



# City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.  
Saint Paul, MN 55102

## Minutes - Final

### Legislative Hearings

*Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer*  
*Mai Vang, Hearing Coordinator*  
*Joanna Zimny, Executive Assistant*  
*legislativehearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us*  
*651-266-8585*

---

Thursday, April 2, 2020

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

---

The Mayor of the City of Saint Paul has declared, and the Council has affirmed, that an in-person meeting of the Legislative Hearings is not practical or prudent because of the COVID-19 health pandemic emergency declared under Minn Stat. Chapter 12 by the Governor of the State of Minnesota and the Mayor of the City of Saint Paul. In light of the COVID-19 health pandemic, these hearings will be held by telephone or other electronic means.

#### Special Tax Assessments

#### 9:00 a.m. Hearings

- 1     **RLH TA 20-225**     Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 108 CLEVELAND AVENUE SOUTH, UNIT 4. (File No. CG2001A2, Assessment No. 200101)

Sponsors:     Tolbert

*Reduce assessment from \$274.01 to \$240.79.*

*Sam Daoud, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$241.01 for service Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because the amount is not correct, Republic made a mistake and added a back bill to Quarter 4 invoice. Resident says they have been current on all payments. We spoke with the hauler, it was meant to cover inaccurate back billing for Quarter 4, 2018 to Quarter 2, 2019. We are recommending removing the late fees of \$33.22 and reducing to \$240.79. That would be taking into account the amounts owed for those quarters. Q2, 2019 he was short billed by 89.75, in total that's 240.79.*

*Moermond: so this sounds like kind of a bad deal Mr. Daoud, that they screwed up your bill and then want to collect it later, what has been your experience?*

*Daoud: ultimately, I'd like it dropped, but if not I appreciate the late fees being dropped. It is unfair that I'm on top of my billing every quarter, pay them right away, and their mistake over a few quarters they throw it all on me at once and it is their mistake.*

*Moermond: I agree with you. They are a big company who should know what they're*

doing with their billing. I do have Chris Swanson here too, he manages the program, what sort of follow up can you do with Republic? I'm disappointed they behaved this way, what can you do to communicate the City's displeasure.

Swanson: very early we expressed our displeasure with them and the back billing. We had two other haulers who also did back billing, but they did a better job following up with the residents and explaining. Republic did send a letter, but the invoice itself didn't express what the charges were for adequately. We have had many conversations with Republic about mistakes like this, and future mistakes they cannot back bill like this. This was an unfortunate growing pain they had, we've had a lot of conversations the last couple months about the scope of incorrect billing and how to correctly respond to resident complaints. If there are billing issues with Republic moving forward, we will proceed with more drastic actions and they are aware of that.

Moermond: I can reduce the assessment removing the late fees. Right now, this is scheduled to go in front of Council May 27 for a public hearing, I'll ask them to reduce the assessment and get rid of the late fees. We'll have communication to Republic about our disappointment so Council will see they screwed up, the other piece is if you wanted to testify at Council, I am not sure if by then we'll be doing public testimony again or not, but right now I'll reduce it. You'll get a letter from the Real Estate office with a reduce amount, you can choose to pay it or let it go on your 2021 taxes.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

- 2      [RLH TA 20-198](#)      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 644 DAYTON AVENUE. (File No. CG2001A1, Assessment No. 200100)

**Sponsors:**      Thao

*Layover to LH April 9, 2020 at 9 AM (unable to reach owner).*

*Called 9:32 am 4/2- no answer. Moermond left message*

*Called again 10:30 am 4/2 – no answer. Moermond left message with Mai Vang's information for rescheduling to April 15.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/9/2020**

- 3      [RLH TA 20-227](#)      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 712 HAGUE AVENUE. (File No. CG2001A1, Assessment No. 200100)

**Sponsors:**      Thao

*Layover to LH April 9, 2020 at 9 AM (unable to reach owner).*

*Called 9:32 am 4/2- no answer. Moermond left message*

*Called again 10:30 am 4/2 – no answer. Moermond left message with Mai Vang's information for rescheduling to April 15.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/9/2020**

- 4      **RLH TA 20-207**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1059 HAGUE AVENUE. (File No. CG2001A1, Assessment No. 200100)

**Sponsors:**      Thao

*Delete the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff Report by Clare Pillsbury: \$711 for Quarter 4, 2019. Same issue as Quarter 3, 2019, they are getting double billed for a property, Ramsey County has both properties listed as the same duplex with the same PID number, so they have two accounts for the same property and are getting charged incorrectly for the property. The unit with the address of 1059 Hague is currently getting billed for two 64 gallon containers, while the unit with the 1061 Hague address is getting billed for one 94 gallon container. The resident did provide documentation of one 94 gallon container at the property, therefore they should not be getting double billed for both accounts. We recommend removal.*

*Moermond: who is the hauler?*

*Pillsbury: Republic.*

*Moermond: and this is fixed going forward?*

*Chris Swanson: it is. We will look at first quarter 2020 and make sure we check this.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

**5**      [RLH TA 20-191](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 908 LAUREL AVENUE. (File No. CG2001A2, Assessment No. 200101)

**Sponsors:**      Thao

*Layover to LH April 9. Staff to follow up with hauler.*

*Giovanni Pizzuti, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$480.64 for service Quarter 4, 2019. The property currently has one 64 gallon container and one 35 gallon container with every other week service. Therefore, we recommend reducing the assessment to \$163.77.*

*Moermond: so staff is taking more than \$300 off right off the bat. What are you looking for?*

*Pizzuti: it should be zero. I got a phone call a couple months ago after the last set of hearings, Republic stated they were removing all of it. If you go back further, this bill should never have occurred, because I spoke with them 15 different times and they said they'd remove all the charges. Each time I spoke with them they had a different answer for what I was being charged for. Three times they said it was for extra trash. We had a 96 gallon container, they promised to remove the charges, when it got sent to the city I spoke with the woman who contacted Republic by email, who contacted me 2 months ago saying they were removing all the charges.*

*Moermond: you're saying what size barrel?*

*Pizzuti : we had a 96 gallon container. And that was it.*

*Moermond: and you still have that?*

*Pizzuti: we have changed that to two 35 gallon containers, every other week.*

*Moermond: when did you do that change?*

*Pizzuti: more than 6 months ago. They can't keep their information straight.*

*Moermond: the information they gave us is not the same information you are giving us, we'd like to investigate as well.*

*Pizzuti: they promised to remove the charges before it even went to the City, all the communication between City person and Republic got resolved and they contacted me and said they were removing all charges, this was 2 months ago, and now I'm hearing you want to reduce it, Republic said they would remove it.*

*Chris Swanson: It is frustrating for us to hear how much time and effort you've spent with Republic, do you know who you talked with at Republic who said they would remove all charges?*

*Pizzuti: I have notes, but every time you call in you get a different person. I think it was Simone in South St. Paul, she said she was handling it, she never called back. I stressed I want this taken care of before it gets sent to the City, she never got back to me.*

*Moermond: we can't come to a resolution on this; it is looking closer to zero than the \$167 but I'd like to confront Republic about this and hear back from them. I'd like to lay this over to next week, get some information on the record. We will reach out to you by phone next Thursday in the same time slot, and you can add additional comments at that time.*

*Pizzuti: great, thank you*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/9/2020**

- 6 RLH TA 20-193** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1244 LINCOLN AVENUE. (File No. CG2001A2, Assessment No. 200101)

**Sponsors:** Tolbert

*Delete the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: This is for \$161.77 for quarter 4, 2019. They were paying for 2 carts from Jan 7, 2019 to October 5, but only had one because Waste Management didn't have any small containers on hand when they changed sizes in January. Staff comments are that when the hauler came to pick up the 96 gallon cart they never returned to deliver the 35 gallon cart. They did not get the new cart until Nov 4, 2019. Hauler has requested we remove the whole assessment as it was incorrect.*

*Moermond: so recommended, delete.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

- 7 RLH TA 20-202** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1378 LINCOLN AVENUE. (File No. CG2001A2, Assessment No. 200101)

Sponsors: Tolbert

*Reduce assessment from \$154.93 to \$78 (cost of extra bags plus one month of service).*

*Mary Callender, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: This is for \$154.93 for service quarte 4, 2019. Resident is appealing because she states her trash has not been picked up since September 30, 2019 and she phoned in a temporary service hold months ago. This bill is for one 94 gallon container with a chare of \$24 for 8 extra bags and three finance fees of \$4.38. Waste Management stated they have not received a request for a temporary service hold for the property. They stated she did call on January 15, 2020 and stated they were looking for a hold, but there is no record of a hold being put into place. Since September 2019 there have been no reports of the trash not being put out for collection, therefore staff recommends approving the assessment.*

*Callender: there was no one in the house doing trash, I plan on moving back in, it is my childhood home. I can see the time coming when I don't want to do the stairs. One renter moved out and I'm renting out until I can get it cleared out. Vacant until March 1. The cans were imbedded in ice in the back. I called and talked to someone down there. .*

*Moermond: I'm hearing at one point there were 8 extra bags, I'm also hearing the hauler say there are no reports of the trash not being put out for collection. How do they track that?*

*Chris Swanson: if they go down at the point of pickup there isn't a cart, they will make a notation on their computer or their route sheet saying it wasn't out there.*

*Moermond: if there's a cart out and nothing in it? Do they note that?*

*Swanson: no, if the cart is out it is considered a tip.*

*Moermond: so if the cart is out the whole time, they don't look inside they just hook it up and dumping it. The 8 extra bags, what might that be about?*

*Swanson: my best guess is your tenants moved out in late August, and the extra bags were the first week of September so they noted the extra bags, and normal collection after that.*

*Callender: how much were the extra bags?*

*Pillsbury: \$24.*

*Callender: I can contact them and they are responsible for that. I didn't exactly get a bill for that; I didn't know that was the case at any rate.*

*Moermond: I'm going to decrease this bill and get it to \$78.00. I'm thinking that we don't have you calling until January according to their records, we do have tenants moving out that needed September pickup, so I'm saying those bags need to be charged and one third of the fourth quarter bill will be charged, we won't charge for the next 2 months.*

*Callender: I'm still paying for time if they didn't use.*

Moermond: there wasn't an official hold—

Callender: I did call. I let them know, it didn't get registered apparently. I didn't mark down when I called. They moved out the end of August. I called in January because they sent me a bill, but I called earlier when the renters turned over.

Moermond: this goes to Council May 27, if you want to contest it further that would be the time to do that. You'll get a call before that about what is being done about hearings.

Callender: are they going to send me a bill for \$24?

Moermond: my recommendation is \$78, you have one more chance to contest it and we'll call prior to May 27.

Callender: I do owe for the extra, I'd like to pay the \$24.00.

Moermond: you won't get any bill now. The best thing to do is wait until the matter is resolved.

Callender: ok thank you.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

**8 RLH TA 20-208** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1003 SUMMIT AVENUE. (File No. CG2001A1, Assessment No. 200100)

**Sponsors:** Thao

Delete the assessment.

Diane Follmer, owner, appeared via phone

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$299.73 for quarter 4, 2019. The reason given for appeal was the medium cart was never used and, after repeated requests finally picked up. the large cart is fully paid for. All incorrect charges/assessments should be canceled and resolved. Staff comments are that according to Republic, the assessment should include the cost of one 64 gallon container with late fees for \$110.54 as well as back billing from quarter 2, 2019 for \$71.42, which equals \$181.96. Property currently has two registered dwelling units. AT the start of Quarter 4, 2019 resident had both a 64 gallon and 96 gallon cart at the property. Staff records show that UDRF for the residential dwelling unit with the 96 gallon cart was received by the City on November 26, 2019, sent to the hauler December 1, 2019. Therefore staff recommends reducing Republic's suggested assessment to \$147.81 from \$181.96.

Moermond: bottom line, you're recommending reducing from about \$300 to less than half, \$147.81, and that is because one of the dwelling units was not using a container and it shouldn't have been billed, we're looking at a vacancy.

Pillsbury: the vacancy request was submitted the final month of the quarter, so we're just subtracting that amount, a month of the large container, also an issue with the back billing. They had back billed too much.

Moermond: ok so for two reasons, they didn't back bill correctly, plus the reduced level

of service. Does that address your concerns Ms. Follmer?

*Follmer: not at all. Why, when there was a reduced level of service, was there a magical date it was not charged. I notified the City as early as November 2018 that there was a cart not being used, and again your records are incorrect, it was not a large cart, it was a medium cart. We had requested one large cart. We were delivered a large and medium cart in September of 2018. I notified both the City and the hauler at that point, they said they would come pick it up. It was never picked up until there was pickup in the hauler's records for January 26, 2019. They continued to bill me for that cart. So, I have never had this service, \$147 is just as incorrect as \$299. I paid the large cart quarterly, the entire time, it is fully paid. That medium cart was never used, when it was finally picked up, they called me and told me it was picked up, but they just threw it in the bushes, the tape was still on it when they finally did pick up.*

*Moermond: earlier staff said you have two units; do you have a carriage house or ADU at this property?*

*Follmer: yes, and since fall of 2018 it has been vacant. That's what the form said, since fall of 2018.*

*Moermond: and the form was recorded when, Ms. Pillsbury?*

*Pillsbury: the form was received November 26, 2019.*

*Follmer: that's because after eleven calls to the hauler and four to the City I finally found out there was a form, so I filed it. No one had told me there was a form. In fact, the bookkeeper at Republic said "oh the City said we can charge you that, so it doesn't make any difference and we're going to charge you." The City thinks it is fine that the trash company charges for a service they do not provide.*

*Moermond: please don't jump to a conclusion to where I'm at with this. I'm trying to sort it out in real time, hearing your communication. What a Republic customer service person said, I don't know why they would say that. Mr. Swanson, have you had issues with this?*

*Chris Swanson: Republic Service had some general issues with how to bill multi units. One of the challenges was how to deal with vacant units in duplexes, triplexes, etc. The resolution was how to do the unoccupied dwelling form., which you sent in late in 2019. If you had talked to City staff early in the year, we were using it to address these issues. I don't see any calls about someone calling on this property.*

*Follmer: the first time I called, the City said we're not making any changes until after January 1, 2019. Then I called and they said I had to call the trash hauler. So, let me tell you how I tried to work this out. In September of 2018, Jason gave me a pickup date for that medium cart, September 6. October was Brenda who said the account will be credited and adjusted. And then there was Francis in billing, Kyra in about March 2019, the credit was supposed to be taken care of for \$96.08 October 20, 2018. They were going to send it to their division, they even gave us a case number. Along the lines they have changed our account number at least twice. So I called the City, they tell me to call the hauler, the hauler doesn't carry through on what they said. No one informed me, even the City, that there was a form. So the form comes in late. So what about all these billings before that time? There are two billings on my property taxes, for services we didn't receive.*

*Moermond: I'll recommend it gets deleted for this particular assessment, since you made significant effort to get in contact with them.*

*Follmer: that will certainly meet my approval, does that mean the charges applied to my property tax will be removed as well?*

*Moermond: the only thing in front of me today is the bill for \$299.73 for the fourth quarter of 2019. I have no legal authority to go backwards and look at the assessments that weren't previously appealed.*

*Follmer: who has the power to do it?*

*Moermond: when you receive your assessment letters, you would need to file in District Court within 20 days of that assessment. If you're asking me this question now, I'm pretty sure you didn't do that.*

*Follmer: so you can put charges on the property taxes, but you can't take them off?*

*Moermond: after a certain point in time, that is correct.*

*Follmer: and it doesn't make any difference that I've acted on this and given assurance it would be taken care of it never was.*

*Moermond: Ms. Follmer, when you received the notification of the assessment from the previous cases, and I'm not looking at anything from the past, but when that went out it included information on appealing and about going to District Court if you weren't successful in your appeal. That is the same for everyone, so after the Council votes, a clock starts and you have the opportunity to appeal the Council's decision. Once that time has ended, I can't un-ring that bell for you. You can talk to an attorney, but the notifications you got were clear about the expectation and I can't clean that up. Just what is in front of me today.*

*Follmer: I wrote a letter to the City dated January 18, I said that we are having billings that are incorrect, my next letter was...*

*Moermond: and I can't help you with those today, all I have in front of me is this fourth quarter bill, and I appreciate the value of a letter, but I can tell you legally you need to actually file an appeal on the assessment, and that procedure is outlined on the assessment letter.*

*Follmer: the summary of this conversation is the City has put things on my property tax bill and they have no power to take them off.*

*Moermond: the summary of this conversation is that this assessment, that was appealed, for the fourth quarter of 2019 I am recommending it gets deleted. I have nothing else in front of me to make a recommendation on.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

**9**      [RLH TA 20-219](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 658-660 THOMAS AVENUE. (File No. CG1904E3-1, Assessment No. 200170)

**Sponsors:**      Thao

Layover to LH April 23, 2020.



*No one appeared*

*Moermond: lay it over to April 23 so we can talk about both assessment at that time.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/23/2020**

**10 RLH TA 20-187** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1641 THOMAS AVENUE. (File No. CG1904E1, Assessment No. 190160)

**Sponsors:** Jalali

*Delete the assessment.*

*Kate Prock, owner, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: were recommending deleting, but it sounded like you had comments you wanted to put on the record.*

*Prock: I just got another assessment in the mail today for \$3.52. It is going to continue based on how I pay my bill. I have contacted the Attorney General, how legally it can even be can I pay in full every time and get penalized and I get a fine for services I haven't even received, the \$3.52 fine. Even after I have called about it, I've gotten some sort of weird response to it, this is prior to contacting the Attorney General. I also talked to a municipal lawyer who thinks legally if it was any other business you couldn't do that but because the City made it a law you're stuck with \$3.52. So then the hauler send a letter back to the Attorney General's office saying they tried to work with me and I hung up on them. I ha I didn't talk to them in 2019, maybe 2018 one time. They are claiming they send a bill and I have 20 days to pay for it, I was waiting to see when I got my next bill. I have someone copies of the checks I send out, they're the 28, 29, 30th of every month, and they claim they get them after the first of the month. I don't know how long it takes to process them. I'm asking that, I'll make arrangements. I pay by the end of the month, it is in the mail by the end of the month. Why do I continue to get a fine, it has been that way since you switched over to citywide garbage.*

*Moermond: the bills are due by the 25 of the month, according to the contract we have with the haulers, if they receive payment after that they can charge the 5 percent late fee. I'm hoping you are able to rearrange to pay on time.*

*Prock: they're getting paid 3 months in advance! For services not even rendered.*

*Moermond: please stop yelling at me. This is \$3.52. I'm recommending deletion, we've talked about a way to get ahead of it, it is an industry standard, it is not particular to our contract.*

*Prock: I never had that problem ever before, until it went to a Citywide basis.*

*Moermond: I'm sorry this is a new experience for you –*

*Prock: plus my garbage went up \$125 a year!*

*Moermond: I get you object to he program, but I'm deleting it.*

*Prock: I pay my bills when I pay my bills. I'm a small business. I have done this for*

*the last 35 years. For a garbage hauler, I'm paying in full and getting fined for services I haven't even received.*

*Moermond: I've done what I can for you this morning, I don't know what else I can do to help you out. All your comments will go on the record.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

### 10:00 a.m. Hearings

- 11 RLH TA 20-224** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 48 DELOS STREET WEST. (File No. CG2001A3, Assessment No. 200102)
- Sponsors:** Noecker
- Delete the assessment.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**
- 12 RLH TA 20-218** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 786 MANOMIN AVENUE. (File No. CG2001A3, Assessment No. 200102)
- Sponsors:** Noecker
- Delete the assessment.*
- No one appeared*
- Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$3.52 for Quarter 4, 2019. Hauler reached out to City and asked assessment be removed as courtesy to the resident. We recommend removing the assessment.*
- Moermond: who is the hauler?*
- Pillsbury: Republic.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**
- 13 [RLH TA 20-214](#)** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 542 OHIO STREET. (File No. CG1904A3-1, Assessment No. 190167)
- Sponsors:** Noecker
- Layover to LH April 9, 9 am (PO was reached but unable to speak).*
- Wayne Carlson, owner, appeared via phone*
- Moermond: is this Mr. Carlson? This is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council, I'm calling you about your two appealed garbage hauling bills.*
- Carlson: you were supposed to call me at 10:00.*
- Moermond: we did call you and no one answered, this is the second time we've tried to call you.*

*Carlson: that's not true because I was sitting there with both phones until 10:15.*

*Moermond: I believe the message was at 10:34 and we should have indicated it was between 10 and 11 that you'd receive your call. Is this a bad time? Should we reschedule?*

*Carlson: I'm not at home now, I'm not in front of my desk. You're an hour late.*

*Moermond: would you like to reschedule?*

*Carlson: not really, because I can't expect you will actually do what you say you're going to do.*

*Moermond: Mr. Carlson, would you like to reschedule when you have your paperwork in front of you? I'm uncomfortable conducting a hearing where you don't have your documents with you.*

*Carlson: I think I'll just go before the City Council and tell them you never called, which is true. I'll check both my voicemails when I get home.*

*Moermond: you can do that.*

*Carlson: I sent Chris an email and you don't respond to that.*

*Moermond: Mr. Carlson, I'm rescheduling you, you are welcome to go directly to Council. What I will do today is hear a staff report and develop a recommendation without your testimony, but my strong preference is to hear from you---*

*Carlson: well you do that, because I sat and waited for you, I stayed in my house when I had work to do, until 10:15 this morning, waiting for your call.*

*Moermond: my understanding is you were informed that the call would be between 10 and 11 this morning, a message was left for you at 10:34—*

*Carlson: my appointment was at 10:00!*

*Moermond: my understanding is that staff reached out to you and said you would hear from us between 10 and 11 am this morning.*

*Carlson: no, it was 10:00, that was my appointment date with you.*

*Moermond: Mr. Carlson, I've said what I can—*

*Carlson: I sent you an email, did you get the email?*

*Moermond: Mr. Carlson, do you want to have the hearing conducted without your paper work in front of you or would you like to schedule a different time?*

*Carlson: well if I can rely on you to actually call me. Why the hell do you think you'd be responsible enough to call? Leave a phone number and I'll call you back and set up an appointment.*

*Moermond: Mr. Carlson—*

Carlson: goodbye [hangs up]

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/9/2020**

**14**     [RLH TA 20-213](#)     Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 542 OHIO STREET. (File No. CG2001A3, Assessment No. 200102)

**Sponsors:**     Noecker

*Layover to LH April 9, 9 am (PO was reached but unable to speak).*

*Wayne Carlson, owner, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: is this Mr. Carlson? This is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council, I'm calling you about your two appealed garbage hauling bills.*

*Carlson: you were supposed to call me at 10:00.*

*Moermond: we did call you and no one answered, this is the second time we've tried to call you.*

*Carlson: that's not true because I was sitting there with both phones until 10:15.*

*Moermond: I believe the message was at 10:34 and we should have indicated it was between 10 and 11 that you'd receive your call. Is this a bad time? Should we reschedule?*

*Carlson: I'm not at home now, I'm not in front of my desk. You're an hour late.*

*Moermond: would you like to reschedule?*

*Carlson: not really, because I can't expect you will actually do what you say you're going to do.*

*Moermond: Mr. Carlson, would you like to reschedule when you have your paperwork in front of you? I'm uncomfortable conducting a hearing where you don't have your documents with you.*

*Carlson: I think I'll just go before the City Council and tell them you never called, which is true. I'll check both my voicemails when I get home.*

*Moermond: you can do that.*

*Carlson: I sent Chris an email and you don't respond to that.*

*Moermond: Mr. Carlson, I'm rescheduling you, you are welcome to go directly to Council. What I will do today is hear a staff report and develop a recommendation without your testimony, but my strong preference is to hear from you---*

*Carlson: well you do that, because I sat and waited for you, I stayed in my house when I had work to do, until 10:15 this morning, waiting for your call.*

*Moermond: my understanding is you were informed that the call would be between 10 and 11 this morning, a message was left for you at 10:34—*

Carlson: my appointment was at 10:00!

Moermond: my understanding is that staff reached out to you and said you would hear from us between 10 and 11 am this morning.

Carlson: no, it was 10:00, that was my appointment date with you.

Moermond: Mr. Carlson, I've said what I can—

Carlson: I sent you an email, did you get the email?

Moermond: Mr. Carlson, do you want to have the hearing conducted without your paper work in front of you or would you like to schedule a different time?

Carlson: well if I can rely on you to actually call me. Why the hell do you think you'd be responsible enough to call? Leave a phone number and I'll call you back and set up an appointment.

Moermond: Mr. Carlson—

Carlson: goodbye [hangs up]

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/9/2020**

- 15 RLH TA 20-215** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 197 SIDNEY STREET WEST. (File No. CG2001A3, Assessment No. 200102)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

Delete the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: This is for \$355.63, appealing because they have been making timely payments on their account. Staff comments are that the hauler confirmed the assessment was incorrect, therefore staff recommends removing the assessment.

Moermond: recommend deletion.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

- 16 RLH TA 20-212** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 331 SIDNEY STREET WEST. (File No. CG2001A3, Assessment No. 200102)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

Approve the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: One month late fee for Quarter 4, 2019. They never

*knew the amount was due to the hauler, they paid late, December 10, 2019. Hauler is justified in charging it.*

*Moermond: did we get ahold of the owner?*

*Pillsbury: she's fine paying the assessment, I spoke with her.*

*Moermond: approve the assessment, owner is ok with it, perfect.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

### 11:00 a.m. Hearings

- 17 RLH TA 20-190** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 984 ARMSTRONG AVENUE. (File No. CG2001B1, Assessment No. 200104)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Layover to LH April 9, 11 AM (unable to reach owner).*

*Moermond left message 4/2 at 11:10 am*

*Moermond left message 4/2 at 11:34 am to reschedule with Mai Vang.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/9/2020**

- 18 RLH TA 20-206** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 473 HOWELL STREET SOUTH. (File No. CG2001B1, Assessment No. 200104)

**Sponsors:** Tolbert

*Reduce assessment from \$323.55 to \$281.36.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$323.55, Waste Management requested the late fees of \$42.19 be removed, so we recommend reducing to \$281.36.*

*Moermond: and you've communicated with the owner?*

*Mai Vang: communicated with the daughter, and she's handling her mom's bills and when I told her about it, she said she's fine with the reduction and will contact Real Estate to pay the fee.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

- 19 RLH TA 20-216** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 799 WATSON AVENUE. (File No. CG2001B2, Assessment No. 200105)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Delete the assessment.*

*Mark Dezelar, owner, appeared VIA telephone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$2.71 for service Quarter 4, 2019, appealing because the property owner made a payment for \$66.91 on December 19, 2020 on a final invoice of \$69.95. They shouldn't have an assessment, there should have been a credit applied to their bill. Staff comments that the hauler did say they had a credit, therefore the total balance due was \$16.51 which is why the late fee was only \$2.24 instead of the normal amount of \$3.04. Hauler also confirmed that the Quarter 4, 2019 bill of \$44.30 was not paid in full until November 12, 2019. Payment was therefore late, and resulted in the late fee charge and we recommend approving.*

*Moermond: it sounds like you were making a good faith effort to address the bill situation. Has the bill paying been going ok otherwise, no issues?*

*Dezelar: I just don't get why I had credit and still got a late fee.*

*Moermond: I think you were making a good faith effort and we'll recommend this is deleted.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

### Special Tax Assessments-ROLLS

- 20 RLH AR 20-54** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001A1, Assessment No. 200100)  
**Sponsors:** Brendmoen  
**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**
- 21 RLH AR 20-55** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001A2, Assessment No. 200101)  
**Sponsors:** Brendmoen  
**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**
- 22 RLH AR 20-56** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001A3, Assessment No. 200102)  
**Sponsors:** Brendmoen  
**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**
- 23 RLH AR 20-57** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001A4, Assessment No. 200103)  
**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

- 24 RLH AR 20-58** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001B1, Assessment No. 200104)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**

- 25 RLH AR 20-59** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001B2, Assessment No. 200105)

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 5/27/2020**