog/faqs/alarm-registration-and-false-alarm-fees-in-different-cities_11121,

"In Austin, Texas, where our headquarters is located, a residential permit costs \$30, and a business permit costs \$50.

In Dallas, Texas, the price is almost double that of Austin. A residence costs \$50 dollars, and a business costs \$100.

In San Antonio, the fee for home is \$40, but \$30 for those aged 65 and above, and \$100 for businesses.

In Omaha, Nebraska, a home is \$25, while a business costs \$50.

In Los Angeles, California, a permit fee costs 35\$ for both home and businesses, and \$30 for renewals.”

I like the renewal permit costing less and a lower fee for seniors as well.

Paul Wulterkens
413 Totem Road
St. Paul, MN 55119
651-739-8190

From: John Viewu [mailto:kcrut2003@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, July 7, 2017 11:11 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Saint Paul City Ordinance Section 310.18 - License fee schedule and Section 329.02 - Use of alarm systems

ATTN: Offices of the Saint Paul City Council

I am writing to express my concern as an alarm permit holder regarding the recent proposed amendments to double the fee schedule and permit fee.

It should come to no surprise that I find these increases unnecessary and irresponsible. As a sixth year home owner in Saint Paul, it seems every year a new assessment comes along. It is unfair for hard working families to continue to pay more than their fair share when I get no increased benefits from paying these increases.

Honestly, what will these increases be used for? Will I actually benefit from them? How will the revenue be actually used to help my community and my children?

Please think twice before doing this, since we could decide to stop paying the permit and then you would have no revenue at all.

BR,

John Vu
1251 5th St E
Saint Paul, MN 55106
763-234-1255

From: Andrew Hansen [mailto:andrewzhansen@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, July 8, 2017 10:20 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Alarm Permit Amendment

Dear Saint Paul City Council,

I received the notice regarding the proposed changes to the alarm ordinance. I'm unable to attend the public hearing and wanted to pass along my feedback via email.

The proposed change more than **doubles** the annual permit cost for holders. I understand that there's a need for additional revenue to offset false alarm expenses, but this substantially puts the burden of cost on those *not generating the expense of false alarms*.

I would propose instead more substantial increases of fees for false alarms (perhaps even very significant fee increases after the second false alarm), and doing away with one or more of the false alarm warnings, moving immediately to false alarm fees. This would more highly incentivize avoiding false alarms, which is the source of the expense. Currently the proposed amendment, with its steep annual fee increases, incentivizes people **not** to have alarm systems or not to register their alarm systems with the city. It seems to me that it's in everyone's best interest for many residents to have registered alarm systems (thereby deterring burglary) but for users of those systems to be conscientious in avoiding the false alarms that are generating unnecessary expenses.

I hope the council will reconsider how they are distributing the expense of unnecessary false alarms, and not penalize those who are registering and using their alarm systems responsibly.

Sincerely,
Andrew Hansen, Resident

From: Sarah Kline-Stensvold [mailto:sklinsten@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, July 8, 2017 10:51 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Ordinance Section 310.18 & 329.02; License fee schedule and Use of alarm systems

I have no objection to the proposed changes to Sections 310.18 and 329.02 of Saint Paul City Ordinances. I appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed changes.

Sarah Kline-Stensvold

From: Michael Monahan [mailto:mike.monahan@live.com]

Sent: Saturday, July 8, 2017 11:23 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Amendments to City Ordinance 310.18

I cannot attend the hearing on this but want to add a few comments on the proposed change.

- I am not sure how the cost calculation was done, since the officers are salaried. While false alarms are clearly not a productive use of their time, it's also not clear what alternative work it was assumed they were doing to offset the reported "cost" of the alarms.
- Also, no breakdown was shown between commercial and residential false alarms.
- While I understand the work false alarms create, the reason for having alarms in the first place remains the increasing risk of theft and other crime in our neighborhoods (see below; certain databases show crime in St. Paul as worse than Minneapolis and the overall nation). Alarms

may not be 100% reliable, but they serve as a deterrent to crime and an alternate way of notifying the police when one may be occurring.

- Police responses to alarms, in our experience, has been slow. We have seen responses of 30 to 60 minutes in the past, so the service level on alarms is not high.
- Net, I think the issue of alarms is part of the cost of having a supplemental solutions to deter crime in our city, one which the alarm system hardware and annual monitoring costs borne by the homeowner to maintain safety in our community. Don't further add to the cost of living in St. Paul.

Michael Monahan
1 Shelby Place
St. Paul, MN 55116

<http://www.homefacts.com/crime/Minnesota/Ramsey-County/St.-Paul.html>


Crime Reports - St. Paul, Ramsey County, MN

www.homefacts.com

Crime Statistics For St. Paul, MN. Research historical aggregate crime statistics in two categories; violent crimes and property related crimes.

<http://www.homefacts.com/crime/Minnesota/Ramsey-County/St.-Paul.html>

Crime Scores Breakdown for St. Paul, MN



The graph is based on a score of 100%. Crime scores above 100% indicate higher rates for that offense. Crime scores below 100% indicate lower rates for that offense.

Risk Levels

Low Risk

Moderate Risk

High Risk

Crime Comparison for St. Paul, MN per 100,000 people

CRIMES	3,985 ST. PAUL	2,465 MINNESOTA TOTAL	2,860 NATIONAL TOTAL
Violent Crime	703	243	373
Murder	5	2	5
Forcible Rape	0	31	28
Robbery	237	69	102
Aggravated Assault	393	129	238
Property Crime	3,282	2,222	2,487
Burglary	707	352	491
Larceny Theft	1,994	1,725	1,775
Motor Vehicle Theft	581	145	220

From: Dan McIntyre [mailto:dkmcintyre1@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 8, 2017 2:14 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council; #CI-StPaul_Ward7
Subject: Alarm Ordinance

Hello,

I don't know if I will be able to attend the hearing so I wanted to send some comments. We have had a monitored alarm at our home for more than 30 years and it has interrupted two break-ins. I think we have had maybe 2 false alarms over that period that required police response, caused when pets gained access to a room where there was a motion sensor.

My concern about the proposed changes is that raising the permit fee substantially may reduce the number of homes with alarm systems. I fully support the increase in fees for false alarms and would favor allowing only one false alarm before penalties kick in. If there are 5,000 false alarms, then there is likely at most 1,666 false calls that pay a penalty (assuming not many homes reach high numbers of false alarms). At the current increase to \$50, this would only generate about \$83,000 in revenue. This might go higher if some of the homes have false alarms exceeding 3 per year but is more likely to go lower because of a large number of homes with fewer than 3 false alarms per year. The proposed increase in fees will generate an additional \$300,000, or less if fewer people register alarms.

A smaller increase in the permit fee to keep up with inflation would be reasonable. People who have working alarms with no false calls, do not add to the cost to taxpayers (other than registering the permits). In fact, preventing robberies likely reduces the burden for our police by deterring crime. The problem is false alarms requiring a police response so I think the changes should more strongly focus on that problem (should the permit fee really be more expensive than having three false alarms that cost the taxpayers). The proposed increases would still cover only about 25% of the reported cost for false alarms.

Thank you for the work that you do,

Dan McIntyre
65 B St
Ward 7
651-778-8031

From: Steve Simmer [mailto:stsimmer@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 8, 2017 9:13 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Alarm Permit Ordinance

Hello:

This is to comment on the proposed Alarm System ordinance amendments.

According to the letter I received from the City, the cost of responding to an average of 5000 false alarms annually averages \$2,618,476 annually. This works out to about \$524 per false alarm. Yet, the ordinance proposes to increase the annual permit license fee from \$28 to \$58 for every permit holder, most of who never have a false alarm. Meanwhile, you propose to charge anywhere from \$0 to \$300 for false alarms! This is an unfair and woefully inadequate solution to the problem.

I suggest that the permit fee should not be increased at all. It seems that only a few permit holders are responsible for the majority of false alarms. The burden of false alarm costs should fall on those whose systems repeatedly fail, rather than on those who rarely, if ever, generate false alarms.

I doubt very much that it even costs the city \$28 per permit to process Alarm Permits and annual renewals. I understand the desire to recover more of the costs for responding to false alarms. However, My sense of fairness says the burden should fall upon those who generate the workload and associated costs.

As a homeowner permit holder, I object to paying more in order to cover the costs of false alarms for others.

Steve Simmer
1265 Jefferson Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55105

stsimmer@hotmail.com

From: kristen joseph [mailto:kristen.joseph@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 8:53 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Objection Comment - Amendment To Licence Fee Schedule (310.18)

To Whom It May Concern -

I completely object to raising the fee for alarm permits. As a long time alarm system permit user, I have never gone over my false alarms and only had a few the first couple of years of my alarm being installed (not my fault). I totally agree to raising the fees associated with going over your number of false alarms, but to raise the License Fee seems to be punishing those who get an alarm for their safety and the safety of their belongings. I have had conversations with Police Officers and they have encouraged me and my neighbors (I already have one) to install an alarm system so it seems to be supported by Law Enforcement.

Thanks and let me know if you need anything else from me.

Kristen Joseph
957 Thomas Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55104

From: Susan Foster [mailto:suzybalaam1@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 9:03 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: ALARM PERMIT HOLDER


Hi,

I have reviewed the alarm permit notice regarding the ordinance amendment.

I feel the Fee increasing by \$30 a year to \$58 is excessive.

I have had ADT for over 10 years and not had any false alarms because I am careful with how I set the alarm etc., And feel I am being charged an increase due to other homeowners not being responsible.

I think any false alarm should have a charge to the owner, that is the first second or third or any number in any year. That way it will make home owners more cautious and bring in more revenue.



Susan Foster

From: Steph Lange [mailto:lange.steph@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 9:22 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: proposed ordinance amendment for alarm permits and false alarm fees

Good morning,

This is in regard to the proposed ordinance amendment for alarm permits and false alarm fees. I am not able to attend the public hearing [on 07/19/2017](#).

I was dismayed to see such a deficit between the amount of funds acquired through alarm permit fees and false alarm fees and the amount spent on false alarms. It is really astonishing.

I am in whole hearted agreement that the false alarm fees should be increased as much, if not more than, as what is noted in the proposed amendment. Responding to false alarms is a very poor use of taxpayer money.

However, I staunchly oppose the drastic increase to the alarm permit fee. An increase of more than 50% seems extreme. Why should the responsible homeowner that has never had a false alarm (of which I am one) be penalized so severely? The people who have had false alarms should pay for the false alarms. Not the people that do not have them.

I would strongly recommend that the alarm permit fee not be increased. I would also suggest that people only be given one warning, this would increase the amount of funds retrieved from false alarms.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns,
Stephanie Lange
ST. PAUL W-7 P-09 1510

From: NANCY NORDEEN [mailto:nordeennancy@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 9, 2017 6:26 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Comments regarding alarm permit fees

July 8, 2017

Re: Response to Saint Paul City Council regarding the council's proposed increase in fees for alarm permits and false alarm fee schedule.

In an effort to provide incentive for alarm holders to prevent or cut down on the number of false alarms police respond to increasing the false alarm fee schedule seems reasonable to me and my husband. However, increasing the alarm permit fee by 107% (\$28.00 to \$58.00) is not reasonable or fair to law abiding/tax paying citizens who have paid for a police response to crime. This effort by the city council to penalize citizens who actually applied for and purchased an alarm permit is unjust to those of us who obey the law; especially when you allow protestors to shut down the freeway unlawfully and march without a permit or bond.

These protests and shutdowns cost the city taxpayers far more than false alarm responses. None of these people were held to account, fined, charged, or brought to justice. How much did the riots in July of 2016 cost the city taxpayers when 94 was shut down and our police attacked by rioters, some even hospitalized.

My husband and I moved here in 1999. We felt safe and supported by our Mayor and city council. We no longer feel safe or supported by our mayor and city council. For this reason we installed an alarm system. Taxes are out of control, a once well managed city no longer is, crime continues to increase, businesses continue to move to the suburbs, the schools are failing, and we can't even walk down Grand Avenue without being panhandled. The city council has more pressing problems to address than the cost of false alarm responses.

Regards,

Nancy and Tom Nordeen

Hague Ave., St Paul

From: alfredhannemann@comcast.net [mailto:alfredhannemann@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 9, 2017 5:56 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Alarm Permit Fee Increase

I agree that there is a need to retrieve costs for police responding to false alarms. However I cannot agree to such a large increase of the alarm permit fee, especially since Saint Paul seems to be, according to my alarm system provider, the only city in the metro area requiring such a permit. I don't think it is fair that people who never cause false alarms are being punished for the negligence of other customers. Please do not increase the basic fee, but pass on the costs to the people who actually create them by increasing the penalties even more.

Thank you.

Alfred Hannemann

From: Cassie Stewart [mailto:cassies@live.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 9, 2017 4:17 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Alarm System Ordinance (Proposed)

Hello,

I'll keep this direct and brief. I'm all for charging us alarm permit holders to come out if there is a false alarm. However, let's try to make sure we don't keep cost a barrier to someone living in a high crime neighborhood who needs a system. Hence, I'm all for fees associated with false alarm police time, but not an all around permit price hike.

Thanks

Cassie

-----Original Message-----

From: Jane Amberg [mailto:Jane201@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 9, 2017 1:16 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Alarm Fees

I am definitely opposed to raising the alarm permit fee. It is one thing to raise the false alarm fee, but I feel it is unfair to raise a fee for those of us who have not caused the problems related to repeated false alarms.

The wording on the second paragraph is confusing, and I would like a better explanation of the dollar amounts that are discussed. Is the current revenue of \$261,915 for 2016/17? Is this money you have collected from false alarm fees?

The average cost to taxpayers of \$2,618 needs to be clarified, the sentence doesn't make any sense.

Again, I am opposed to raising the alarm fee, and until I receive a better explanation of the dollar amounts in the letter I am opposed to raising the false alarm fees also.

This proposed fee increase comes at a bad time, as I read on the paper this morning that our street maintenance, etc. fees/taxes, whatever you want to call them, are going to be going up. We can only absorb so much.

I'm looking forward to your response.

Jane Amberg
201 Woodlawn Ave.
St. Paul

From: Dave Ulve [mailto:daveulve@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 9, 2017 11:24 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: License Fee Schedule

Am opposed to increasing the fee for everyone. Why penalize those that do not have false alarms. Hold those that do accountable. Additionally curious how the cost is calculated. Do the false alarms require extra man hours, overtime?

Dave Ulve

From: Verne E. Jacobsen [mailto:verne.jacobsen@tkda.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 6:22 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Re: Burglar Alarm Systems

Honorable city council members: From review of the information provided in the June 23, 2017 letter, it appears to present a single view point. Burglar alarm systems limit the number of burglaries in the city and actually reduce police work and time. Burglaries add more cost to citizens and police work than response to false alarms; police are traveling the city most of the time as part of their service to city.

The council may want to look at the savings/ benefits from the alarm systems, rather than one issue and encourage a greater use of alarm systems. Even with an alarm system we have had two burglaries in the last 10 years, they are not pleasant- how many would one have without an alarm system? It may provide more benefit to city/citizens and reduce police costs to encourage more use of alarm systems. Thanks for your consideration.



Verne E. Jacobsen, PE | Senior Registered Engineer Water/Wastewater

444 Cedar Street, Suite 1500, Saint Paul, MN 55101

P 651.292.4484 | C 651.233.0155 | [check out our new tkda.com](http://tkda.com)

Professional Engineer: MN

From: skeie002 University of Minnesota [mailto:skeie002@umn.edu]

Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 12:16 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: False alarms vs. power outages.

Not too long ago this summer, there was a power outage over which I received a call that went to messaging.

I am concerned that this is not counted as my alarm going off.

Thank you.

Robin Skeie
182 Kent St. #6
St. Paul, MN 55102

6126956620

From: Kari Guida [mailto:kjguida@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 3:26 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Alarm Permit Holder Fees

Hi,

I am writing to provide input as I will not be able to attend the public hearing on the increases in the alarm permit license fees and false alarm fee schedule. I recognize the need to address the cost associated with false alarms and I support the increases - I would even be ok with \$500 after the fifth or sixth false alarm. I do strongly encourage you to identify if this policy negatively affects any of our communities by using an equity lens.

We had a false alarm a few months ago and appreciated the follow-up by the police. Until then we had not known a license was needed for the alarm system. I suggest you also work at better communication about needing a license before a false alarm.

Please feel free to share my input or ask for more information.

Also, please start taxing parking lots owned by non-profits, churches, and the state.

Thanks
Kari Guida
1170 Charles Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104

From: John Fineberg [mailto:johnfineberg@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 9:09 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council; #CI-StPaul_Ward3
Cc: John Fineberg; #CI-StPaul_Ward7
Subject: Alarming False Alarm Fees

Hello City Counselors,

I have received notice about the intent to raise false alarm fees. While I understand the policy to charge those people who abuse the system — and I understand that the fees themselves do not cover the real costs — I do question one thing about the policy in general.

As I understand it, the first two false alarms are simply given a warning. But then, for rest of your life, you get charged an annual alarm permit fee. Seriously, for the rest of your life? It's like you've committed a felony and you're, therefore, a felon for the rest of your life.

But I'm simply talking false alarms here, not felonies. Are you never given a fresh start? Does it never get reset back to zero?

The only reason I was required to get a permit in the first place is because of simple human mistakes, alarms that were set off by friends coming over to feed our cat while we out of town and/or an elderly relative staying with us and not understanding how alarms work.

Granted, the city needs to recoup costs incurred by negligent residents. But, seriously, there is something "alarming" (pun intended) about a system where the annual fee more than doubles, and the per-incident fee also doubles (more or less), even without a single infraction in several years.

I would appreciate a written response.

John Fineberg
1941 Yorkshire Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55116
(651) 690-3535

From: Jonathan Deering [mailto:deerinjr@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 10:26 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Ordinance Section 310.18

Hello City Council,

I will be unable to attend the public hearing about the proposed amendments to ordinance section 310.18 but have one request and one comment.

It was cited that the annual average cost to tax payers for false alarms is \$2,618,476. My request is: Could you please break down that value into cost buckets for myself and the other citizens of St. Paul?

Note: I am assuming that you are including salaries for the police officers in this figure. If that is true, can you please note what excess capacity was required so as to respond to false alarms versus you allocating standard fixed-cost officer hours to false alarms.

Additionally, my comment is: I would greatly prefer that the license cost remain fixed or only be increased by inflation. I would prefer that the brunt of the cost of false alarms be borne by the repeat offenders who are causing these extra costs. As a homeowner with an alarm system and no false alarms for 2 years (I'm a relatively new member of the community), I see a 207% rise in alarm permit cost to be an unfair burden to put on individuals and families who are not causing these costs to the city. I consider my property taxes to be my contribution to pay for my use/benefit from police resources (which fortunately I have not needed to use directly thus far).

Thank you for considering my request and comment,
Jonathan Deering
1319 Niles Ave

From: Jake Kimmes [mailto:kimmes02@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 10:45 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Part Opposition to Proposed Amendments to Alarm Permit Ordinance 310.18 and 329.02

Greetings,

I writing this email to you to voice my STRONG OPPOSITION to the amendment to ordinance 310.18 that raises the fee for alarm permits from \$28 to \$58. My wife and I just got married and bought a home in the west Frogtown area of St. Paul. As most people know, Frogtown has more criminal activity than most neighborhoods in St. Paul. We purchased a home alarm system and permit to protect us, our home, and our future children. We were initially surprised to discover it cost \$28 for a permit, but we were willing to pay that. However, you are considering DOUBLING THAT FEE, which is just ridiculous. I understand money is wasted on false alarms, but by raising the permit fee you are also penalizing people who are responsible and never have false alarms. You are also making it more difficult, especially for families living on less income, to afford home alarm systems. I think it is arbitrary and capricious to raise alarm permit fees by such a significant amount. I strongly encourage the council to vote AGAINST the amendment to raise the permit fee from \$28 to \$58.

However, as I mentioned before, I understand there are a significant number of false alarms every year that cost taxpayers and the city a substantial amount of money. **I do not oppose raising the false alarm fees.** If anything, I think you should raise them even more than the proposed amendment is written if that would convince you not to raise the permit fees. This way you are collecting money to cover the cost from false alarms from the people who are actually causing the false alarms. I would even suggest implementing fee for the second false alarm to help with the costs, but don't raise the permit fees.

Thus, I do not oppose raising the false alarm fees, but I do strongly oppose raising the alarm permit fees. People should not be charged such a significant amount of money for protecting their homes and families, especially people who are responsible and rarely, if ever, have false alarms.

Thank you,
Jake K.

Ja
cob
Kimmes
, Esq.
kimmes02@gmail.com

From: Lauren Hill [mailto:LaurenHill69@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 9:22 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: comment on proposed alarm permit ordinance amendments

Dear St. Paul City Council,

I have received and reviewed the proposed updates to the alarm permit ordinance.

I have one suggestion. You have only focused on raising the fees. I think you have overlooked something obvious.

Why don't you reduce the number of false alarms residents are allowed without incurring a fee from two to one? Starting with the second false alarm, the homeowner would incur a fee.

Best,

Lauren Hill

638 Summit Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55105 USA
651-646-8993

From: Neil Koppy [mailto:neilkoppy@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 9:38 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: alarm permits fee increase

You have got to be joking! My property taxes, already too high, pay for police service. Of course they're also suppose to pay for property improvements, yet I'm being assessed \$7809.75 this year for street improvements. Here's the bottom line for me: I'm sick and tired of the tax increase, fees, assessments, etc. YOU have to learn to balance the budget with what you have, period. This state is one of the worst in the country to retire in! What do you plan on doing about that? Raise taxes on social security more? Why are they taxed at all...because you spend too much. I can assure you, Mr. Bostrom and Mayor Coleman will not receive my vote. I've voted DFL for a long time, but I cannot believe how out of touch you've become. It is absolutely mind-boggling! Time for a change.

neil and patty koppy
1611 atlantic st
55106

From: Geri Rotter [mailto:gmrbrj@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 10:58 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Security Alarm Ordinance 310.18 & 329.02

Received the notice for hearing on July 19, 2017. I am unable to attend. I have a question regarding Permit to be displayed 329.02 (A)(6). I live in a condo and we are not allowed to display items outside our doors in the hallways. How do you handle that if the association doesn't allow this. I do have a city permit for my alarm system.

Geri Rotter
(612)210-6521

From: Delbert Foley [mailto:foleydelbert@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 10:27 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: alarm permit holders

Regarding the subject "NOTICE"

I definitely don't agree to a permit fee increase, it appears the the mayor needs more money in the general fund. \$28.00 is more than enough to pay for a permit.

I do agree with the false alarm fee schedule, in fact I would change it slightly. (\$100.00 for the second false alarm and permit surrendered on the third plus a \$200.00 fee).

Thank you

Del Foley
2103 Suburban Ave
St Paul

From: Emily R. Lowther [mailto:lowther@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 9:38 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council; #CI-StPaul_Ward6
Cc: Renstrom, Scott (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Opposition to proposed amendment to Saint Paul City Ordinance Section 310.18

Members of the St. Paul City Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on proposed amendments to Saint Paul City Ordinance Section 310.18 - *License fee schedule* and Section 329.02 - *Use of alarm systems*. I am a resident of St. Paul's East Side and have had an alarm system and alarm permit for about five years.

Comments regarding Section 310.18

As a private homeowner using a monitored security system, I am **strongly opposed** to the proposed annual alarm permit fee increase from \$28 to \$58 annually. This increase would more than double the annual amount I pay the city and would provide no additional benefit or service value to me as a homeowner.

In addition, this fee increase is out of line with fees for alarm permits in surrounding communities:

- [Minneapolis](#) does not require alarm owners to pay for an alarm permit unless they have one false alarm, at which time they are charged a \$30 registration fee.
- [Roseville](#) charges \$35 for an alarm permit application, with the permit valid for two years. Permits must be renewed every two years at a cost of \$15.
- [Maplewood](#) charges an alarm permit application fee of \$57 and then has a \$10 annual renewal fee.

Assuming a household has no false alarms, here is city-by-city permit fee spending breakdown:

	Minneapolis	Roseville	Maplewood	St. Paul
Year 1	\$0	\$35	\$57	\$58
Year 2	\$0	\$0	\$10	\$58
Year 3	\$0	\$15	\$10	\$58
Year 4	\$0	\$0	\$10	\$58
4-year total	\$0	\$50	\$87	\$232

St. Paul homeowners would pay far more than homeowners in surrounding communities under the proposed fee increase. While it would take a Maplewood resident six years to surpass \$100 in

alarm permit fees and a Roseville resident 11 years to surpass \$100 in alarm permit fees, a St. Paul resident would pay over \$100 in just two years.

I would support a change to a model similar to Maplewood's or Roseville's, in which a higher initial permit application fee is then offset by a lower annual renewal fee. However, the fee increase as currently proposed lacks this nuance.

In the city's notice to alarm holders regarding the proposed amendments, false alarm fee revenue being lower than false alarm fee cost was cited as the rationale for the proposed alarm fee increases. If this is the case, additional false alarm fee revenue should be raised to help offset costs to taxpayers. Holders of alarm permits who do not have false alarms should not be penalized with this large fee increase to help offset false alarm fees that they do not incur.

Comments regarding Section 392.02

I support the concept of increasing fees for false alarms, since the cost of responding to false alarms is what the city is trying to offset with this fee increase.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Emily Lowther

From: Marilyn Mauritz [mailto:marilynmauritz@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 9:57 AM
To: #CI-StPaul_Council
Subject: Comments on proposed changes to alarm penalties

While I appreciate the cost fact for false alarms, I live alone and am old and on a fixed income. I pay a lot each year to maintain my alarm. Up to \$40 a month.

I am very careful and have not had one false alarm since being in my home for 7 years now.

I think it is unfair to penalize everyone for those who aren't responsible about their use.

Perhaps the first mistake is free.

After that put in your cost factors in the others; and, raise the annual fee just \$10; that will be annoying enough.

After all, those of us who have alarm systems are paying already to be a deterrent to your city's police-ing costs.

Thanks,
Marilyn Mauritz

From: peggy cerrito [mailto:cerrito2009@live.com]

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 10:03 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Fees for Alarms

We recently received a notice that the fee for our alarm system is more than doubling. The justification seems to be that the SPPD answer 5000 false alarm calls a year. That tells me absolutely nothing. 5000 false alarms out of how many alarm calls total would be a much more informative number. We have had an alarm system in our house almost 20 years, we have been paying your alarm fee since it was implemented. In the 20 years I believe we have had one or two false alarms. My real question here is don't we pay taxes (and ample taxes I might add) to have police protection? We already pay an additional fee for our alarm and now because the city of St Paul can't control spending we have that fee more than doubled? Why don't you start charging repeat offenders for multiple police calls to their home? It seems all too often when there is a news report of police activity at a given address the residents are chronic offenders....do they pay a fee per visit? I think not. I am tired of St Paul fees and taxes, they already excessive.

Peggy Cerrito
1074 Juliet Ave
St Paul, MN 55105

From: silverjean80 [mailto:silverjean80@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 10:32 AM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Alarm permit fee increase

Instead of raising fees for all, including those of us who have NEVER had a false alarm, charge \$30 for the first false alarm. Eliminate the 2 freebies for false alarms.

Thanks

Sylvia Mcalpine
1609 Dale St No 55117

From: ck miller [mailto:c.kyrolamiller@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 3:56 PM

To: #CI-StPaul_Council

Subject: Objection to a portion of the proposal to increase alarm fees and fines

Hello,

First, I want to thank you for your service on the city council. I am writing to state my objection to a general fee increase for the use of residential alarm systems.

Those who register their systems and properly use them should have no fee increases imposed. That said, businesses and other entities that can claim the expense as a write off for protection of property could perhaps afford to pay more. I would like to indicate here, as some would say, that residents get a discount on insurance premiums for having the system... that the amount is negligible unless you have the "premium" systems. The fee is reasonable now for people who are already paying to have their systems installed and monitored. For our family, it was after a burglary that was followed up by significant property damage, costing us thousands of dollars and significant personal stress. Please do not increase permit fees.

The fee for those who do not register their systems in the first place should be imposed as suggested but I will say many are not even aware that they need a permit because many alarm services do not inform them that it's required. Some choose not to even inquire. Either way it's not fair to those who register their systems to pay more to make up the deficits caused by those who do not.

Lastly, false alarms. Again, do not propose an increase in the initial permit fee because of false alarms...consequential costs of police response for having multiple false alarms rests on those people/places that are having multiple false alarms. Enforce collection of those fees. I think the city seems fair in the forgiveness of two false alarms but then the fees seem low as compared to Minneapolis, for example.

In conclusion, raising the fee on those who follow the laws and do what they are supposed to do is not the correct course of action. We pay taxes and we paid for our permit. Look to increase awareness of the requirement to purchase a permit and hold those with no permit and/or repetitive false alarms more accountable.

Thank you for your time.

Chris Miller
District 10 resident

