



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 9, 2020

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

Special Tax Assessments

9:00 a.m. Hearings

- 1 **RLH TA 20-237** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 335 ARBOR STREET. (File No. CG2001B1, Assessment No. 200104)

Sponsors: Noecker

Approve the assessment.

Sean McGraf, owner, appeared via phone

McGraf: ever since I talked to this gal in the afternoon on Monday, both Monday morning and Monday evening. She claimed you would call at 9 am on Thursday, but the fact of the matter is I've had my barrel out in the alley and it hasn't been picked up ever since! She said it would be! I've got the same kind of proof she had that they haven't been here.

Moermond: I need to state a couple of things for the record on your assessment, this recommendation goes to the Council.

McGraf: I was in there on the 2nd at 9:00 am and I talked to somebody. They claimed they were going to call me back, and I finally heard from a gal that I just told you about on Monday. That was Thursday the second that I was in court.

Moermond: Sir, I'm sure you understand that the Covid19 crisis has profoundly affected how the courthouse operates. You do have a hearing now; you seem to be available. I'd like to move forward and get a staff report, and then we'll talk with you again.

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$80.28 For Quarter 4, 2019. Property owner states that he has a 35 gallon cart with every week service but has not received service. He also still has his Walter garbage can that he would like removed from property. Staff comments are that we spoke with Waste Management and the cart has been serviced regularly for one small cart with every week pickup, there were some dates where the cart in February and March 2020 where the cart wasn't being put out for service. Apart from these dates it appears the resident was using the service, therefore we recommend approving the assessment.

Moermond: so he is by and large using the cart, even if he doesn't put it out he's still responsible for the bill?

Pillsbury: yes, correct.

Moermond: so we have a single family home with a small cart, that's what the bill is, every week. Mr. McGraf you were saying several things pretty quickly, I'd like you to slow down and tell me a bit about what you're looking for today.

*McGraf: oh boy, I get to go! I was told the reason my trash wasn't being picked up was because I didn't have my can out. That wasn't true. Bullsh*t. My can has been out since I talked to her. Nobody has showed up to pick it up, since I talked to her. I think this is a bunch of crap. Bye! [hangs up]*

Moermond: we didn't have a chance to talk about decreasing service level or anything, though he has some frustration with the service provision, we weren't able to explore that to see if we could assist. Bottom line that doesn't affect whether he owes a bill for this particular property. He does, and it went unpaid, so we have a bill with late fees attached. I'm going to recommend approval of the assessment.

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

Delete the assessment.

Becky Austin, owner, appeared via phone

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$595.78 for service quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because the property owner stated they received their quarter 4, 2019 bill in the amount of \$288.24 and paid that October 29, 2019, and that went to the old account, and was told in January it had been rectified. Staff comments are the original invoice was \$884.02 which included the quarterly charge for three 64 gallon containers along with \$578 worth of back bills. Therefore, the current pending assessment, we did confirm with the hauler that the back bill had been added to quarter 3, 2019 bill and recommend removing per the hauler's request.

Moermond: so the hauler made a mistake in billing and caused the homeowner some difficulty. Who is the hauler?

Pillsbury: Republic

Moermond: can we communicate with them this is not ok, the property owner shouldn't have to go this level to get it addressed.

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

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

Reduce assessment from \$927.78 to \$89.75.

Becky Austin, owner, appeared via phone

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$927.78 for Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because the property owner said they already paid the invoice in October of 2019. Staff comments are that we confirmed that the assessment was for back billing originally meant to cover inaccurate invoices generated for Quarter 4 2018 to Quarter 4 2019, the level of service had been for three 64 gallon carts and one 94 gallon cart so the price would have been \$398.68 per quarter. In quarter four 2018 an invoice was issued for \$300.93 which would be \$80.75 short. In Quarter 1, 2019 an invoice was generated for \$0, which would be \$300.68 short, and Quarter 2, 2019 an invoice was generated for \$0, which would be \$300.68 short. This led to a back bill of \$871.11 with late fees of \$56.67, for a total assessment was \$927.78. The hauler acknowledged there was a temporary service hold in place for quarters 1 and 2, 2019, therefore the invoice of \$0 for each quarter was correct. We recommend reducing by the total late fees, \$56.67 plus the amount back billed for quarter 1 and 2 2019, which would be \$781.36, reducing the assessment to \$89.75.

Moermond: so the only part of the charge that was accurate was the Quarter 4, 2018, which they short billed by \$89.75. They should have billed that much more for that quarter, but the rest were in error. So, the rest would get deleted. Is this what you're looking for today Ms. Austen?

Austin: no, I want it to end.

Moermond: the hearing? The program?

Austin: I just spend too much time trying to figure out my bill.

Moermond: I know you have. Let's add onto our communication with him about how this was done very poorly. They were very high. It doesn't reflect well on them or on the City. We'll get this decreased and we'll follow through making sure the hauler is aware.

Austin: how do I pay that if I don't want it to go on my taxes?

Moermond: you will get a letter from the assessment office, indicating the reduction. You'll get it the first couple weeks in June, after it is approved by Council.

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

4 RLH TA 20-191 Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 908 LAUREL AVENUE. (File No. CG2001A2, Assessment No. 200101)

Sponsors: Thao

Reduce assessment from \$163.77 to \$40.92.

No one appeared

Moermond: for this 908 Laurel there was follow up with Republic. There was a fair bit of mis-billing involved, and we arrived at, in the course of last week's hearing, was that the \$480.64 proposed assessment should be reduced to at least \$167, but there were additional questions proposed to Republic.

Clare Pillsbury: the hauler did confirm the property was receiving service for two 35

gallon, every other week service, since September 24, 2019, quarter 3, 2019. Resident should have been billed \$40.92 for quarter four, 2019, this is less than the cost of two 35 gallon carts with every other week service, which would have been \$115.20. We recommend reducing to the amount proposed by the hauler, of \$40.92.

Moermond: so it would appear the hauler is going to take some ownership of this which is good, but the poor property owner has been through a lot. Ms. Vang, I understand you had a chance to talk to Mr. Pizzuti? Or was it you Ms. Pillsbury?

Pillsbury: it was me, he's aware of the reduction.

Moermond: ok, so he is aware of the reduction and is ok with it, so we'll go ahead and reduce to that \$40.92.

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

- 5 RLH TA 20-196** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 385 MARYLAND AVENUE EAST. (File No. CG2001B3, Assessment No. 200106)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Reduce the assessment from \$109.11 to \$79.98.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$109.11 for Quarter 4, 2019. Basically, the property owner was being billed for a 64 gallon when they had a 35 gallon, so Waste Management is requesting we reduce the total assessment by \$29.13 (the difference in cost between 32-gallon and 64-gallon cart). The new assessment total would be \$79.98.

Moermond: that makes sense, let's go with that.

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

- 6 RLH TA 20-238** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1347 SIMPSON STREET (File No. CG2001B4, Assessment No. 200107)

Sponsors: Jalali

Delete the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$80.68 for service quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because they had received no service since July of 2019 when the owner passed away and they have been in storage ever since. Staff recommends as a courtesy that it gets deleted.

Moermond: let's go ahead and delete that assessment. I'm curious, have either of you talked with Mark Kelsey. Is he selling the house? I'm curious where we go from here, whether it is appropriate to have a service hold, is it vacant or is someone still living there?

Pillsbury: I did speak with him. He is selling the house sometime this week, and he

actually paid the assessment because he didn't want anything on the property when he closed. I would say service should continue as normal, the new owner should call the hauler if they want a change in service. The assessment office will hopefully refund him the \$80.68 he paid.

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

10:00 a.m. Hearings

- 7 **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

Approve the assessment.

Wayne Carlson, owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: my job is to review your appeal on these two tax assessments for garbage hauling at 542 Ohio, develop a recommendation for Council, if you're ok with that recommendation they will go with it, but if for any reason you are not okay with it, it goes to a Public Hearing so you can present your perspective to Council. We start with a staff report so we know why we're looking at the assessment, and then talk with you about why you're appealing and what you're looking for. One is for the third quarter of 2019, one is for the fourth quarter 2019.

Carlson: ok, you have all my communication? I don't have anything in front of me because I wasn't expecting a call from you this morning. I'm totally unprepared for this call. I have sent everything into Chris, I assume you got that.

Moermond: I have everything you sent to Chris and his responses to you. Last week when we spoke we scheduled this time, when you weren't available at this time last Thursday.

Carlson: how did you schedule that? I wrote back to Chris that I didn't have anything scheduled with you.

Moermond: Sir, we spoke in person on the phone, I have a recording of that conversation.

Carlson: you do not have that recording!

Moermond: I do.

Carlson: you never made any appointment, I had to ask you to call, to give me a phone number and I'd call you back to make an appointment, you never did that.

Moermond: sir, we also have an email from Chris Swanson April 6 at 5:09 p.m. that confirms in all capital letters, underlined and bold that you have an appointment at 10 am Thursday, April 9th.

Carlson: I don't have anything like that at all. You've got my letter, so I guess all you need to say is I think I owe like \$1,100 and wanted to know how much had been certified to my taxes already and how much I owed for the third and fourth quarter, and

I'd pay it, based on \$19.20 per unit per month for those quarters.

Moermond: I'm going to get a staff report on those third and fourth quarter assessments and we'll come back and talk to you.

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: the third quarter is for \$445.11 and fourth quarter for \$843.15. For the third quarter the resident stated he should pay less than the assessed amount, what he has now is four small containers with every other week service. He only wants to pay what he feels he should owe. There was a small billing error in the third quarter, we noticed the total invoice should have been \$441.95, so that difference—

Carlson: for the two quarters I expect to pay \$460.80, that's 19.20 per unit for six months, times four units.

Pillsbury: that difference \$3.16 was credited by Republic, so we recommend approving the third quarter assessment. For Quarter 4, 2019, the resident was incorrectly billed in the amount of \$266.53 in the original invoice, the hauler confirmed that the back bill of \$266.53 was remaining back bill from quarter 4, 2018 and quarter 1 2019 was incorrect, so we recommend reducing to \$576.62.

Carlson: that's for the fourth quarter?

Pillsbury: yes.

Carlson: how much was the third quarter?

Pillsbury: \$445.11.

Carlson: you're about \$700 too high. I owe \$19.20 per unit per month, times six months.

Moermond: what are you basing that rate on sir?

Carlson: \$115 per unit times four, equals \$460.80.

Moermond: what are you basing that number on sir?

Carlson: I just told you! I'm basing it on the rate of \$19.20.

Moermond: what is that rate for sir?

Carlson: Would you shut up! We just talked about it, I'm trying to tell you! Shut your mouth until I get through! I'm basing it on \$19.20 per unit per month. Six units, six months is \$115 per unit for six months, times four equals \$460.80. Are you there?

Moermond: I'm here, I'm waiting for you to talk more.

Carlson: I'm through! I owe you \$460.80 for six months of no trash service. Nothing has been picked up. I'm through.

Moermond: so in reviewing your appeal you have four medium carts for this time period that we're talking about. You don't have four small carts.

Carlson: Don't try to hose me for a medium cart. There was nothing picked up, I was never told there was different sizes of cans, they're laying in the back not being used and you wouldn't even let me throw them away or give them back, I had to store those damn things for you. I resent you trying to hose me for medium carts when nothing was picked up at all. I don't think there's anything further to talk about. Put me in front of the Council. When am I supposed to be in front of Council?

Moermond: it says on each of these letters you received on these assessments when your public hearing is.

Carlson: can you repeat that time and date for me?

Moermond: both of them are scheduled for May 27, 3:30 PM. It is also in the letters you've received.

Carlson: ok I'll be there, thank you. Bye.

Moermond: I didn't get a chance to put my recommendation on the record before he hung up. He seems to be thinking he should pay for the lower level of service, but he wasn't able to articulate why he thought the \$19.20/unit was correct. I wasn't clear on why he was calculating six units instead of four, I believe this is a fourplex. The other thing is that he doesn't have the same service level now, as he did in these quarters. I'm going to turn it over to you guys, we have four units, medium containers.

Chris Swanson: I can speak to this, what I think Mr. Carlson was referencing for the \$19.20 that is the per month charge for a small every other week cart in 2020. That is also reflecting the reduction of rates we saw in 2020. We're looking at quarters 3 and 4 in 2019, he had four medium carts at his property at this time. The per quarter charge, with late fees, is \$110.49, times by the four carts he had, we have \$441.96 per quarter for his units. That's why he's trying to push that \$19.20 per unit charge. Staff actually worked recently with Mr. Carlson to bring him small every other week carts at the end of March. Moving forward, he will see a reduced bill, reflecting the four small every other week carts.

Moermond: looking at the fourth quarter bill here, it says the resident was incorrectly back billed for \$266.53 and then staff are saying you've confirmed that, for quarter 4, 2018 but that's not the amount you have in your email. The amount of the adjustment—oh I see it's a credit that got issued. So they over billed him, sent it to assessment, and instead of asking for the assessment to be decreased they chose to credit his account moving forward and ask for the assessment to move forward at the higher level.

Swanson: we're talking quarter 4, 2019 right?

Moermond: we're talking quarter 4 and why there's an extra \$266 above. \$576 is not what the amount would be right?

Pillsbury: it is \$800, oh I see.

Swanson: what we see for quarter 4, 2019 is the full charge for four medium carts at the property, and the back bill for quarter 2, 2019. What happened there was Republic under charged this resident for the carts, they have adjusted the bill down to only \$134.64 for the back bill. So the combined amount for the \$441.98 for quarter 4, 2019 and the back bill which is roughly \$135 is the \$576.62 you see in front of you.

Moermond: my reading of the contract, quite frankly, is once they send it to assessment, it is our responsibility to figure out what the correct amount would be if it is under appeal and to resolve the matter. Them going and leaving the assessment as it stands and using a credit within their Corporation is an abuse of the assessment system. That takes advantage, it is completely inappropriate they would have operated in this fashion. This is the first time I've seen it this screwed up in this way. In any other case where I see this come forward like this, I'm going to recommend it gets down to the original level, and they will have to deal with it on their end. Crediting once it is an assessment is not an acceptable billing practice, and we won't move forward with it. We'll dock them in their repayment. In this particular case, this is their one time we will go with it, and I'll recommend for the third quarter, which appears to have been inaccurately assessed, but knowing they've credited the account, and recommend approval. For the fourth quarter, we will reduce from \$843.15 to \$576.62. Dealing with the way they've done the credit on the account, and again, this is not an acceptable billing practice and we will simply dock and assessment the amount the correct bill should be.

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

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

Sponsors: Noecker

Reduce assessment from \$843.15 to \$576.62.

Wayne Carlson, owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: my job is to review your appeal on these two tax assessments for garbage hauling at 542 Ohio, develop a recommendation for Council, if you're ok with that recommendation they will go with it, but if for any reason you are not okay with it, it goes to a Public Hearing so you can present your perspective to Council. We start with a staff report so we know why we're looking at the assessment, and then talk with you about why you're appealing and what you're looking for. One is for the third quarter of 2019, one is for the fourth quarter 2019.

Carlson: ok, you have all my communication? I don't have anything in front of me because I wasn't expecting a call from you this morning. I'm totally unprepared for this call. I have sent everything into Chris, I assume you got that.

Moermond: I have everything you sent to Chris and his responses to you. Last week when we spoke we scheduled this time, when you weren't available at this time last Thursday.

Carlson: how did you schedule that? I wrote back to Chris that I didn't have anything scheduled with you.

Moermond: Sir, we spoke in person on the phone, I have a recording of that conversation.

Carlson: you do not have that recording!

Moermond: I do.

Carlson: you never made any appointment, I had to ask you to call, to give me a phone number and I'd call you back to make an appointment, you never did that.

Moermond: sir, we also have an email from Chris Swanson April 6 at 5:09 p.m. that confirms in all capital letters, underlined and bold that you have an appointment at 10 am Thursday, April 9th.

Carlson: I don't have anything like that at all. You've got my letter, so I guess all you need to say is I think I owe like \$1,100 and wanted to know how much had been certified to my taxes already and how much I owed for the third and fourth quarter, and I'd pay it, based on \$19.20 per unit per month for those quarters.

Moermond: I'm going to get a staff report on those third and fourth quarter assessments and we'll come back and talk to you.

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: the third quarter is for \$445.11 and fourth quarter for \$843.15. For the third quarter the resident stated he should pay less than the assessed amount, what he has now is four small containers with every other week service. He only wants to pay what he feels he should owe. There was a small billing error in the third quarter, we noticed the total invoice should have been \$441.95, so that difference—

Carlson: for the two quarters I expect to pay \$460.80, that's 19.20 per unit for six months, times four units.

Pillsbury: that difference \$3.16 was credited by Republic, so we recommend approving the third quarter assessment. For Quarter 4, 2019, the resident was incorrectly billed in the amount of \$266.53 in the original invoice, the hauler confirmed that the back bill of \$266.53 was remaining back bill from quarter 4, 2018 and quarter 1 2019 was incorrect, so we recommend reducing to \$576.62.

Carlson: that's for the fourth quarter?

Pillsbury: yes.

Carlson: how much was the third quarter?

Pillsbury: \$445.11.

Carlson: you're about \$700 too high. I owe \$19.20 per unit per month, times six months.

Moermond: what are you basing that rate on sir?

Carlson: \$115 per unit times four, equals \$460.80.

Moermond: what are you basing that number on sir?

Carlson: I just told you! I'm basing it on the rate of \$19.20.

Moermond: what is that rate for sir?

Carlson: Would you shut up! We just talked about it, I'm trying to tell you! Shut your mouth until I get through! I'm basing it on \$19.20 per unit per month. Six units, six

months is \$115 per unit for six months, times four equals \$460.80. Are you there?

Moermond: I'm here, I'm waiting for you to talk more.

Carlson: I'm through! I owe you \$460.80 for six months of no trash service. Nothing has been picked up. I'm through.

Moermond: so in reviewing your appeal you have four medium carts for this time period that we're talking about. You don't have four small carts.

Carlson: Don't try to hose me for a medium cart. There was nothing picked up, I was never told there was different sizes of cans, they're laying in the back not being used and you wouldn't even let me throw them away or give them back, I had to store those damn things for you. I resent you trying to hose me for medium carts when nothing was picked up at all. I don't think there's anything further to talk about. Put me in front of the Council. When am I supposed to be in front of Council?

Moermond: it says on each of these letters you received on these assessments when your public hearing is.

Carlson: can you repeat that time and date for me?

Moermond: both of them are scheduled for May 27, 3:30 PM. It is also in the letters you've received.

Carlson: ok I'll be there, thank you. Bye.

Moermond: I didn't get a chance to put my recommendation on the record before he hung up. He seems to be thinking he should pay for the lower level of service, but he wasn't able to articulate why he thought the \$19.20/unit was correct. I wasn't clear on why he was calculating six units instead of four, I believe this is a fourplex. The other thing is that he doesn't have the same service level now, as he did in these quarters. I'm going to turn it over to you guys, we have four units, medium containers.

Chris Swanson: I can speak to this, what I think Mr. Carlson was referencing for the \$19.20 that is the per month charge for a small every other week cart in 2020. That is also reflecting the reduction of rates we saw in 2020. We're looking at quarters 3 and 4 in 2019, he had four medium carts at his property at this time. The per quarter charge, with late fees, is \$110.49, times by the four carts he had, we have \$441.96 per quarter for his units. That's why he's trying to push that \$19.20 per unit charge. Staff actually worked recently with Mr. Carlson to bring him small every other week carts at the end of March. Moving forward, he will see a reduced bill, reflecting the four small every other week carts.

Moermond: looking at the fourth quarter bill here, it says the resident was incorrectly back billed for \$266.53 and then staff are saying you've confirmed that, for quarter 4, 2018 but that's not the amount you have in your email. The amount of the adjustment—oh I see it's a credit that got issued. So they over billed him, sent it to assessment, and instead of asking for the assessment to be decreased they chose to credit his account moving forward and ask for the assessment to move forward at the higher level.

Swanson: we're talking quarter 4, 2019 right?

Moermond: we're talking quarter 4 and why there's an extra \$266 above. \$576 is not what the amount would be right?

Pillsbury: it is \$800, oh I see.

Swanson: what we see for quarter 4, 2019 is the full charge for four medium carts at the property, and the back bill for quarter 2, 2019. What happened there was Republic under charged this resident for the carts, they have adjusted the bill down to only \$134.64 for the back bill. So the combined amount for the \$441.98 for quarter 4, 2019 and the back bill which is roughly \$135 is the \$576.62 you see in front of you.

Moermond: my reading of the contract, quite frankly, is once they send it to assessment, it is our responsibility to figure out what the correct amount would be if it is under appeal and to resolve the matter. Them going and leaving the assessment as it stands and using a credit within their Corporation is an abuse of the assessment system. That takes advantage, it is completely inappropriate they would have operated in this fashion. This is the first time I've seen it this screwed up in this way. In any other case where I see this come forward like this, I'm going to recommend it gets down to the original level, and they will have to deal with it on their end. Crediting once it is an assessment is not an acceptable billing practice, and we won't move forward with it. We'll dock them in their repayment. In this particular case, this is their one time we will go with it, and I'll recommend for the third quarter, which appears to have been inaccurately assessed, but knowing they've credited the account, and recommend approval. For the fourth quarter, we will reduce from \$843.15 to \$576.62. Dealing with the way they've done the credit on the account, and again, this is not an acceptable billing practice and we will simply dock and assessment the amount the correct bill should be.

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

9 [RLH TA 20-236](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1223 FARRINGTON STREET. (File No. CG2001C2, Assessment No. 200109)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Layover to LH April 16 at 10 AM (rescheduled per owner's request).

Voicemail left by Marcia Moermond April 9 at 10:27 AM

Voicemail left by Marcia Moermond April 9 at 10:40 AM – laying over to next Thursday April 16 at 10 AM.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/16/2020

10 **RLH TA 20-221**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1140 GALTIER STREET. (File No. CG2001C2, Assessment No. 200109)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Delete the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$99.89 for Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing

because the property owner received a notice from the City for Quarter 4, they contacted Advanced in fall 2019 to request a service hold, and were told a service hold would be put into place, and they feel like there shouldn't have been assessment. We did speak with the hauler and they confirmed the service hold at the beginning of quarter 4, until April 1, 2020, and requested it be removed.

Moermond: I agree, remove the assessment.

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

11:00 a.m. Hearings

- 11** **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 16, 2020 at 11 AM (unable to reach owner).

Voicemail left by Marcia Moermond April 9 at 11:07 to try back in about 15 mins

Voicemail left by Marcia Moermond April 9 at 11:24 AM that we'd be laying it over to April 16.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/16/2020

- 12** [RLH TA 20-220](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1145 DALE STREET NORTH. (File No. CG2001C3, Assessment No. 200110)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Layover to LH April 16, 2020 at 11 AM (unable to reach owner).

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$110.48 for Quarter 4, 2019 for a medium cart and three late fees. Appealing because they originally received a 94 gallon cart, and they tried to switch to a 35 gallon cart with every other week service and were told they would have to wait to January 2019 to do this. The resident says they tried to contact the hauler multiple times and request the change, the hauler stated they would delivery it and never did. We did reach out to the hauler and confirm that on November 23, 2019 the property owner requested the cart change from 96 to 64 gallon. There are no records requesting a switch to 35 gallon service. The hauler did state they will be delivering a 35 gallon cart, so we recommend approving the assessment.

Moermond: it says removing in the comments.

Pillsbury: there should be an update that says approving. Under 3-30-20.

Moermond: I have one that says to delete. So this is not to delete, so it is not a matter of reading it into the record. Do we have a phone number for this person?

Pillsbury: I wasn't able to get in contact with them.

Mai Vang: it was a wrong number when I called, I got someone else.

Pillsbury: 8309?

Mai Vang: no, I had 263-8356.

Pillsbury: I was able to get a number off STAMP, I believe the first number we had was incorrect. I found 235-8309 in stamp, and it stated the number wouldn't accept incoming calls.

Chris Swanson: I have another number, so we can try to call them back and talk about it next week. 612-407-8145, this is from Advanced's customer service notes for Rick Larson.

Moermond: we'll continue this to next Thursday, April 16 at 11:00 AM.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/16/2020

13 RLH TA 20-235 Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 2085 STILLWATER AVENUE. (File No. CG2001C3, Assessment No. 200110)

Sponsors: Yang

Approve the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: original amount was \$228.30. there was a payment made to assessment, so it was reduced to \$13.50. Resident is appealing because she doesn't believe she should owe this amount, she took ownership mid-December 2019 and did not receive service for weeks because of problems setting up service with hauler. The original invoice was \$228.16 for a 64 gallon and 96 gallon with late fees. The hauler confirmed the previous owner made a payment of \$215.16 to the assessment's office. The \$13.50 was the amount unpaid by the previous owner. Since the current owner is responsible for paying all assessments we recommend approval.

Moermond: this is a little confusing, so two containers. What is the bill for 64 and 94 gallon?

Pillsbury: with late fees it would be \$228.28.

Moermond: so I'm curious why if the hauler is paying the previous owner paid \$215, the cost of the assessment, is the \$228 accurate?

Pillsbury: that is what we originally got sent to us.

Moermond: it seems like it should be \$13.

Swanson: did they pay the City part of the assessment?

Pillsbury: the owner did make a payment after I spoke with her about the assessment, so it won't show up.

Swanson: the \$13 was what was left over on the City's property taxes after the closing company paid the \$215. And it does look like the owner has paid the assessment.

Moermond: how about going to the Assessment Roll for the file? So the cost is \$13.50, that's what should be in that line. And the current owner paid that amount.

Pillsbury: yes.

Moermond: so we will approve it, knowing it has been paid.

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

Special Tax Assessments-ROLLS

- 14 RLH AR 20-66** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001B3, Assessment No. 200106)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

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

- 15 RLH AR 20-67** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001B4, Assessment No. 200107)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

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

- 16 RLH AR 20-68** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001C1, Assessment No. 200108)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

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

- 17 RLH AR 20-69** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001C2, Assessment No. 200109)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

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

- 18 RLH AR 20-70** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001C3, Assessment No. 200110)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

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

- 19 RLH AR 20-71** Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001C4, Assessment No. 200111)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

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

Due to Covid-19 Health pandemic, these hearings will be held by telephone.