

From: Anne Carroll [<mailto:carrfran@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Friday, December 01, 2017 10:43 AM  
To: #CI-StPaul\_Ward3  
Subject: Petition, leadership

Thanks to the Council for the resolution finding a way to legally block the un/misinformed yet aggressively persistent attempt to overturn a rigorous and thoughtful 10-year process and plan to move St Paul \*forward\*. As a community, we are better than the narrow-minded and exclusive among us, and I am grateful for your leadership in this important movement to advance the best of who and what we are becoming.  
Anne Carroll

The Saint Paul City Charter requires that any group seeking a referendum to overturn a City Council decision must submit valid signatures representing 8% of the voters in the last Mayoral election within 45 days of the Council's vote.

I wonder what a Judge would think about this situation considering that the last Mayoral election that Mr. Mansky feels the petition must be based upon occurred November 7th, which was 41 days after the Council vote. Thus Mr. Mansky proposes that the petitioners would have four days at most to know how many signatures were necessary and to submit their petition, with probably far less time given the need to tabulate votes in the election to determine the number of signatures needed.

Mr. Mansky's position is unreasonable and preposterous. It's time to let the people decide the future of the Ford Site plan.

Michelle Malone  
1729 Lafond Ave  
St Paul MN 55104

Dear City Council Members,

I have read both letters -- from Joe Mansky and from Neighbors for a Livable St. Paul -- about the referendum vote. The issue is clear: where the ordinance says "last preceding mayoral election," does it mean preceding the petition or preceding the city council action sought to be overturned?

People can argue it either way, especially if there is no legislative history to make it clear. No doubt they will.

But, what is the democratic principle behind the referendum ordinance? Presumably it is to empower citizens to participate directly in their governance. The NLSP interpretation makes citizen participation easier, and eliminates the wild card of a mayoral election intervening after the petition process has begun. The other interpretation does the opposite.

Unless there is clear legislative history or controlling precedent, then, the Council must choose between encouraging and affirming citizen participation, or making it more difficult. Or, put another way, between what is convenient for the Council and what is convenient for citizens.

Who, you might ask, works for whom?

Yours truly,  
Paul Nelson  
1661 Ashland Avenue

All;

I encourage and am asking that you accept the petition / referendum on the Ford site from your constituents. Honoring the democratic process to put this on the ballot and see what the voters think seems the right thing to do. Thank you.

Dennis McGuire  
2203 Fairmount Ave

From: Luba Hickey [<mailto:hicke002@umn.edu>]  
Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2017 8:53 AM  
To: #CI-StPaul\_Ward3  
Subject: Ford Site Petition should be on ballot

The petition should not be dismissed... what happened to transparency?

From: [hathaway@iphouse.com](mailto:hathaway@iphouse.com) [<mailto:hathaway@iphouse.com>]  
Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2017 10:20 AM  
To: #CI-StPaul\_Ward3; Tolbert, Chris (CI-StPaul)  
Cc: [pattie.kellie@ci.stpaul.mn.us](mailto:pattie.kellie@ci.stpaul.mn.us); Stark, Russ (CI-StPaul); #CI-StPaul\_Ward4; Hathaway  
Subject: Item 42 on the Council agenda for today

Hello Chris -

Our Neighbors for a Livable Saint Paul group would like to be given the opportunity to read a brief statement at the Council meeting today in response to the City Council's resolution proposing to dismiss our petition.

I am aware that this is not a public hearing and so this request is unusual, but given the circumstances it seems fitting that the community would have the opportunity to respond.

(I just now left a voicemail message with Pattie Kelley with the same request.)

Please let me know if you are willing to arrange this.

Thanks,  
Charles

**From:** Anne Yuska [<mailto:ahyuska@centurylink.net>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 06, 2017 1:46 PM  
**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward1; #CI-StPaul\_Ward2; #CI-StPaul\_Ward3; #CI-StPaul\_Ward4; #CI-StPaul\_Ward5; #CI-StPaul\_Ward6; #CI-StPaul\_Ward7  
**Subject:** Resolution to dismiss petition regarding Ford Plan

Dear City Councilmen and women,

I am now reading from Neighbors for a Livable Saint Paul that the City Council and its attorney have prepared a resolution dismiss the petition containing 3300 signatures on the basis of legal

technicalities. I am **APPALLED** by this action. You can hereby consider yourselves no longer acting in the form of representative government.

At our next opportunity, we will vote with the intent to unseat you from public office. Clearly this City Council is unresponsive to deep-seated concerns in this community.

The sad part is that I don't think the changes necessary for compromise are difficult or extensive.

Sincerely,  
Anne Yuska