



# 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 16, 2020

9:00 AM

VIA TELEPHONE

---

#### Special Tax Assessments

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

- 1     [RLH TA 20-267](#)     Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 876 ARKWRIGHT STREET. (File No. CG2001D2, Assessment No. 200113)

**Sponsors:**     Brendmoen

*Layover to LH April 30, 2020 at 10 AM. Staff to look into where payment on wrong account went.*

*Ka Houa Moua Vang, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: for large cart weekly for quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because the property owner says she already paid her quarter 4, 2019 bill. We spoke with the hauler and the last payment made was July 18, 2019 with no records of payment quarter 4, 2019. Property owner did provide payment to Waste Management, however the last 5 digits of the account on the bank statement don't match the last 5 with Waste Management. It appears as though the payment was made to the wrong account with Waste Management, therefore we recommend approving.*

*Chris Swanson: additionally, staff will follow up with Waste Management to identify where that payment went and move it onto this account as a credit moving forward.*

*Moermond: So, Waste Management will be able to identify what account it went into?*

*Swanson: they should be able to.*

*Moermond: it got paid to the wrong account, we're not sure how or why that happened. Payment was made by you, but the right account never got money. Staff are telling me they are going to make Waste Management figure out where that money went and credit your account, so you don't have a bill to pay for your next bill. So, we'll approve this assessment today, and delete the late fees off of it, and the money that got paid to wrong account, they will find and put it on your current account, so you have a credit.*

*Swanson: we'll have Waste Management look into the payment on their side and see if they can identify where it went, but we also ask if you follow up with Wells Fargo to see if they can see where it went too. It is hard for Waste Management to do with only the*

*few account numbers show, sometimes the bank can do it quicker, and even pull the money back themselves.*

*Moermond: so, can you call your bank and ask them about this payment made on October 21, 2019? There should be an account number at Waste Management for that transfer of money.*

*Vang: I already called them, they said they wouldn't be able to do that because they only had four numbers.*

*Swanson: Ultimately if they can't figure out what account it was paid on, I'd like to have them remove the assessment.*

*Moermond: I'd like to lay this over to April 30, and that time we'll either delete or make sure you have a credit on your account, I just don't know which yet. That will be between 10 and 11 am.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/30/2020**

**2 RLH TA 20-240**

**Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1083 BRADLEY STREET. (File No. CG2001D2, Assessment No. 200113)**

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

*Reduce assessment from \$109.64 to \$60.83. Staff to reduce Q1, 2020 assessment from \$107.02 to \$57.60.*

*Brent Rekstad, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$109.64 for service Quarter 4, 2019. Resident is appealing because "I have been unemployed since this program started in October 2018. I do not think it's fair to assess and force a fee on someone when they are going through a financial hardship and who doesn't have the ability to pay. It's completely unfair to force someone to pay for something that I don't need nor do I want nor can I afford to pay. I have other more pertinent bills to pay and am looking to cut costs wherever I can." Staff comments are that under citywide garbage service, all residential properties with up to four units, including rental homes and town homes, are required to have a garbage cart and receive garbage service for each dwelling unit. Property owners must provide garbage service for all occupied dwellings. There is no option to opt out of the citywide garbage service. Any garbage service provided must be paid for by the property owner. Staff recommends approving the assessment.*

*Moermond: the cost in the assessment file is \$109.64. What is that charge for?*

*Pillsbury: one medium cart and additional late fees.*

*Rekstad: every other place I've lived, and I've lived several places, Minneapolis, Rochester, West St. Paul, I have never been required to have service until you started this new program. Prior to it being passed by Council, I never had to have service. To tell me that it is a public health hazard to not have service, prior to this being approved by Council and signed by the mayor, why is it now a public hazard when it wasn't before?*

*Moermond: are you asking for me to comment on that?*

*Rekstad: I want it on the record, but I also want to know.*

*Moermond: the City of Minneapolis actually provides services to all the properties in the City, instead of being billed directly, it is part of the water bill. That has been in place for decades. I don't know about the other cities. With respect to St. Paul requiring service, there was an ordinance requiring every residential property to have service, if you didn't have service they would write an order requiring you to get service. It was used sparingly, but it did exist. I would like to help you with your situation as best I can. Mr. Swanson, anything to add?*

*Swanson: I can speak briefly to the "why" of the program. When this was adopted, we wanted to standardize service across St. Paul to ensure all residents regardless of location and income or geographic location had access to service. Before this service came to be there was a patchwork of services for residences, this helped standardized rates. It was also to ensure that people had access to trash to reduce dumping, we do still have issues, but it should decrease moving forward. Those were the broader policy goals.*

*Moermond: I'd like to help you get your bill cut down here though. I'm wondering about the amount of garbage you generate; do you use the full amount of the 64 gallon cart?*

*Rekstad: I've already discussed this with Clare, and I'm actually going to be calling her to reduce the size of the container. I do sometimes use the entire bin, sometimes I don't.*

*Moermond: do you think you need every week or every other week service for the 35 gallon, which is the next size down?*

*Rekstad: regardless, the cost is the same, isn't it?*

*Moermond: I'd like to help you looking at this bill and looking backwards. If you decrease cart size and service it will knock down the bill going forward, and I can also knock down the bill in front of me, to kind of promote the step you're taking. Clare can reach out directly to the hauler about the cart switch.*

*Pillsbury: they will pick up your cart when you put it out on the day of service.*

*Rekstad: let's say that I go to every other week, let's say one week I don't have anything but the next week I have more than what fits in the container. Is there an added charge for that?*

*Moermond yes \$3 a bag extra for everything outside the container. So, you may want to hold onto things that won't go bad or go with a weekly container. What's the difference between small every week and every other week?*

*Swanson: about \$10.*

*Moermond: so, if he has 3 or fewer bags over the quarter, it is better with the every other week, but anything more than that he probably wants to go with every other week service.*

*Rekstad: what is the policy on, let's say I can't close the container, it's above the rim. I feel like we're being nicked and dined on things. That upsets me.*

Swanson: if the lid is open over 6 inches they can charge an additional bag fee. You currently have a 65 gallon cart, so the new size is a quarter of that, that helps people picture it.

Rekstad: you said the hauler could. They do or they don't, or it is up to them?

Swanson: the driver on the route, it is at their discretion. If they do, they take a picture for the record.

Moermond: it also helps us to see if it was or wasn't valid. Would you prefer to go with every week or every other week service?

Rekstad: the difference was \$10, but there was no mention about the weekly cost.

Moermond: it's a 3 month time period.

Swanson: For a weekly 32 gallon cart the cost is \$67.29 a quarter. It would go down from \$93.09 a quarter. Every other week service per quarter is \$57.60. So you would actually see a \$35.49 decrease with the every other week cart.

Moermond: if you let me know right now, I'll adjust this assessment I'm looking at down knowing you've made that commitment. Are you willing to commit to that now?

Rekstad: yes.

Moermond: Which one would you like? Every week or every other?

Rekstad: I can't answer it quite yet, I know that Clare has said that I could change once a year without penalty, does that mean the size of the container or the type of service? So, if I were to say I want to go every week right now, but if I find that is too much and I'm not using that?

Pillsbury: you can request a cart swap. How much you're paying depends on cart size. Any change in service level is considered a cart swap. You can do one cart swap a year without an additional charge, otherwise it is \$25 additional.

Rekstad: so changing the service would be an additional \$25?

Swanson: yes, any change in service level.

Rekstad: which comes back to my irritation with everything being nickel and dimed, to be charged \$25 from a hauler for that is not right.

Moermond: I respect where you're coming from, but I have seven other cases before 10:00 and I really want to help you with your situation. It is on the record in writing for Council you aren't happy with the service or the billing process. I'd like to decrease this bill and the one pending for the first quarter, if you would like to decrease the size, I can do that, otherwise I can continue this conversation at another time.

Rekstad: if I do it another time will you cut me off and tell me you have other people to get to?

Moermond: maybe. With all due respect, I have a lot of people with these same concerns. I'm asking you a straightforward question. If you want to think about the

*change that is fine. What you're telling me, which is fine, it is in the record and doesn't need to be repeated again.*

*Rekstad: I want things to change.*

*Moermond: I get that sir. All I'm looking at bill in front of me, I'm not looking at a policy or a program. I have your bill for the fourth quarter of 2019 which I want to decrease, but I need you to meet me halfway.*

*Rekstad: I get that, but if I don't express my added concerns now they don't get expressed.*

*Moermond: they are being expressed and recorded, what else do you need?*

*Rekstad: I can't say anymore because I'm being cut off due to your other commitments. I'll commit to every other week smaller container.*

*Moermond: so that \$109 assessment to \$60.83. There aren't any late fees on that. The first quarter of 2020 is also unpaid, is that for the same amount?*

*Swanson: it is \$107.02 because rates went down for 2020.*

*Moermond: I'm going to recommend that is reduced to the small container too \$57.60. we're getting you to the smallest bill you can possibly have and the next time you put your cart out they will switch it out.*

*Rekstad: so next week I will have service, and then it will be every other week.*

*Moermond: we'll mail you a schedule of the service. Do you have an email address? We can send you an email with the notes going to Council. If you have anything else you want on the record, you can add anything else you want to at that point.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

**3      RLH TA 20-259      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1046 DESOTO STREET. (File No. CG2001D2, Assessment No. 200113)**

**Sponsors:**      Brendmoen

*Approve the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: for \$88.24 for Quarter 4, 2019. Resident is appealing because they say the bill was already paid to Waste Management. They state that in the past, bills were being mailed to the previous owners of the house. For an entire year Waste Management was not sending the bills to us, or our address. They were going to the previous owners and their new address. We have since spoken with Waste Management and had it corrected. In addition, their online system did not have our account connected to our address because of this problem. So we had a zero balance for a year and assumed all of the assessments notices were our garbage bills. Each were paid within a week of receiving them. Staff comments are that the current owners purchased the property in July 2018. The current property owners did reach out on July 15, 2018 to create an account with Waste Management. However with coordinated collection program starting, the account was then cancelled on September 3, 2018. The coordinated collection was set up with the previous property*

owner's name and mailing address. Waste Management was not contacted by the property owners about this error until November 2019. Therefore staff recommends approving the assessment. It appears the amount assessed is less than the current cost of service to a 64 gallon cart in 2019.

Moermond: so recommended.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 4      [RLH TA 20-270](#)      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 661 GERANIUM AVENUE EAST. (File No. CG2001D2, Assessment No. 200113)

Sponsors:      Yang

Layover to LH April 23, 2020 at 9 AM

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

- 5      **RLH TA 20-266**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1138 JESSIE STREET. (File No. CG2001D2, Assessment No. 200113)

Sponsors:      Brendmoen

Approve the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$80.67 for Quarter 4, 2019. Property owner stated that they already paid their Quarter 4, 2019 invoice and therefore should not have to pay the assessment. Hauler reported that they did not receive any payment to the account from October 1 to December 31, 2019. Therefore staff recommends approving the assessment.

Moermond: did you talk to the property owner at all about there being no record of payment?

Pillsbury: yes. We talked to them, they realized their error, and they made a payment in quarter 3, and didn't make a payment in quarter 4. They were going to pay it.

Moermond: approval of the assessment.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 6      **RLH TA 20-186**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1058 JESSIE STREET. (File No. CG2001D2, Assessment No. 200113)

Sponsors:      Brendmoen

Delete the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: for \$70.79 for Quarter 4, 2019. Resident stated that her second, 35 gallon, cart was removed from her property on July 1, 2019. Hauler confirmed they removed the cart; staff therefore recommends removing the

assessment.

Moermond: so recommended.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 7      **RLH TA 20-246**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 981 MENDOTA STREET. (File No. CG2001D1, Assessment No. 200112)

Sponsors:      Yang

Delete the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$110.48 for quarter 4, 2019 for a medium cart with 3 late fees. Property has been registered by the City of Saint Paul as Vacant since September 2018. Therefore, the resident should not have to pay for garbage service, therefore staff recommends deleting the assessment.

Moermond: delete the assessment.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 8      [RLH TA 20-256](#)      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 93 MILTON STREET NORTH. (File No. CG2001A2, Assessment No. 200101)

Sponsors:      Thao

Layover to LH April 30, 9 am. Staff to review back billing.

Alisa Lein, owner, appeared via phone

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for both 93 and 99 Milton Street North, both for a cost of \$845.89 for service Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because property owner believes they didn't receive acceptable customer service for their multi-family properties, as Republic couldn't break down the back bill when resident called in. The property owner believes these are reasonable requests for anyone being mandated charges by the City of St. Paul. If Republic or the City messed up on the billing or payment promises, they shouldn't be charged for the difference, therefore they should not pay the full assessment. Staff comments are, we did confirm with the hauler the invoice consists base cost of four 94 gallon carts with late fees, \$491.98 as well as a back bill from Quarter 4, 2018 to Quarter 2, 2019 for \$403.91. Resident was short billed for Quarter 4, 2018 \$154.85, Quarter 1, 2019 for \$139.88, and Quarter 2, 2019 for \$154.85. Staff recommends removing late fees on both the back bill for \$24.09 and the base cost for \$57.66 for a total of \$81.75. This would reduce the total assessment cost to \$763.24.

Chris Swanson: it is four medium carts, not four 94 gallon carts.

Moermond: can you tell me more about your conversation and communication with the hauler, the back and forth and how you became aware of this? I know I've seen assessments for these properties come forward before, and I was assuming at the time the assessment would have been for what an accurate bill would have been.

*Lein: just a quick clarification, the staff comments about the \$491.98 is that at typo or different than the spreadsheet Chris Swanson sent?*

*Swanson: that is at typo, it should be \$441.98.*

*Lein: ok, I will make note of that. We got the letter from Republic saying "oops, there was a mistake" and the billing wasn't correct, this was August 2019, but it had no details about the time frame, what the mistakes were, etc. I contacted them immediately, this was August 2019 and asked them to break down exactly what happened, the time frame, the number of lifts, so we know exactly what happened. Because of our apartment business we need to know exactly what is getting charged and when. I talked to a representative in August and they said they would and then I didn't hear anything back. When talking to that representative, they understood why I wouldn't want to pay and make sure it is clear. So, I waited and waited, and then I never heard anything, at that point when I called Republic they said "sorry, too bad, too late, everything had already been sent to the City" and they were washing their hands of this. They said I need to talk to City, and they had okayed the back billing. So that's when I roped in Chris Swanson, so Chris has been great being involved in the back and forth on this. This was January 2020, and here we are in April. It is just frustrating from a customer standpoint to have Republic say they won't help you, and now four months later Chris finally gets the information from August 2019, from bills for fourth quarter 2018.*

*Moermond: do you still have a copy of that letter from Republic in August?*

*Lein: yes. It is just a generic form letter, but I'm happy to send it.*

*Moermond: that would be helpful, I have been looking at the contract and noodling this situation myself and struggling with it. I won't have a conclusion today for you, what I'm going to do is lay this over to April 30, and I'll continue it until then, so I have 2 weeks to work through.*

*Lein: I've talked to other landlords in this same situation. There are many out there. I have something I'd like on the record. There's been a lot of back and forth on the phone, email, City staff and administration time for all of us except for Republic Services. Their billing department created this initial mistake, and then for about 7 months, from September of 2019 through March of 2020, Republic representatives highlighted their incompetency. Ignoring repeated customer requests for information. My dad has also spent hours dealing with this, lack of itemization, which is required by the contract, as well as failure to follow through on multiple customer requests. The solution proposed by City staff on April 9, 2020, eliminating the late fees is genuinely appreciated, but it still ends up penalizing the trash customers, which are the actual tenants as well as the landlords while assigning almost no responsibility to Republic. Republic ends up being paid in full, while customers and city staff are forced to waste valuable time, essentially for free. The initial amount quarter 4, 2018 billed by Republic, through second quarter 2019, we did dispute. Republic and the City's opportunity to confirm the accuracy of, and recalculate if needed, the disputed bills should have ended when the property tax assessment for those bills was declared accurate and valid by the Legislative Hearing Officer and Council months ago. That's where we're frustrated, we dealt with this so long ago, and it comes back and bites us so many months later.*

*Moermond: I hear you Ms. Lein. You mentioned you have other people who have*

experienced this. My ability to interact with this problem is limited people whose bills have gone to assessment and are appealed. I don't have or any authority to deal with a broader issue.

Lein: I think a lot of people just don't want to deal with it because they get tired of dealing with it, they just pay it to make it go away. The hauler gets their hand slapped, and there's no accountability for the hauler. We just have to keep taking this over and over again. In our mind Republic should forfeit all of those late fees, the underbilled amount, plus my time dealing with this. It is reasonable that the City has the staff time, just like they did for 2 couches that were dumped, where the City added service charges. That's a normal thing to do. It isn't unreasonable to ask for compensation for all our wasted time when it is ultimately their fault.

Moermond: Noted and point taken. We'll do some more homework and we'll call you back at 10 that morning on Thursday April 30th.

Lein: is there any way to do it first thing in the morning or lay it over another week, as a landlord that's a really busy day since it is the last day of the month.

Moermond: we can go to 9 am, I don't think it will take much time.

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/30/2020**

**9**      [RLH TA 20-255](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 99 MILTON STREET NORTH UNIT 1. (File No. CG2001A2, Assessment No. 200101)

**Sponsors:**      Thao

Layover to LH April 30, 9 am. Staff to review back billing.

Alisa Lein, owner, appeared via phone

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for both 93 and 99 Milton Street North, both for a cost of \$845.89 for service Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because property owner believes they didn't receive acceptable customer service for their multi-family properties, as Republic couldn't break down the back bill when resident called in. The property owner believes these are reasonable requests for anyone being mandated charges by the City of St. Paul. If Republic or the City messed up on the billing or payment promises, they shouldn't be charged for the difference, therefore they should not pay the full assessment. Staff comments are, we did confirm with the hauler the invoice consists base cost of four 94 gallon carts with late fees, \$491.98 as well as a back bill from Quarter 4, 2018 to Quarter 2, 2019 for \$403.91. Resident was short billed for Quarter 4, 2018 \$154.85, Quarter 1, 2019 for \$139.88, and Quarter 2, 2019 for \$154.85. Staff recommends removing late fees on both the back bill for \$24.09 and the base cost for \$57.66 for a total of \$81.75. This would reduce the total assessment cost to \$763.24.

Chris Swanson: it is four medium carts, not four 94 gallon carts.

Moermond: can you tell me more about your conversation and communication with the hauler, the back and forth and how you became aware of this? I know I've seen assessments for these properties come forward before, and I was assuming at the time the assessment would have been for what an accurate bill would have been.

*Lein: just a quick clarification, the staff comments about the \$491.98 is that at typo or different than the spreadsheet Chris Swanson sent?*

*Swanson: that is at typo, it should be \$441.98.*

*Lein: ok, I will make note of that. We got the letter from Republic saying "oops, there was a mistake" and the billing wasn't correct, this was August 2019, but it had no details about the time frame, what the mistakes were, etc. I contacted them immediately, this was August 2019 and asked them to break down exactly what happened, the time frame, the number of lifts, so we know exactly what happened. Because of our apartment business we need to know exactly what is getting charged and when. I talked to a representative in August and they said they would and then I didn't hear anything back. When talking to that representative, they understood why I wouldn't want to pay and make sure it is clear. So, I waited and waited, and then I never heard anything, at that point when I called Republic they said "sorry, too bad, too late, everything had already been sent to the City" and they were washing their hands of this. They said I need to talk to City, and they had okayed the back billing. So that's when I roped in Chris Swanson, so Chris has been great being involved in the back and forth on this. This was January 2020, and here we are in April. It is just frustrating from a customer standpoint to have Republic say they won't help you, and now four months later Chris finally gets the information from August 2019, from bills for fourth quarter 2018.*

*Moermond: do you still have a copy of that letter from Republic in August?*

*Lein: yes. It is just a generic form letter, but I'm happy to send it.*

*Moermond: that would be helpful, I have been looking at the contract and noodling this situation myself and struggling with it. I won't have a conclusion today for you, what I'm going to do is lay this over to April 30, and I'll continue it until then, so I have 2 weeks to work through.*

*Lein: I've talked to other landlords in this same situation. There are many out there. I have something I'd like on the record. There's been a lot of back and forth on the phone, email, City staff and administration time for all of us except for Republic Services. Their billing department created this initial mistake, and then for about 7 months, from September of 2019 through March of 2020, Republic representatives highlighted their incompetency. Ignoring repeated customer requests for information. My dad has also spent hours dealing with this, lack of itemization, which is required by the contract, as well as failure to follow through on multiple customer requests. The solution proposed by City staff on April 9, 2020, eliminating the late fees is genuinely appreciated, but it still ends up penalizing the trash customers, which are the actual tenants as well as the landlords while assigning almost no responsibility to Republic. Republic ends up being paid in full, while customers and city staff are forced to waste valuable time, essentially for free. The initial amount quarter 4, 2018 billed by Republic, through second quarter 2019, we did dispute. Republic and the City's opportunity to confirm the accuracy of, and recalculate if needed, the disputed bills should have ended when the property tax assessment for those bills was declared accurate and valid by the Legislative Hearing Officer and Council months ago. That's where we're frustrated, we dealt with this so long ago, and it comes back and bites us so many months later.*

*Moermond: I hear you Ms. Lein. You mentioned you have other people who have experienced this. My ability to interact with this problem is limited people whose bills*

have gone to assessment and are appealed. I don't have or any authority to deal with a broader issue.

*Lein: I think a lot of people just don't want to deal with it because they get tired of dealing with it, they just pay it to make it go away. The hauler gets their hand slapped, and there's no accountability for the hauler. We just have to keep taking this over and over again. In our mind Republic should forfeit all of those late fees, the underbilled amount, plus my time dealing with this. It is reasonable that the City has the staff time, just like they did for 2 couches that were dumped, where the City added service charges. That's a normal thing to do. It isn't unreasonable to ask for compensation for all our wasted time when it is ultimately their fault.*

*Moermond: Noted and point taken. We'll do some more homework and we'll call you back at 10 that morning on Thursday April 30th.*

*Lein: is there any way to do it first thing in the morning or lay it over another week, as a landlord that's a really busy day since it is the last day of the month.*

*Moermond: we can go to 9 am, I don't think it will take much time.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/30/2020**

**10 RLH TA 20-262**

**Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1399 MINNEHAHA AVENUE WEST. (File No. CG2001D1, Assessment No. 200112)**

**Sponsors:** Jalali

*Delete the assessment (Q4, 2019). Staff to delete assessment for Q3, 2019, and reduce pending Q1, 2020 assessment from \$77.36 to \$25.79.*

*Delta Irby, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$80.90 for quarter 4, 2019 for a small weekly cart with three late fees. Appealing because they state the home was unoccupied from February 19, 2019 to February 29, 2020. Resident states there has been no garbage collected in my home since February 2019. Disputing billing service October to December 2019. Staff comments are that we confirmed that the property was never listed as vacant or an unoccupied dwelling registration form filled out and submitted. The hauler said the resident reached out May of 2019, and was referred to the solid waste program staff, therefore we recommend approving the assessment.*

*Irby: I am looking for the process that tells me that I have to file a form, I learned of this form on Tuesday when I spoke with Ms. Pillsbury. No one told me I had to file a form, in the trauma of losing your home, I got a call from Ms. Childs in response to a message I left her. I never received or was told about any form. I don't think I should be assessed for 2019 or the first quarter 2020, no one has been in the home to create garbage. When I contacted Aspen, they admitted they haven't picked up garbage. My question is, where is the process that informs me of that form? I went online yesterday and nothing on the website points to a form. In the process of losing my home, when I contacted Ms. Childs and Aspen, someone would tell me about the form. I had no knowledge of this form until Tuesday.*

*Moermond: tell me about what was going on, the note says February 2019 through February 2020 it was unoccupied. You lost the home?*

*Irby: February 1, a pipe burst in my home on the third floor, it flooded all the way down to the basement. I lost the use of my home. The first floor was all moldy and the basement ceiling collapsed. We were moved out of our home February 19 and moved into a residence. I sent a copy of when I registered with the residence. We thought we'd be back home June 30th. That didn't happen. The house was down to the studs, I sent a picture to Ms. Pillsbury, so no one was in the home. It was built in 1845 so we had to check for asbestos. Even as of June, we didn't know when I would be able to move back in. I sent a copy of an email from the project manager in September. After the residence we moved into a rental home. In January of this year there was another claim filed for the radiators, no one could move in until that was addressed. We didn't move back in until March. My question again, is no one ever mentioned to me about this form.*

*Moermond: I just wrote down the time period in terms of quarterly bills, in terms of impact. The first quarter 2019 you were a vacant building for about 1/3. Then you were vacant for the second third and fourth quarter, and then about half of the first quarter 2020.*

*Irby: Ms. Clare said that it was already assessed, and I won't dispute that. In the confusion of losing my home I may have missed that bill.*

*Moermond: I can help you with 3 of the bills. The one in front of me today, it is basically because I believe you, for today I'm recommending deletion. There is a pending assessment for first quarter of 2020, I'm asking that to be reduced by half, and I can look at third quarter 2019 I can ask for that to be deleted. That's all I can help with today.*

*Irby: why would I be paying for the first quarter of 2020? No garbage has been collected at my home this year.*

*Moermond: you wrote that it was occupied as of March 1, so that's one month out of a quarterly bill. Sorry it should be 1/3.  
So, we've gotten that squared away.*

*Irby: so, April through June of 2019?*

*Moermond: for 2019, I can do July to October 1 and then the fourth quarter, October 1 to December. Anything before July 1 is already over and done with. It has already been assessed to your taxes.*

*Irby: ok. Can I recommend that form be put on your website?*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

**11 RLH TA 20-258** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 767 ROSE AVENUE EAST. (File No. CG2001D2, Assessment No. 200113)

**Sponsors:** Yang

*Approve the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: This is for \$9.50 for quarter 4, 2019. Assessment is for*

2 additional bags plus taxes and late fees. Hauler confirmed the lid was open July 5, 2019 over 6" wide due to 2 overflowing bags. Therefore, we recommend approving the assessment. We did speak with the property owner and they are in agreement with the recommendation and will be paying the assessment.

Moermond: so, they're in agreement, recommend approval.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 12 RLH TA 20-263** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 908 YORK AVENUE. (File No. CG2001D1, Assessment No. 200112)

Sponsors: Yang

Delete the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$11.48 for Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because they had a legislative hearing in Quarter 3, reasoning is the same based on the level of service of being received. Currently being billed for a 94 gallon cart that was never delivered. Staff comments are this is the cost between a medium cart and large cart, plus additional late fees. They paid for the cart they had, the 64 gallon cart. The photo provided by the resident proves the swap never happened, the serial number matches that of the original car that was delivered. Therefore, we recommend deleting the assessment.

Moermond: delete the assessment.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

## 10:00 a.m. Hearings

- 13 RLH TA 20-247** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 297 BATES AVENUE. (File No. CG2001D3, Assessment No. 200114)

Sponsors: Prince

Delete the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$4.80 for one late fee for medium cart Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because the hauler asked it to be removed as a courtesy to the property owner and we recommend removing the assessment.

Moermond: so recommended.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 14 [RLH TA 20-239](#)** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 848 BEECH STREET. (File No. CG2001D4, Assessment No. 200115)

Sponsors: Prince

Layover to LH April 30, 2020 10 AM. Reduce assessment by half if started process of

*becoming single family dwelling with DSI.*

*Eng Xiong, property owner's son, appeared via phone*

*Xiong: we just were going to pay the bill and update the house property unit, it is a single-family unit, we talked to someone last week. We're not sure why it is listed as a duplex.*

*Moermond: it is listed everywhere as a duplex. All the paperwork make it look like it's a duplex. Sometimes people live in a duplex as a single-family home, I'm wondering if the case is here?*

*Xiong: it is not even a duplex. It is me, my wife and my son, that's it.*

*Moermond: does it have separate entrances?*

*Xiong: no, just one entrance for the house, that's all. My dad did update that years ago, I'm not sure why the City is pulling it back up as a duplex again.*

*Moermond: it is both City and County records. I don't know where he changed it, there was even a building permit pulled last year and that permit said it was a duplex. What I'd like to is have you reach out to DSI at 651-266-8989 ask them who you can talk to about having your property classified as a single-family home. We can follow up with them if you do that soon, I'm happy to decrease this if you do that. But I'd like you to get that going this week and I'll follow up in 2 weeks and if it is underway, I'll look at cutting it in half.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/30/2020**

**15 RLH TA 20-248**

**Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 616 DESNOYER AVENUE. (File No. CG2001D4, Assessment No. 200115)**

**Sponsors:** Jalali

*Approve the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$25.56 for Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because they submitted a temporary service hold in November and confirmed with hauler on November 19 they had received the hold. They paid for service in October and November but not in December. We did have an update from the hauler, the resident does owe the \$25.56 since she short paid her Quarter 4 2019 invoice. The total invoice was for \$70.34 and she only paid \$46.00. At the time of payment, resident should have paid the full amount. This is due to the fact that when a temporary service hold is submitted, the resident is required to pay the full invoice for the quarter in which the temporary service hold is submitted. Any period during which the resident was not receiving service will be credited to them in the following quarter invoice. This property owner in this case did receive a credit of \$15.96 for no services received from December 5, 2019 to December 31, 2019. Therefore, staff recommends approving the assessment of \$25.56.*

*Moermond: so recommended.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 16      **RLH TA 20-236**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1223 FARRINGTON STREET. (File No. CG2001C2, Assessment No. 200109)

**Sponsors:**      Brendmoen

*Approve the assessment (unable to reach owner).*

*Moermond left voicemail April 16 at 10:23 AM – recommending approving the assessment and the Public Hearing date of May 27*

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

- 17      **RLH TA 20-241**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 924 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST. (File No. CG2001D4, Assessment No. 200115)

**Sponsors:**      Prince

*Reduce assessment from \$117.80 to \$102.44.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$117.80 for Quarter 4, 2019 for a large cart with weekly service and late fees. Appealing because they never received a bill for this quarter. Staff verified that there are no records of notices of nonpayment being sent on behalf of this property. Therefore staff recommends removing late fees and reducing the assessment to \$102.44. I will follow up with the hauler to make sure the notices of nonpayment are going to the correct address.*

*Moermond: recommend the reduction.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 18      **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

*Delete the assessment.*

*Maeve O'Mara, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: for \$4.80 for service late fee for one month for medium cart quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because they did not know this was due to the hauler. Resident made late payment for Quarter 4, 2019 on December 10, 2019, therefore hauler was justified in issuing the late fee of \$4.80. Staff recommends approving the assessment.*

*Moermond: it sounds like you weren't aware of the late fee for a late payment?*

*O'Mara: on December 5 I received a bill for \$96.08 for coverage until the end of December. I got the updated bill with the late fee, for \$100.88, so I called Chris Swanson regarding the late fee, would have been \$96.08. He told me I had to pay it.*

*So I wrote a check for \$100.88 and sent it to Republic. The next thing that happened was on January 5, 2020 I got a new bill from Republic and on there it said the late fee was actually two, one was November 4 and one for December 12, and then a minus charge for the \$100.88 and a minus charge for the \$4.80 and the balance was \$93.07 and I paid that January 16, 2020. So, I'm confused why I have an assessment for a late fee, because according to Republic I paid one late fee, and I did call and ask why I have to do this.*

*Swanson: I don't remember unfortunately; I have a lot of calls.*

*O'Mara: I'm sure. I have no problem paying my bills or the one late fee, but I don't see how I got a second late fee. On the January 5 bill from Republic I don't know why the credited me that fee as well. I have no idea why the invoice dated January 5 it was credited. They credited and then charge to the City and then you waste your time with this phone call?*

*Moermond: you made a good faith effort to address this. I'll recommend it gets deleted and moving forward things are squared up.*

*O'Mara: that's fair.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

**19**      [RLH TA 20-242](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 667 SURREY AVENUE. (File No. CG2001D3, Assessment No. 200114)

**Sponsors:**      Prince

*Reduce assessment from \$355.63 to \$324.90 (to be rescheduled per owner to April 23, 10 AM).*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$355.63 for Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because they didn't receive an invoice for Quarter 4 or any notices of nonpayment due to them being mailed to the wrong mailing address. We recommend removing the late fees of \$30.73 and reducing to \$324.90.*

*Moermond: did we talk with Greg Oppegard?*

*Swanson: the hauler talked with him and basically they directed us to remove the late fees, and he said Mr. Oppegard was ok with this moving forward.*

*Moermond: do we have a phone number for him?*

*Swanson: yes. 612-991-XXXX.*

*Moermond: so if we have to call him we have that in the record. Recommend the reduction.*

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

**11:00 a.m. Hearings**

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

**Sponsors:**              Noecker

*Reduce assessment from \$80.90 to \$40.76.*

*Ricki Larson, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$80.90 for small weekly cart and 3 late fees for Quarter 4, 2019. Appealing because they bring their trash to Twin Cities Refuse and don't use garbage service. They don't have much trash and can't afford the bill. Staff comments are that under citywide garbage service, all residential properties with up to four units, including rental homes and townhomes, are required to have a garbage cart and receive garbage service for each dwelling unit. Property owners must provide garbage service for all occupied dwellings. There is no option to opt out of the citywide garbage service. The property owner is currently using a 35-gallon Small Weekly. As it was suggested at the Quarter 2, 2019 legislative hearing, staff will request that the 35-gallon cart be switched out for a 35-gallon cart with every other week service. Staff therefore recommends reducing the assessment to the cost of one 35-gallon cart with every other week service, \$60.83.*

*Larson: I won't pay anything, I didn't have any garbage. You can ask the driver if you want to investigate. I'm willing to start paying now since my wife died, I have maybe a bag a week. I never had anything hauled away, I shouldn't have to pay for it, that is blackmail. Ask the driver, they didn't pick up anything. My parents were in the garbage business 45 years before all this sh\*t happened, so I know what is going on with all this sh\*t. Especially with the vote and you don't tell anyone you're going to raise the prices, after they voted. It is bullsh\*t.*

*Moermond: can you watch your language sir?*

*Larson: I'm sorry. It gets me mad. I'll start paying for it and put my rubbish out. I was in treatment and she was in the nursing home, I didn't know you had to tell the City you were going on of your house.*

*Moermond: what happened in terms of past assessments?*

*Mai Vang: quarter 4, 2018 and quarter 1, 2019 it was reduced from \$80.90 to \$60.83.*

*Larson: they have never hauled any trash since you guys took it over. I bring my trash to Twin Cities Refuse.*

*Moermond: I understand, you said that last time you talked. What are we looking at for 2019 for past assessments?*

*Vang: Quarter 2, 2019, it was reduced to \$60.83.*

*Moermond: is there a quarter 3 charge?*

*Vang: we did an amended resolution.*

*Pillsbury: he was on the assessment roll for \$80.90. Levied March 11, 2020 by Council.*

Moermond: I think you remember every property that's single family through a fourplex needs to have service. In the past we worked with you to get the bill as small as possible knowing you object to the program. We did that change last year for the first quarter and second quarter, and you had an assessment for the third quarter but it wasn't appealed. Now you're appealing the fourth quarter. Because you changed your cart size—

Larson: I never got that other cart. I had it out there.

Moermond: Your third quarter bill that was already processed was for \$80, but you didn't appeal so I couldn't give you \$20 back them. I'm going to do that now, as well as this quarter. I'm recommending reducing this assessment from \$80.90 to \$40.76. Ms. Pillsbury will follow up with you about changing out that cart.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

**21**      [RLH TA 20-203](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 2175 BEECH STREET. (File No. CG2001E2, Assessment No. 200117)

**Sponsors:**          Prince

Layover to LH April 30, 2020 at 11 am.

No one appeared

Moermond: we don't have contact information for this resident.

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$187.36 for quarter 4, 2019. reduce by 47. Resident is appealing because they state: I am paying for one half of this bill. This is for the people renting from me. The other half would be for me and I have not put out garbage to haul since 1996. I have been hauling the garbage myself for 24 years. I do not wish to change. I do not litter or pollute and do not use a neighbor's cart. That would be dishonest. I will not pay any hauler for doing nothing and the hauler is being dishonest for sending me a bill for doing nothing. Why did no one ask the basic question "Do you have garbage to haul?" The City should have done that since I requested no cart. But they left me with one anyways. Staff comments are under citywide garbage service, all residential properties with up to four units, including rental homes and town homes, are required to have a garbage cart and receive garbage service for each dwelling unit. Property owners must provide garbage service for all occupied dwellings. There is no option to opt out of the citywide garbage service. This property is registered as a two family dwelling and therefore is required to have two garbage carts on site to receive garbage hauling services. Staff records show that currently there are two 64-gallon carts at the property. However, staff did notice that there was a slight discrepancy in billing. The original assessment was for \$374.92, as the property was charged \$220.96 for two 64-gallon carts with late fees and a back bill of \$153.73. We have determined that the back bill should have been for \$134.64. Therefore, we are recommending reducing the assessment by \$19.12 plus any late fees for the entire assessment totaling \$28.80. Together, this would be a reduction of \$47.92. Therefore, with the current assessment being \$187.36, we recommend reducing the assessment to \$139.44.

Moermond: so, we have two 64 gallon carts here. He clearly doesn't want any cart for his own unit. In cases where we've had that situation, we've consistently decreased the bill to the least amount of service, and hopefully change the cart out as well. I'd like to

*make the reductions you recommended, and bill instead of at the medium cart size, instead bill at the small every other week cart rate for one of the cans. We need to talk to him about switching out the cart, and we don't have contact information so let's send him a letter and outline this. Say we don't have the option to get him out of the program, but we'd like to get him to the smallest bill. I can reduce the third and fourth quarter of 2019, and even first quarter of 2020. Let's send a letter to that effect and ask him for his phone number to discuss this further. Let's continue this to April 30 at 11 am.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/30/2020**

**22**      [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 23, 2020 at 11 AM.*

*No one appeared*

*Voice mail April 16 at 11:17 AM, will try calling back.*

*Called again 11:54 am left voice mail, laying over for 1 week calling between 11 and 12*

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

**23**      **RLH TA 20-261**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1865 MARGARET STREET. (File No. CG2001E2, Assessment No. 200117)

**Sponsors:**            Prince

*Delete the assessment.*

*Sharon Karas, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$3.52 for quarter 4, 2019, for one late fee for a small weekly cart. Resident says they are unable to pay garbage bill until the beginning of the second month of the quarter. Their PERA check does not arrive until the first of the month, therefore she should not be charged a late fee. Staff comments are under citywide garbage service all payments for each quarter are due on the 25th of the first month of the quarter. Bills paid after the 25 of the month will incur a late fee of 5%. The bill for Quarter 4, 2019 was due on October 25, 2019. Resident stated that she paid her Quarter 4, 2019 bill after October 25. Therefore staff recommends approving the assessment.*

*Moermond: what are you looking for today?*

*Karas: I've been fighting this issue since the city moved to organized hauling. I think it's a good plan, my issue if there had been an arrangement directly between myself and my hauler, my previous hauler was very accommodating, and I'm in a position now where I can't negotiate. I'm tired of fighting this battle. It's a huge flaw in the contract. There should be accommodations for people's income and when they get paid. This hauler is resistant to making any accommodation whatsoever, they blame the city, the city says I have to speak to the hauler. I've been doing it since it started. I'm done. I*

*don't care what you do anymore. You've already attached some of these late fees to my property taxes. I'm not going to win, and I'm tired of the whole thing. I'm just letting it go at this point. It's a serious flaw in the contract, will it ever get changed? I don't know. I am letting you know. I'm done, it is over for me.*

*Moermond; just to touch on the contract, the contract established the deadlines for everyone in the City. Everyone has the same due date. Neither the City nor the contractor can change the due date. I'm sorry they said the City could, because they signed an agreement saying it would be the same date. That you got jerked around in the communication is unfortunate, because it was set in stone. I'm sorry that happened.*

*Swanson; I would add, last time you spoke with us to try and work out some way to do this, was paying it before so you can pay all of it moving forward and not having an outstanding amount. Definitely call us if you want to talk about that more. The due date of the invoice is pretty cut and dry.*

*Moermond: I'll recommend this one get deleted.*

*Karas: we're that group that always gets nailed. It is a lack of understanding and sympathy with people who have one income and whatever increase I get per year is swallowed by a Medicare increase or whatever. This just tells me once again we're being slapped around; it goes up to the State. I'm an activist, and I've spoken to everyone including the governor and this is just part of it. I appreciate your time, I'll try to make it work, but I think it's a lack of understanding about incomes that don't fluctuate.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

**24**      [RLH TA 20-253](#)

**Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1217 THOMAS AVENUE. (File No. CG2001E2, Assessment No. 200117)**

**Sponsors:**              Jalali

*Layover to LH April 23, 2020 at 11 am. Staff to follow up about late fees.*

*No one appeared*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: this is for \$82.34 for quarter 4, 2019. Stated reason for appeal is they stated that they made a payment of \$385.26 on October 7, 2019 for the Quarter 4, 2019 invoice. It was deposited by Aspen Waste on October 19, 2019. Property owner sent documentation confirming that they paid the full amount on the invoice. Staff comments are the hauler confirmed that original assessment charge of \$85.63 was from the balance unpaid during Quarter 3, 2019 by the previous owner. The current owner purchased the property on September 6, 2019. As any pending assessments are the responsibility of the property owner, staff recommends approving the assessment.*

*Moermond: does the \$82.34 proposed assessment include any late fees?*

*Pillsbury: I can follow up with the hauler, I don't have that information.*

*Moermond: I'd like to delete any late fees. I think that this is one of those situations where there was confusion in the transition from old to new owner, and I'm not sensing there is resistance to paying the bill. I'd like to lay this over for one week to see what*

*the makeup of the bill is.*

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

**25**      [RLH TA 20-254](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1375 THOMAS AVENUE. (File No. CG2001E2, Assessment No. 200117)

**Sponsors:**            Jalali

*Layover to LH April 30, 2020 at 11 am. Recommend approval of the charge on the 2 large carts, waiting to see about the late fees until staff follows up with hauler.*

*Tony Strouth, owner, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$235.61 for quarter 4, 2019. Resident is appealing because they state City ordinance was suspended during period of billing, vendor continued to provide services on their own accord. Staff comments are that the ordinance was never suspended. Judge Castro's order to suspend the ordinance never went into effect as it was stayed by the Minnesota Supreme Court pending the outcome of the election. During the period up to the general election the ordinance (and the contract) was still in effect. A majority of resident voted in support of the new coordinated garbage program in the November 5, 2019 general election. With the overwhelming support from the election the ordinance continued to be in place. In summary, the ordinance was never suspended and the resident owes the hauler for the time when they received service. Therefore staff recommends approving the assessment.*

*Strouth: When I was going through the bills from the vendor, they had a 1% charge for any late fees. I was charged 1% plus additional City fees, plus the penalty to go on my taxes, all of which is not disseminated on the invoice from the vendor. We reached out to the attorney general and the vendor admitted they were sending an incorrect form to St. Paul residents. They didn't update their terms and agreements with the residents. So, I just have a tough time paying 30% penalties.*

*Moermond: who is your hauler?*

*Strouth: I think this is Waste Management. I have two properties appealed.*

*Moermond: I believe I just have one property in front of me today, but we'll come back to that.*

*Pillsbury: Aspen.*

*Moermond: I know the Citywide contract provides for a 5% late fee charge each month. So, it is 5% per month, if they fail to pay one month it is another 5% the following month?*

*Pillsbury: correct.*

*Moermond: The bill I'm looking at here, the \$235, what is included in that bill?*

*Pillsbury: the records state he has two large 94 gallon carts.*

*Moermond: is that the size carts you want?*

*Strouth: yes, we need two large carts.*

*Moermond: the charge for a single large cart is what?*

*Chris Swanson: \$102.44.*

*Moermond: so, I'm looking at is the provision of two large carts plus three late fees. What I was hearing you say was you thought the ordinance was suspended during the fourth quarter of 2019, is that right?*

*Strouth: yes, I was under the impression it was suspended under Judge Castro, and then the Supreme Court did something, I didn't see anything between those two rulings.*

*Moermond: the Supreme Court did put a stay in place on Castro's order. So, I'm left with the bills and late fees here. I'm wondering if you had another argument about why you wanted this decreased or deleted.*

*Strouth: 1.5% is listed on the invoice, it says nothing about additional penalties, so I was led to believe it was all confined within the bill and the vendor was handling the differences. I'm not a fan of the program, it puts an undue burden on City services, and as a resident for over 30 years, my garbage bill tripled with the bill. We had \$15 a month for our service, now we're paying a lot more and our tenants aren't accepting the additional burden of the trash. I understand there's a process, I am just surprised in such a lucrative deal can't update their forms or properly notify the people of the terms.*

*Moermond: I haven't heard yet about any statement on the bills about 1.5%. Mr. Swanson deals with this deeply and been working on this since the beginning basically.*

*Swanson: basically, what the contract requires is the original invoice was sent to the resident. You should have also received a notice of nonpayment, starting within the first week of the next month. There would be two more of those, outlining the 5% late fee on the outstanding balance. That's what we rely on in terms of notifying residents of the late fee. If there was a small, incorrect information on Aspen's invoice we will take a look at those. I have not heard of that during this period.*

*Strouth: it is on the bottom of the invoice, it says "a finance charge of 1.5% per month will be assessed on the unpaid balance." The Attorney General looked into this, and they admitted they haven't updated their forms, even to date. This shouldn't be totally new information.*

*Swanson: we'll look into it. Regardless, you were still notified via the notices of nonpayments.*

*Strouth: but I pay the vendor directly. I would get it if it was coming from the City, they want their fees. But according to how this whole thing has been run, I'm sending checks to vendor.*

*Moermond: I think you two were talking past one another. I think what Mr. Swanson was saying was that the vendor would have sent, if things were done properly, two separate letters to you for each month of the bill not being paid, and they both would have said there's a 5% late charge.*

Swanson: yes, there actually would have been three letters.

Strouth: it isnt on the invoice. So I don't know if they are incurring it, or if I am. Do they have any registered mail they sent me on this

Moermond: I don't believe they're required to provide you with registered mail. We can check to see the letters with the late charges do go separately from your invoice, so that would be something dealt with at the end of the quarter when they forward it to the City. The city doesn't have any administrative charges for handling these assessments. Can staff reach out and confirm there were letters that went out notifying of late payment? Mr. Strouth deserves to see those if they aren't in his records. Do we have an email address?

Pillsbury: yes, I sent an email this past Friday, April 10. Did you receive that email?

Strouth: yes I received that.

Moermond: so let's get those notices to him, and I'm going to continue this two weeks to make sure you have that information. I can tell you right now I'm recommending approval for the two large carts, and we'll hold off on the late fees until we see documentation on that. We'll call you back between 11 and 12 on April 30th and wrap up our conversation at that time. If we can't get ahold of you we will email you with that information. You said there was a second address, and we don't have record of that. What is that so we can add that in?

Strouth: 1510 Concordia. I submitted it online at the same time.

Moermond: we'll look at it.

Pillsbury: I don't see anything online.

Mai Vang: It would have been today.

Moermond: I'm not sure what the glitch was, but we'll talk about 1510 Concordia April 30 when we cover this one again.

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/30/2020**

**26 RLH TA 20-269**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1320 WILSON AVENUE. (File No. CG2001E1, Assessment No. 200116)

**Sponsors:** Prince

Approve the assessment.

No one appeared

Staff report by Clare Pillsbury: \$116.91 for Quarter 4, 2019. Resident states they paid their bills with Waste Management. They spoke to the hauler and say the hauler told them their bills are up to date and don't know why the City is sending that. Resident states they called the City and they told me that they will stop sending bills. Staff comments are the hauler confirmed that the payment made to the account for Quarter 4, 2019 bill on October 22, 2019 was declined. The payment for Quarter 1, 2020 was also declined so there seems to be an issue with payment. Therefore staff recommends approving the assessment.

*Moermond: the hauler said the bill was up to date when they called, I'm assuming they said that because they had sent the balance to the City to be assessed.*

*Pillsbury: we did talk to the hauler and they apologized, it was a lack of understanding on the part of the Customer Service representative. They said they would speak to them about that issue.*

*Moermond: in terms of attempted payment, either the check bounced or the transaction was declined, so no payment was made.*

*Pillsbury: correct, it was a credit card payment that was declined.*

*Moermond: with that information I will recommend approval of the assessment.*

*Pillsbury: I did speak to the property owner and they are going to pay the assessment and they will look into the payment issue.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

### **Special Tax Assessments-ROLLS**

- 27      RLH AR 20-74**      Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001D1, Assessment No. 200112)

**Sponsors:**      Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 28      RLH AR 20-75**      Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001D2, Assessment No. 200113)

**Sponsors:**      Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 29      RLH AR 20-76**      Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001D3, Assessment No. 200114)

**Sponsors:**      Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 30      RLH AR 20-77**      Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001D4, Assessment No. 200115)

**Sponsors:**      Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 31      RLH AR 20-78**      Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001E1, Assessment No. 200116)

**Sponsors:**              Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

- 32      RLH AR 20-79**      Ratifying the assessment for the City's cost of providing Collection of Delinquent Garbage Bills for services during October to December 2019. (File No. CG2001E2, Assessment No. 200117)

**Sponsors:**              Brendmoen

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/3/2020**

**DUE TO COVID-19 Health Pandemic, these appeals are to be held telephonic.**