



City of Saint Paul

City Hall and Court House
15 West Kellogg
Boulevard
Phone: 651-266-8560

Master

File Number: RLH TA 19-742

File ID: RLH TA 19-742

Type: Resolution LH Tax
Assessment Appeal

Status: Passed

Version: 2

**Contact
Number:**

In Control: City Council

File Created: 09/26/2019

File Name: 143 Baker St W

Final Action: 11/13/2019

Title: Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 143 BAKER STREET WEST. (File No. CG1903A3, Assessment No. 190123)

Notes:

Sponsors: Noecker

Enactment Date:

Attachments:

Financials Included?:

Contact Name:

Hearing Date:

Entered by: diana.chao@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Ord Effective Date:

Related Files:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Legislative Hearings	10/03/2019	Laid Over	Legislative Hearings	10/24/2019		
<p>Notes: <i>Laid over to LH October 24, 2019 at 10:30 AM (rescheduled)</i></p> <p><i>Diana Chao: resident comments are we don't intend to approve for a service we've never used. There's no opt out option. Recommend approving.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Moermond: so recommended.</i></p> <p><i>Follow up: resident rescheduled after LH.</i></p>							
2	Legislative Hearings	10/24/2019	Referred	City Council	11/13/2019		
<p>Notes: <i>Approve the assessment.</i></p> <p><i>Anna Botz appeared</i></p> <p><i>Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: resident is appealing \$68.86 for service for Quarter 2, 2019. Appealing because they didn't want to pay for service they had never utilized. Under city wide service all dwelling units up to four units must have service, there is no option to opt out, so the property owner is responsible for paying for the charge.</i></p> <p><i>Moermond: so you don't use it, you don't want to pay.</i></p>							

Botz: I'm happy the issue is coming up, as a low consumer family, our world is polluted with garbage and we make the decision as consumers. I rode my bike here, I want my way of life respected, we don't use plastic in our home, I know that sounds far out. We've been doing this for years, we haven't had service for 10 years. We create a handful of garbage each week. I don't want more trucks coming down the street. I don't want compost picked up, we backyard compost. I just want to argue and fight about garbage, I have an objection based on principle. I think we have to rethink the way we're consuming and wasting. I'm trying to teach my kids that. We don't buy things that are packaged. If we buy tortillas, it gets another life wrapping a sandwich. I'm an artist, my husbands an engineer, we live on a limited income, trying to figure out how to send our kids to college. We've never used the bin in our garage. I think older things are made better. You decide as a consumer what to buy or not buy. I'm tired of people saying 'oh you're a zero waster'. If we do have a small amount and when we do, we bring to Twin Cities Refuse. The City needs to have policies for this. I don't have a problem with organized collection, I just have never used the bin. I have pictures of all the way we reduce and don't consume. All our decisions are really intentional. I want the right to not be a huge consumer. When I buy things at the store I think about where that will go, if every human keeps doing this it's a huge problem. Some of the microplastics are being consumed by the fish, and we don't know what will happen yet. That's all I'd like to say. I'm happy the conversation is coming up. I'm not trying to skip out on my bill, but its not necessary for a truck to come pick up trash.

Moermond: you don't sound radical at all, you aren't the first and won't be the last person to deliver that message. Most people are in the middle of that spectrum of non-recycling at all and where you're at. Right now, we have a contract, future contracts are going to be negotiated and creating an incentive and being rewarded for consuming less is a good idea. This is the first year of the program, all your comments are on the record, and if you think of things that may be a good incentive, how would it look that we can create an incentive for people more broadly than what we have. That's going to be the future of this whole thing. I'm there with you, I just don't have a legal contract that allows me to do that yet.

Botz: when you say renegotiated, you mean in four years or with the current referendum?

Moermond: right now, based on the Supreme Court decision, the City has to pay the haulers regardless, a no vote its paid out of general fund. A yes vote means it goes to those one to four-unit owners. The Supreme Court was clear the contract stands. It won't be a full four years before renegotiations happen. I do appreciate what you're doing, and I think how you're describing it is educational too.

Botz: we have to go back 100 years, before plastic. Use glass or cotton. This is the core of my beliefs, I try so hard and show my neighbors and teach my kids. I'm wondering, will they start to negotiate this sooner?

Moermond: we're one year in now, it would be premature now, the vote will happen and that talks about how it gets paid for. Its usually one to two years before a new contract begins that they start that process. I don't have control of your assessment. I can't make it go away legally.

Swanson: we are very supportive of your efforts. This is kind of the City's first steps towards a more comprehensive system. Now we know, because we know how much is being collected, I always say the first step is knowing. The goal is ultimately to incentivize reduction.

Botz: I don't understand the rush to do this. If it is repealed it won't be negotiated sooner?

Moermond: no. I think there are people that think that will happen, but that's not consistent with the Supreme Court decision.

Botz: if I don't pay, it is put on my property taxes?

Moermond: yes. A no vote means its integrated into your general taxes. Recommend approval.

Notes: *Legislative Hearing Officer Marcia Moermond said the Council had heard from appellant Ms. Botz earlier in the meeting (regarding having a zero-waste household). Ms. Botz's comments in Legislative Hearings were targeted towards future negotiations of the contract. Ms. Moermond said her recommendation was to approve the assessment for \$66.86 for the second quarter of 2019 as the single-family home was included in the program.*

Council President Brendmoen said she believed Ms. Botz had left.

No one was present to testify. Councilmember Noecker moved to close the public hearing and approve the resolution.

2 Mayor's Office 11/19/2019 Signed

Text of Legislative File RLH TA 19-742

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 143 BAKER STREET WEST. (File No. CG1903A3, Assessment No. 190123)