



City of Saint Paul

City Hall and Court House
15 West Kellogg Boulevard
Council Chambers - 3rd
Floor
651-266-8560

Meeting Minutes - Action Only

City Council

Council President Amy Brendmoen
Councilmember Russel Balenger
Councilmember Mitra Jalali
Councilmember Rebecca Noecker
Councilmember Jane L. Prince
Councilmember Chris Tolbert
Councilmember Nelsie Yang

Wednesday, June 14, 2023

3:30 PM

Council Chambers - 3rd Floor

ROLL CALL

Meeting started at 3:32 PM

Present 5 - Councilmember Amy Brendmoen, Councilmember Rebecca Noecker, Councilmember Jane L. Prince, Councilmember Nelsie Yang and Councilmember Russel Balenger

Absent 2 - Councilmember Chris Tolbert and Councilmember Mitra Jalali

COMMUNICATIONS & RECEIVE/FILE

- 1 [CO 23-30](#) Letter from the Department of Safety and Inspections declaring 1213 Woodbridge Street a nuisance property. (For notification purposes only; public hearings will be scheduled at a later date if necessary.)
Received and Filed
- 2 [AO 23-54](#) Amending ESG project budgets: funding for 2021-22 Emergency Solutions Grant activities administered by Ramsey County per the Joint Powers Agreement approved via RES 19-2110.
Received and Filed
- 3 [AO 23-55](#) Amending CDBG Project Budgets: funding for 84 Wabasha S (Crasqui) project; funding for 979 Arcade (Arcade Laundromat), a project selected by CDBG subgrantee ESNDK for their Business Investment Fund (BIF) program; additional funding for Dayton's Bluff Neighborhood Housing Services 2022 Community Based Development Organization (CBDO) award.
Received and Filed
- 4 [AO 23-58](#) Amending the City's Operating Budget to reflect the final sale details resulting from the issuance of the G.O. Capital Notes, Series 2023B.
Received and Filed

ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Councilmember Amy Brendmoen, Councilmember Chris Tolbert, Councilmember Rebecca Noecker, Councilmember Jane L. Prince, Councilmember Nelsie Yang and Councilmember Russel Balenger

Absent 1 - Councilmember Mitra Jalali

CONSENT AGENDA

Items listed under the Consent Agenda will be enacted by one motion with no separate discussion. If discussion on an item is desired, the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

Approval of the Consent Agenda

Consent Agenda adopted

Yea: 6 - Councilmember Brendmoen, Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Jalali

- 5 [RES 23-808](#) Preliminary Order setting the date of City Council public hearing for July 19, 2023 to consider approval for the Grand/Snelling parking lot operation and maintenance costs for 2024. File No. 18746-23, Assessment No. 237202.
- Adopted**
- 6 [RES 23-835](#) Approving the Collective Bargaining Agreement (January 1, 2023 - December 31, 2025) and Memorandums of Agreement between the City of Saint Paul and AFSCME Local 3757 - Legal.
- Laid over to June 21, 2023**
- 7 [RES 23-846](#) Authorizing the Fire Department to pay for all costs incurred to hold a graduation ceremony for the EMS Academy on June 12, 2023 at the Conway Recreation Center.
- Adopted**
- 8 [RES 23-868](#) Approving Ordinance Permit 20220010602 for Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure Installed by Alliant Engineering, Inc. for Pulte Model Homes.
- Adopted**
- 9 [RES 23-871](#) Amending RES 23-33 (supporting the authority of the City to impose a local sales tax to fund special capital improvements providing regional benefit, to establish the duration of the tax and the revenue to be raised by the tax, and to authorize the City to issue bonds supported by the sales tax revenue) to authorize bridges as a use of revenues as required by 2023 Laws Chapter 64, Article 10, Section 3.
- Adopted**

- 10 [RES 23-881](#) Recognizing longtime community volunteer Chuck Nehls's ongoing service to Highland Park and the City of Saint Paul.
Adopted
- 11 [RES 23-885](#) Approving the use of grant funds through the Ward 5 Neighborhood Star Year-Round Program for the project located at Nanny's Jamaican Kitchen.
Adopted
- 12 [RES 23-886](#) Approving the use of grant funds through the Ward 2 Neighborhood STAR Year-Round Program for Saint Paul Downtown Alliance and Amsterdam Bar and Hall.
Adopted
- 13 [Min 23-25](#) Approving the minutes of the Saint Paul City Council meetings of April 5, 12, 19, and 26, 2023.
Adopted
- 14 [RES 23-792](#) Establishing the rate of pay for Senior Organizational Development in SPSO, EG 09.
Adopted
- 15 [RES 23-890](#) Approving the use of grant funds through the Ward 6 Neighborhood STAR Year-Round Program for Wyld Chyldz LLC.
Adopted

FOR DISCUSSION

- 16 [RES 23-875](#) Adopting the City of Saint Paul Vision Zero Transportation Safety commitment.
Adopted

 Yea: 6 - Councilmember Brendmoen, Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

 Nay: 0

 Absent: 1 - Councilmember Jalali
- 17 [SR 23-113](#) Legislative Session Update from Intergovernmental Relations Associate Eric Petersen.
Received and Filed
- 20 [RES 23-793](#) Approving the Cultural Sales Tax Revitalization (STAR) Program Guideline modifications. (laid over from June 7, 2023)
Adopted

Yea: 6 - Councilmember Brendmoen, Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Jalali

- 21** [RES 23-824](#) Approving the Neighborhood STAR Program Guideline modifications.

Adopted

Yea: 6 - Councilmember Brendmoen, Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Jalali

- 18** [RES 23-880](#) Commemorating the 51st Anniversary of Twin Cities Pride.

Adopted

Yea: 6 - Councilmember Brendmoen, Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Jalali

- 19** [RES 23-878](#) Commemorating Juneteenth 2023 as an annual celebration of Black liberation.

Adopted

Yea: 6 - Councilmember Brendmoen, Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Jalali

ORDINANCES

An ordinance is a city law enacted by the City Council. It is read at three separate council meetings and becomes effective after passage by the Council and 30 days after publication in the Saint Paul Pioneer Press. Public hearings on ordinances are generally held at the second reading.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Live testimony is limited to two minutes for each person. See below for optional ways to testify.

- 22** [Ord 23-26](#) Granting the application of Minnesota Assistance Council for Veterans to

rezone property at 704 Larpenteur Avenue East from R3 one family residential to RT2 townhouse residential and amending Chapter 60 of the Legislative Code pertaining to the zoning map. (Public hearing continued and laid over for Final Adoption from June 7, 2023)

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 23** [RES PH 23-121](#) Approving the application of The United Hmong Family, Inc. for a sound level variance in order to present amplified sound on July 1 and 2, 2023 at 1151 Wynne Avenue - McMurray Fields.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 24** [RES PH 23-128](#) Approving the request of Energy Park Utility Company to amend rates.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 25** [RES PH 23-142](#) Approving the petition of Brian Ingram on behalf of Hope Fire House, LLC to vacate a portion of Leech Street from Grand Avenue to West Seventh Street.

Public hearing continued to July 12, 2023

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 26** [RES PH 23-143](#) Approving the application of Trilingua Cinema for a sound level variance in order to present amplified sound on June 16, 2023 at East Side Sculpture Park - 705 Seventh Street East.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 27** [RES PH 23-144](#) Approving the application of Papa Legba's Lounge LLC for a sound level variance in order to present amplified sound on June 23 and June 24, 2023 at 200 & 202 Cesar Chavez Street - Papa Legba Lounge.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 28** [RES PH 23-149](#) Authorizing the Police Department to accept \$25,000 in additional funds and amend the 2023 Special Fund Budget for an amended award from the Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs, Innovation in Community Safety Grant.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 29** [RES PH 23-151](#) Amending the financing and spending plans in the Department of Parks and Recreation in the amount of \$43,040 to reflect additional 2023 funding from Como Friends.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

LEGISLATIVE HEARING DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 37** [RLH TA 23-205](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 817 MARSHALL AVENUE. (File No. J2307E1, Assessment No. 238320) (Public hearing closed and laid over from June 14, 2023)

Laid over for 2 weeks to reevaluate compliance. If brought into compliance by the next hearing, the fine is to be cut in half.

Also in attendance: Chana & Richard Pittman, appellants.

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer: what we have in front of us for this item is an excessive consumption special assessment resulting from non compliance

with a vehicle abatement order issued on October 31st of 2022. The deadline for the vehicle to be either repaired or removed was November 10th. Photos were taken on November 10th. The vehicle abatement order itself was that the vehicle appeared in operable because of flat tires, and the license plate was not current. The work was not done on the deadline and an excessive consumption bill was issued. A lot of things came up in the legislative hearing itself, and I would note, there was no appeal of the order issued on October 31st. These are just for the excessive consumption bills. The appellant and I had two substantive conversations. The appellant was focusing on the fairness of the issuance of the order for this property and the context in which that was ordered. There was a focus also on the timing of the compliance with the order and how that should be taken into account. Finally, there was some discussion of whether or not the City had the right to issue an order for a vehicle in the location in which it was issued. After the ending of the second hearing on these assessments, there was some homework done to figure out how it came to pass that the inspector did the inspection at this particular property. The concern was that it was a race based complaint generated and that there was some neighbor dispute that involved using City enforcement systems to frustrate one another with competing orders. A complaint was being investigated at the other end of the alley in question, 798 Iglehart. That inspection was the result of a truck and trailer being present there and orders were written immediately adjacent to the property at 790. There was also a problem with vehicles on that vacant parcel and orders were generated there. That is what the department calls a "field find," where the inspector is out investigating one particular complaint and observes another one, and writes orders on that. As the inspector was exiting the alley, they came to the property on the other side, 817 Marshall, observed a vehicle in noncompliance, which led to the issuance of the order. With respect to compliance with the orders, I understand that there were attempts on the part of the owners to reach the inspector to talk about what's going on, although I can't say that the inspector in every case writes a note in the file about communications with the owner. There is an indication that on at least December 14th there was a conversation and an extension was granted for a couple of weeks and then additional communication noted in the file in April and May. I don't know if there were any other communications. I just know what the notes indicated there. The vehicle abatement order itself does explicitly state that the order is appealable. Certainly the Council has heard many of that type of appeal. In the May 16th Legislative Hearing, the owners indicated that the vehicle was now in compliance as of the week prior to that hearing, meaning that the tires were inflated and new plates were on the vehicle. The inspector did investigate and confirmed that new plates were on the vehicle, but again found the tires to be flat. They also knew from the owner that the timing chain was broken on the vehicle, also making it an inoperable vehicle. I mention this because it takes us to where we are today with the matter not yet being resolved. What is in front of you with this item is the matter not having been resolved when the inspector did the reinspection on the deadline for the work to be done, November 10th. When we had the first legislative hearing, we know that the owner has changed the plates and updated them. Therefore, and I don't want this to confuse the matter, but an additional separate order was issued which removed that from the items there were needed to bring into compliance. The new order also updated the license plate numbers so that it was consistent with what was actually in the driveway. That abatement order was appealed. It was a no show hearing yesterday. I did lay the matter over for a week. Returning us to where we are now: Was there or was there not compliance on the deadline? The photo indicates there was not compliance on the deadline. Looking at subsequent photos for the following five months, do you confirm that there's ongoing lack of compliance? I don't feel that I have any option but to recommend approval of this assessment. The assessment is for \$124.00 with a \$35 surcharge totaling \$159, and your report for the next assessment will be briefer because it's very simple.

Councilmember Noecker: Any questions for Moermond? Seeing none, we will open the public hearing.

Chana Pittman: I don't understand why we're here today. Our vehicle isn't abandoned. It is on our property and it's been on our property since he stopped driving it in the 2019. After the City came by for several calls to cut down some trees that were hanging on our fence, he saw the vehicle there. He also saw it in 2022 when they came by to pave the back alley. There is a big issue with the new culture that's moving into the neighborhood. They have people in police stations and down in the city, and we have received a lot of harassment on the corner of Marshall and Fisk. Also, this person moved in during October or late September and he has two vehicles. One of them is attached to a trailer that he just lets sit on the block. For weeks at a time, and we didn't know whose it was, so we called the police. It was winter starting to get cold outside and we wanted him to move so things can be cleaned up. I called a couple times and he never was ticketed. He comes out and moves it across the street and puts it back and leaves it for another 7 days. All of a sudden, we're starting to get harassment from the City on my husband's vehicle that is guarded by three fences, and it's up on an alley, and you can barely see it when you're riding through. You have to walk up on our property to get a good picture, which that person did. We don't believe that this isn't harassment from someone who knows someone. We feel it's an abuse of power. We feel it's a harassment of black people, and I don't like it. We've never been harassed like this before from the City. It's just tiring the different things that we're going through on that block. You mentioned our first letter in October. Yes, my husband called him several times and he did not respond to his calls. He did, finally pick up in December when we got a second letter and he told my husband to cover the vehicle and he'll wipe everything away. That was shared at our previous meeting and Moermond didn't share that at today's meeting. After that, a new assessor came out and lied and said that the plates were not brought up to date. I said on that phone call "you're lying," because he did go ahead and buy tabs. Then they sent somebody out again who verified yes, there were tabs. So, you do have people in your industry that are lying and covering up for things, and we feel like we're being harassed. I don't understand what's happening. Our yard is always kept up. His vehicle is doing nothing but sitting way off up on a slab, way up against the fence. He does put things in there. He does use it every now and then. We just feel like we're being harassed and I'm just going to step aside and let my husband finish.

Noecker: There's just a bit of time left. I want to know what your ask is of us today.

Richard Pittman: Our ask is simple. As Chana mentioned, the vehicle is on private property. It has three fences around it. You cannot locate that vehicle from Marshall or Fisk driving by either way. I've had several police officers come by and I've asked "Would I be ticketed for this?" They said I needed to have current plates. I was talking with the assessor, and I was doing everything he told me to do. He said to cover it, I did. He said to inflate the tires, I did. He said get new plates, I did. At one point I was going to give it to Kars for Kids but they didn't return my call. In the midst of all this, I was in constant communication and trying to comply with the city. We are law abiding citizens. We pay our taxes, we keep our corner looking well and well lit to help promote community safety. I did everything he asked and he said he would drop the charges. He said he was just trying to get my attention to bring it to compliance. But now, he said that we weren't in compliance. I said that can't be, because I put the plates on 2 weeks ago. I saw him come out half an hour after our meeting and he went to the front and back of my car. He said it's because the tires weren't inflated. I said that I do inflate them often. But, back to when this first started in November, we got 105 inches of snow. It was hard to bring it into compliance with all the snow that we were receiving and shoveling. \$1000 in total with other fees, so it's not just

\$125.00. They told us. I have the letters. They're putting a lot of taxes and fees on us and we already pay heavy taxes to be on that corner and we keep that corner up. We even clean the fire hydrant like the city asks every winter to make sure they can have access to it. I just feel that the fees need to be cancelled. We haven't done anything wrong. We tried to do everything that we were asked to do.

Councilmember Balenger moved to close the public hearing. Approved 6-0.

Balenger: I guess what the problem is, is that the tires are still deflated. What I would offer is that the fine be cut in half if the car can be brought into compliance within two weeks.

Noecker: So the motion would be to cut the fine in half as long as the tires can be brought into compliance within two weeks. Moermond, would you like us to lay the matter over for two weeks to check for compliance or adopt that motion today?

Moermond: I think it would be easier to follow up if it were to be laid over and the resolution amended in two weeks time.

Noecker: Before we vote on this, just one matter of discussion. I heard some of the questions that our testifiers were asking related to what the policy is, and why storing vehicles on one's own private property in any condition is a problem. I think it would be really helpful if you're willing to share what the policy is and why they're out of compliance because I just want to make sure that there's understanding there. I think those are good questions.

Moermond: Looking at an aerial image, you can see a maroon car, and then what appears to be gray and the alley and the three sides with the fence that he was speaking about. Not visible from Fisk but visible from the alley that the inspector went down. I will pull up the code on parking and that is, I believe, Chapter 163 of the legislative code. The expectation is that tabs are current anywhere. On private property, the practice is to say they can be expired for three months before Enforcement will do anything. My understanding is that in the orders issued here in 2022, the tabs that were on the car at that time were from 2019. That, coupled with the apparent inoperability because of the flat tire, makes this definable as an abandoned vehicle located on private property. The other things that Code Enforcement would write orders on relative to vehicles would be if it's open to entry and unsecured, which makes it an attractive nuisance for people to break into, trash, steal. Other things would be missing vital parts being dismantled or appearing undriveable, which is what we are talking about here. If it's parked on an unimproved surface, so parked in the middle of the backyard, that would be a violation. The general advice when someone has a vehicle that has gone without tabs for so long and it appears in operable, is to store it within a garage. The thing is, this property doesn't have a garage, so that wasn't practical advice that could be given in this particular case, which makes it trickier. But, somebody can definitely repair a vehicle on their own property if it's their own car and they're not running a car repair business out of a residential home.

Noecker: Thank you for that. I appreciate having a better understanding, and I think that helps respond to some of the really valid questions.

Public hearing closed and laid over to June 28, 2023

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

38 [RLH TA 23-206](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 817 MARSHALL AVENUE. (File No. J2308E2, Assessment No. 238324) (Public hearing closed and laid over from June 14, 2023)

Laid over for 2 weeks to reevaluate compliance. If brought into compliance by the next hearing, the fine is to be cut in half.

Also in attendance: Richard Pittman, appellant.

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer: This tax assessment is for the same property for the same issue. It is for a follow-up inspection that was conducted on November 29th. The one you just considered was from November 10th noncompliance and this is for continued noncompliance November 29th, 4 weeks out from the issuance of the original orders. The amount of money is the same.

Councilmember Noecker: Any questions? Seeing none, this is another public hearing and the appellant is welcome to speak again.

Richard Pittman: As you've seen from the photos, my vehicle is pushed up against the fence. There has not been an issue from any of our neighbors. Even law enforcement said they don't even see why this is a problem, because it is not in public view. It is on an approved surface. We just don't have a physical garage over it. It is not a public street. It is referred to as an abatement. They said as long as it's just to put your plates on there, you should be fine. I have inflated the tire several times. I did everything they've asked me to do. That's why I feel that we shouldn't be charged anything. We're already paying heavy taxes on that corner. I don't see why we should be penalized to pay any more on that. I have plans in the near future for the vehicle anyway, but I don't feel that we should continue to be taxed for something that is not a public issue. It's not being driven, but the car is insured. It's insured against vandalism. I keep insurance on it, even though it's not moving. From the picture, it looks clear cut to me that the vehicle is not in the way of anybody. You just have to really want to make a big issue out of it in order to go back there. I was told from back in November or December when I finally got in contact with the individual that I was working with, they did switch him out after they found out that he told me he would cancel the fees. They took him off and, gave me a supervisor, who called me very aggressively and started threatening to tow my vehicle and charge me \$1000 plus the fees behind the towage, which kind of was offensive, the way he was talking to me. He said to call the City Council if you don't like it. I don't think it was necessary to speak to me that way. So my piece still says the same. I don't think we should be charged anything for storing it on our approved surface, close to my fence, away from the street. My wife is upset so she just left, but I'm glad I stayed around.

Councilmember Balenger moved to close the public hearing. Approved 6-0.

Balenger: Same motion as the previous one. If it's resolved in 2 weeks, cut the fine by half.

Noecker: So the motion is for a 2-week layover.

Public hearing closed and laid over to June 28, 2023

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 40** [RLH SAO 23-7](#) Making finding on the appealed nuisance abatement ordered for 1676 NEVADA AVENUE EAST in Council File RLH SAO 22-55. (Public hearing continued to June 14, 2023)

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer: I am changing my ask on this particular case. Rather than to amend and adopt, I would ask that you refer this matter back to Legislative Hearing on June 20th.

Councilmember Yang moved to refer to June 20th Legislative Hearing.

Referred to June 20, 2023 Legislative Hearing

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 41** [RLH RSA 23-1](#) Appeal of Jamele Watkins to a Rent Stabilization Determination at 400 SELBY AVENUE, Apt. 312.

Appeal denied.

Also in attendance: Jamele Watkins, appellant

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer: The next items that I'm asking the Council to consider are 41 through 44. All of these items pertain to the same building and are based on the same application for an exception to a rent increase determination. I ask to give one staff report for all of the items, although I understand that the Council needs to consider them individually for voting purposes. I would note that for each of the four items there is an appellant present to testify. This is an appeal of a city determination on an application for an exception to the 3% rent cap. The appeal is not of the rent increase but rather of the city's determination on the rent increase. The determination was made through the self certification process that is described in the Department of Safety and Inspection (DSI) administrative rules for operating this program. Self certification is used when the requested increase is between 3% and 8%. That is the application that was made by the owner. The applications that go self certification route receive very minimal staff review and that was the situation with this particular one, as with all the others. It is required in the rules that when someone files for self certification increase that they prepare the maintenance in that operating income statement that would be supportive of that request. It could be asked for in the context of an audit, or we always ask for them for it if an appeal is filed. When we get a tenant appeal, reach out to the landlord ask them to provide this information for the record. It is then shared with the appellants and added to the public record, which you have. The building itself is 91 units, called the Blair Boutique Apartments, and is in the Cathedral Hill neighborhood. For context, I also included in the report that you have what the rents are currently advertised to be. In the hearings, we didn't discuss what the individual tenants rents were, but here's what's advertised for a one bedroom: \$1425 to \$1590. That gives you a ballpark that means that 3% to 8% increase on that one bedroom is going to run someplace between \$43 and \$127 a month. Similarly, looking online for two-bedroom rents they were running in the \$1900 to \$1975 range. The increase 3 to 8% there would be \$58 to \$158. When we discussed this in the hearing with the owner, about the owners intention and where they were going to peg rent increases, they indicated

that they were going to evaluate each unit individually and anticipated some units would receive a 0% increase. Some 3%, some 5%, some 8%, depending on market conditions, but they would seek a maximum of 8% in this particular application. That worksheet that I just referred to is the Maintenance of Net Operating Income (MNOI) worksheet. The one that was completed was actually one that DSI probably should have pulled down from the website, because it was last year's form. It provided two columns that had 2019 data and 2021 data to be used for comparison. The application was made in January, and so the updated form that DSI uses should now indicate 2022 instead of 2021. The form was filled out though prior to DSI updating its webpage. As you recall, there are nine reasons for which someone can ask for an exception to the 3% rent cap. The two reasons that were cited in the application were an increase in property taxes and an increase in operating expenses. The increase in property taxes between 2019 and 2021 was 13%. From 2019 to 2022, if we look at that span, it's 17.7%. So again, the application used the lower number, the lower percentage. One point about property taxes I'd want to make is that property taxes constitute 46% of the expenses that were presented in this worksheet, so that is a substantial chunk of the reason for the increase. The operating expenses themselves use the Consumer Price Index (CPI), which is automatically loaded into the form. The form that they used had a 6.05% CPI increase in that time period. But we all know that inflation has been significant. What's showing up now with the current form would be a CPI all the way up to 13.95%, so more than double the percentage point amount used for the previous year. In the staff analysis, using those numbers, they found that the owners qualified for an 11.4% rent increase. What had been asked was for a maximum 8% increase. That was with the application using 2021 numbers. Using 2022 numbers, they could have gone to 16.6%, which again was not what was requested. The appellants will speak with a clearer voice than I on what their concerns are with my recommendation. My recommendation is to deny the appeal for these cases. That would be based on my finding and recommendation to you that the rent increases are justifiable. The main 2 considerations that I think come into play that the tenants did bring up had to do with whether 2019 was an appropriate base year to be used for comparison for measuring whether an increase should be granted and also whether some of the individual line items within the worksheet were accurate or representative. In my estimation, 2019 is the base year that's been used for all other cases except for very limited circumstances where we may have an owner who does not, have access to 2019 numbers. They may have acquired the building. There may have been a death. Otherwise, everyone is using 2019. Secondly, given that the large share of the increase is justified just under the CPI and the property tax increases, auditing much smaller line items does not seem mathematically justifiable in my estimation.

Councilmember Noecker: So just to make sure I'm clear, it sounds like there was a rent increase of 8% applied for. We determined that was allowable. The appeal now is of that decision to allow that rent increase. Alright, that was a staff report on all 4 items. We can open the public hearing.

Jamele Watkins: For corporate entities, finance enthusiasts, and people who are very economically secure, it's very easy to talk about the cost of living like it's weather, completely out of our control and the results of million little interlocking factors. For renters, especially cost-burdened renters, that's not what it's like at all. When you rent, it's the single biggest monthly expense that you have to deal with, and that can change with little to no warning or justification, and based off of the decision of a single person or business. So using what we could do with our rights as citizens and tenants, we asked our landlord to justify why they needed to raise the rent to 8%. The justification, while accurate and admissible within the processes created by the city, were not impressive or compelling to us as renters. Property taxes hadn't been vigorously itemized, and again, we were talking about the base here, which you had

earlier mentioned arguing for base year of 2020 instead of 2019, pre pandemic versus post pandemic. Administrative expenses that also did not result in increased quality of living or noticeable efficiencies in the budget and a high rate of inflation that we as working families are far less equipped to bear the brunt than shareholders. So to anyone tempted to believe that 8% isn't a lot. Let's think about it a little bit. Let's do some math. So 8x12 eight percent of 1 months rent times 12 is 96% of 1 months rent, or approximately 1 extra month's worth of rent over the course of a year. The year after an 8% increase, you will pay your current year's rent, but 13 times instead of 12, while getting the same number of paychecks. Well, it may seem like a small number in the grand scheme of things. I'll break this down for you. I'm actually paying for my 2 bedroom apartment at \$1750, but I will be paying \$2000. I will end up paying \$2000 monthly before utilities and that will include the rent, the \$100 a month for parking, \$75.00 for pet insurance, and another \$75.00 for storage unit. I need the storage unit and the garage because I have a toddler who has a lot of accessories. What I'm saying is that these aren't hypothetical numbers for me here. I wonder if you all could manage an 8% increase in your mortgage or in your rent. This isn't a game to me, but I feel like I'm being played. 8% this year is burdensome and 8% again next year is untenable. When we spoke with our neighbors around the building to tell them about the opportunity we would have today to address the City Council, many families we encountered had already resigned themselves to having to move, and we've seen a lot of our neighbors move out of the building. They knew that they might be able to find cheaper rent in town for one year, but knew that if their landlord had also self certified for 8% at the end of a new lease term, they may very well be back on the market again and having to move in 12 months. In fact, when I tried asking for a 12 month lease back in May because my lease was coming up, Victoria told me that they wanted to wait for the City Council decision on whether or not I could renew for a 12 month lease. I did try to protect myself but was not able to. This also does not take into account the rising prices of groceries. Daycare also went up for me. Health insurance, also went up. Unlike other expenses that we have from year to year, you can't simply cut back on housing. You have to pay or move, and interest rates to buy a house or a condo are so unbearably high right now that buying isn't an option for me either. Moving of course, involves its own monetary costs, but other costs can't be quantified. Being further from work, family and community resources like groceries or having to move my child to a new daycare and trying to get my bearings as a new voter or in a new ward or precinct. When rent gets out of reach, so does the stability, community and peace of mind. When this happens to more than one household at a time, entire neighborhoods could disintegrate. While this appeal focuses on our units and our building, we believe that this is bigger than us. This appeal is an opportunity for us as residents of Saint Paul to speak against an 8% increase in rent. Again, how are we supposed to trust our local government when you overturn mandates that the residents of City of Saint Paul voted for?

Councilmember Balenger moved to close the public hearing. Approved 6-0.

Balenger: I want to say I appreciate you all coming down to City Hall and making your case not just for yourselves, but for tenants across the City as well. It's an admirable thing to do. The unfortunate reality is that the Rent Stabilization Ordinance we passed last year doesn't do enough to protect tenants. The subsequent rules set by DSI don't reflect what Saint Paul residents voted for. That being said, we have to work with the rules and the ordinance we have now. I will be supporting Moermond's recommendation today, but I will give a firm commitment to work with Councilmember Jalali and the rest of the Council on bringing back Safe 2.0 to better protect tenants from situations like this when we have today.

Noecker: I will support your motion. I also want to thank you so much for your testimony. I think painting the picture of what that amount looks like for you personally

and your story of childcare, your story of moving expense, I mean all of those things, I think really helps demonstrate concerns about the policy at large. We're here on whether or not the rent increase that was applied for is justified under the policy as it stands and I agree with Balenger, that I think it clearly does. The larger questions about the policy itself aren't germane to this conversation, but I hear a willingness to talk about that bigger question that Balenger mentioned.

Councilmember Prince: I too really appreciate the testimony that we heard. It's extremely frustrating that, regardless of it didn't involve this Council, the rent stabilization ordinance was passed by the voters and that was with a 3% increase, and as Balenger said the administration developed rules that allow self certification up to 8%. Those were rules that were also not passed by the Council, and whether or not that's something that we can revisit. The ordinance, as it was passed, did make clear that a property owner had a right to a reasonable return on investment, and unfortunately that's the analysis that was done that we have been legally advised is the correct analysis under the ordinance passed by the voters. We have a housing crisis. For people at low and moderate incomes, there is just no question that more needs to be done to build affordable units. It is really, really upsetting to hear about young families and individuals being displaced even with the hope that people had that the rent stabilization ordinance would help to solve this problem. We have a supply problem and I know that doesn't make you feel any better, but we are kind of locked in on what we can do here and I think we're all committed to trying to do everything we can to create a larger supply of affordable units and to try to make this ordinance. Thank you for being here and this is this is really painful.

Councilmember Yang: I definitely have a lot that I'm thinking about and I think what I'm feeling in the moment right now is really an urgency for us as Councilmembers to dig more into our stabilization ordinance policy and to really connect with DSI around how decision making is made around, even things like bringing in the 2019-2023 finance records, and what sort of system or benchmarks are put into place when we revisit that conversation, because I don't have that information and also I'm not getting those responses either or even getting updates about it. I just wanted to be really transparent about that. This is a really frustrating situation to be in and at the end of the day. The people who hurt the most are people in our city who are renters and just trying to make it day by day. If we don't figure this out, then there will continue to be more displacement, which is unacceptable. I wanted to make that really clear and also let the renters who are here testifying know that you can definitely reach out to councilmembers for additional support, and I also would urge you to connect with Homeline too, which is a really phenomenal organization for renters where you can get free advice.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

42 [RLH RSA 23-2](#)

Appeal of Christine Hackney to a Rent Stabilization Determination at 400 SELBY AVENUE, Apt 327.

Appeal denied.

Also in attendance: Cole Hanson, Philip Coolidge, Laura Janik

(See RLH RSA 23-1 for staff report)

Cole Hanson: My name is Cole Hanson. I'm speaking, actually on behalf of Christine. They were not able to be here at the hearing. I brought some fellow folks from Saint Paul. I myself am a public health educator in the community and I just wanted to speak to a couple of specific instances of concern regarding renting as a whole here in Saint Paul, and then in specific, what I saw with regards to this case here at 400 Selby. First, as a number of you have said, affordable housing is essential to life in our city. As someone who was a renter previously, I'm a homeowner now, there are a number of costs that are passed on to the folks who are renting. I take these on as an owner, with the difference being that at some point I can expect a return of equity on my home, regardless of these changes overtime and I can in fact, deduct property taxes which are considered in this application as well. Renters cannot do that in the same way. Increases to the rent are not deductible. They just become a part of life. In fact, another month of rent that is collected from them over time. In looking specifically at the application, I noticed a couple of things that jumped out to me, the first being a near doubling of management services fees. What caught me by surprise was I haven't seen my wages double in two years and I'm certain that most of us haven't. I'm curious as to why they would be seeking such a large increase. Commensurate with such a large increase in management fees, another piece was that there was a \$35,000 uninsured loss on the application. That did seem to raise some questions overall in general. It is hard to be a renter when it comes to the changes in our economy. Making space for our renters to have safe places to live, places where they can raise their families, raise their children, and contribute to our City is essential.

Philip Coolidge: I'm just echoing the concerns that have already been said about this rent increase and encouraging the Council members to be bold on these actions that you can make to affect everyday renters. Even if you know this current ordinance has passed that allows for greater increases than 3% and you know the renters and you feel for them as you've expressed earlier, I encourage you to stand up to this rent increase. It's possible that the organization might appeal your decision and there might be lawsuits or something. I assume they have some level of monetary resource for that. I'm a renter myself. Just asking the Council to consider that.

Laura Janik: Like Cole, I used to rent for a long time and now a homeowner, which is essentially a rent controlled place to live in a lot of ways. Dignified housing means affordable housing. I just want to stand in support of the all the residents today at 400 Selby Ave.

Councilmember Balenger moved to close the public hearing. Approved 6-0.

Councilmember Noecker: I appreciate the comments in general about rent and in general about the differences between that and home ownership, but we really legally need to make sure our comments are germane to the specific appeal in front of us.

Balenger: I move to support the recommendation of the Legislative Hearing Officer.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

AVENUE, Apt. 303.

Appeal denied.

Also in attendance: Levi Indvik, appellant

(See RLH RSA 23-1 for staff report)

Levi Indvik: I just want to talk a little bit about the sort of process we went through to even try to get this appeal. We're not really surprised by the City's recommendation to reject our appeal because it was kind of clear from the structure of the hearing and the tenor of the conversation and the appeal process that it is not designed to be won by tenants. If an appellant can overcome the numerous barriers to submitting an appeal and appearing in front of City staff, they're still on their own to create a response to the landlord's self certification. Even having something to say at the hearing requires the access to those documents funded by the landlord's time, and expertise to interpret those numbers and trust that the numbers reported are accurate and representative. In our case, it didn't really matter whether the numbers reported by a landlord were accurate or representative. There are some interesting numbers and increases between the base here and the comparison year, such as the 58% increase on management spending services. They reported spending almost 2.5 times the amount of money on accounting than they did in 2019. There's also an increase of 34% in cost of insurance from 2019 to 2021, while at the same time claiming they had \$35,500 in uninsured damages in 2021 when they did not report any uninsured damages in 2019. Also for our building, it is a mix of residential and commercial space. Yet, there's no way to know if the numbers they submitted are across the whole building or just for our apartments. They submitted the entire property tax bill for this mixed-use property and self reported that the proportion of taxes related to residential units was 60% of the bill, but the city declined to verify this. When we brought up these sort of blind spots and concerns with the numbers accuracy, we were essentially told, "Well, the basic math checks out." We will simply trust these numbers. As the Hearing Officer mentioned, they decided that actually the numbers suggest they could apply for a higher increase than 8%. After we brought this up, we were basically told that we are not within our rights as tenants to expect or demand any oversight into those numbers that they submitted. The Legislative Hearing Officer's findings noted that we believe that the 2019 was not a representative base year due to the 32% increase in operating costs from 2019 to 2021. But, they did leave out that they told us during our hearing that we are not within our rights as tenants to ask for an adjusted base year. That is not true, as the rent stabilization rules update states that landlords or tenants may present evidence to rebut the presumption that the base year net operating income provided a reasonable return. In their findings, they stated that our argument was not persuasive as to why our property should be treated differently than all other applicants for an exception of the 3% rent cap. We believe this is an example of the city not following the rent stabilization rules update and justifying it by saying that they've never chosen to verify self reported expenses from landlords before. These numbers may very well be accurate, and we acknowledge that, but we really don't have any way to know. Our landlord said they needed to raise their rent and there was nothing we could do to confirm they were telling the truth and nothing the city was willing to do to offer us assurance to those numbers.

Councilmember Balenger: From what I understand, the records that were used made it seem to me that the increase would be less than if we used the numbers moving forward. So I guess it would be like, if these numbers were verified, it would be like rolling the dice. It could be more. Is it possible to do that?

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer: In reviewing the areas that were

brought up as parts of the Maintenance of Net Operating Income (MNOI) worksheet that the tenants were concerned about, even if there was no justification at all for an increase, for example in management services, and that it was illegitimate to say in 2019 we spent \$86,700 on management, but in 2021 we spent \$136,000. The difference there is a \$50,000 increase over those two years. If the entire \$50,000 shouldn't have been increased, that still isn't a number that moves the meter on whether or not a rent increase would be acceptable under the rules being applied. Therefore, I did not go deeper into that because the numbers simply it did not make sense from my perspective, just from staff time in those cases, if it wasn't going to move the needle over or under. Did you ask about property taxes as well?

Balenger: I'm just thinking about all of the fees that were added on, there seems to be some question as to whether or not they were accurate. If that's the case, I guess I would like to think that I would like to say that maybe we should take a look at those numbers, if that would make the tenants feel better. I'd like to see that happen if and maybe that should be a discussion. Maybe we could put this off for a couple of weeks until we could have that discussion.

Councilmember Yang: Would you be able to share how we get the numbers and verify accuracy?

Moermond: We have staff people who review all of these. Do they ask for someone's property taxes, to look through them? I haven't heard that happen. In reviewing this does something rise to the level that it makes sense to pursue the audit ability that's described in the ordinance? Would that be a good use of time to do that? In this case, I did not hear from staff that they found any of these line items particularly alarming. Management increases happen that much over 2 years from different styles of management or different things happening. Should we audit that number? If we did audit it, where does it take us? In the hearing, office expenses were brought up. Accounting charges were brought up, since it goes from 3400 to 11,000. It is such a small amount when you're talking about these huge, huge numbers that no, I didn't go there with this particular case. That doesn't mean it can't happen in the future. With respect to using 2019 as a base year, absolutely a different base year can be substituted. I did not find justification in the tenants arguments to do that. That was my finding. The Council can always make a different determination. With respect to the property tax numbers that were brought up, there was a very careful analysis of the property tax numbers that I did myself. I had staff look at it as well, but I ran those numbers looking at the property tax statements from the county and the proportion of the building the owner used. Not the entire property tax bill, but rather the portion attributable to the residential portion of the building, which amounted to about 60% of each of the property tax statements in question. Those were the numbers. We ran them. They were accurate. What the tenants submitted as part of their appeal were proposed property tax statements. That's what comes out to a property owner and gets talked about in the yearly Truth in Taxation hearing. That came in as an attachment, and is a different animal.

Councilmember Noecker: It sounds like the bulk of the increase was justified by two things: The property tax increases and the cost of living increases. You did not do further analysis of things like the management expenses because those were irrelevant. The other two increases alone would have justified more than the increase that was being applied for. To Miss Yang's question, which was also mine, it sounds like there is verification of something like a property tax. We don't just take their word for it.

Moermond: Those are attached to the records in front of you. Balenger, you were talking about fees and charges connected with the amount of money that the tenants

pay on a monthly basis? Looking at the ordinance and the items that were included as rent before the increase, did they transfer did they transfer any of the expenses to another kind of bill? Did they formally just give tenants parking and now they're going to give a parking bill and increase rent, you know, so there's this larger bump? There was not an allegation that was happening and it did not appear in any records. There are other fees, such as a pet deposit and other thing, but I did not hear that they were in any way interfering with the analysis of this particular application. I could look into that more deeply, but it wasn't previously asserted.

Councilmember Prince: The staff memo indicates the reasons for the increase listed in the application include an increase in property taxes and an unavoidable increase in operating expenses. What is the unavoidable increase in operating expenses based on? Did you say that those weren't considered in calculating that number? For example, the \$50,000 increase in management fees.

Moermond: Those are included in the worksheet.

Prince: Are they avoidable?

Moermond: To distinguish unavoidable increases is to capture all the costs with operating the building that are going up, as opposed to, for example, capital improvements that affect specific units. I did not parse out those things. It was a single application looking at the entire statement of operating expenses. That is page 7 of the application. You could see differently between 2021 and 2022, but that might be onerous. You could, and we want to see 2022 numbers, but I don't know that it's going to change the analysis based on the property tax data and the inflation jump there alone.

Prince: The real estate taxes do not reflect the commercial real estate?

Moermond: No. That 40% of the property tax statement was not included in the worksheet that they submitted.

Noecker: I appreciate the thoughtful discussion and questions. Based on this information, I am going to move the recommendation of the Legislative Hearing Officer.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

44 [RLH RSA 23-4](#)

Appeal of Erica Mumm to a Rent Stabilization Determination at 400 SELBY AVENUE, Apt. 332.

Appeal denied.

Also in attendance: Erica Mumm, appellant

(See RLH RSA 23-1 for staff report)

Erica Mumm: I would like to echo Levi's concerns about the different line items and the way that the Blair reported them. I think it is potentially worth investigation. You know that they reported a 32% increase in their operating costs in two years. I'm not

a business lady, but that doesn't seem unavoidable to me. I also would just like to question again the property taxes. They did submit their property tax information, but they are for the combined residential and commercial. The actual tax forms that they submitted are for the residential and commercial properties combined. During the hearing, the Legislative Hearing Officer declined to look further into which proportion was allocated towards residential and which was commercial. I'm not sure what type of analysis was done afterwards, but I am concerned that in the recommendation from the Hearing Officer, it mentions that we believed that 2019 was not a representative base year and it said that we were not persuasive since they hadn't ever looked into any self reported expenses from landlords. But, it also said that this was sort of negligible compared to the amount of money spent on the property taxes. Then in another part of the recommendation, it said that the we brought up that they're supposed to get a decrease in property taxes in 2023. It says that the decrease should be considered but it should be noted that property taxes are only one consideration. When you look at the recommendation for the expenses versus the property taxes, when we were talking about the expenses, that was only part of it. But when we were talking about expenses, that was only part of it. It just seems a little bit like circular logic to me. I know that during this appeal process, landlords are not able to raise rent over the 3% cap. I think it's very concerning because the Blair has actually refused to renew leases during this time until they are able to increase rent up to 8% even though they say it could be anywhere from 0% to 8%. They're actually not renewing leases until they're able to increase it to that higher amount, which I don't think is in the spirit of not being able to increase rents up to 8% while you're waiting for the determination of the appeal. I know that there's been a few comments about staying within the scope of this hearing. I think it's also concerning that the process for landlords to appeal for an exemption is that they have to fill out a Google form online while tenants have to fill out a form and they can either email and then mail in a check or have to show up to City Council during office hours. They have to pay \$25 when landlords don't have to pay for their applications and don't need to show up during business hours. I know that's more procedural but I do think that's a concern. All of these expenses are self reported. There is no oversight on that or the breakdown of the property tax system. The math is not being provided to us as renters, and so it's hard for us to know is there oversight into this when it's not being provided to us.

Councilmember Noecker: I just want to acknowledge your procedural concerns, although that is not the main point that you made. I think I speak for all of us when I say that we believe strongly that we need to modernize City services and start not only accepting checks.

Councilmember Balenger: I'm going to move Moermond's recommendation.

Adopted

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

LEGISLATIVE HEARING CONSENT AGENDA

Items listed under the Consent Agenda will receive a combined public hearing and be enacted by one motion with no separate discussion. Items may be removed from the Consent Agenda for a separate public hearing and discussion if desired.

Approval of the Consent Agenda

Councilmember Tolbert moved approval.

Legislative Hearing Consent Agenda adopted as amended

Yea: 5 - Councilmember Tolbert, Councilmember Noecker, Councilmember Prince, Councilmember Yang and Councilmember Balenger

Nay: 0

Absent: 2 - Councilmember Brendmoen and Councilmember Jalali

- 30** [RLH TA 23-182](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 399 BLAIR AVENUE. (File No. J2308E, Assessment No. 238307) (To refer to August 1, 2023 Legislative Hearing)
Referred to August 1, 2023 Legislative Hearing
- 31** [RLH TA 23-169](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 809 CHARLES AVENUE. (File No. J2301V, Assessment No. 238000)
Adopted
- 32** [RLH TA 23-168](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1783 DAYTON AVENUE. (File No. J2308B, Assessment No. 238107)
Adopted
- 33** [RLH TA 23-186](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 600 HATCH AVENUE. (File No. J2301V, Assessment No. 238000) (Refer back to June 20, 2023 Legislative Hearing)
Referred to June 20, 2023 Legislative Hearing
- 34** [RLH TA 23-177](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1885 IVY AVENUE EAST. (File No. J2308E, Assessment No. 238307)
Adopted
- 35** [RLH OA 23-1](#) Appeal of Rachael Rivard to a Denial of a Fence Variance at 530 JENKS AVENUE.
Public hearing continued to July 12, 2023
- 36** [RLH TA 23-163](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1557 MARGARET STREET. (File No. J2308E, Assessment No. 238307)
Adopted
- 39** [RLH TA 23-172](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 828 MOUND STREET. (File No. J2308E, Assessment No. 238507)
Adopted

- 45 [RLH RR 23-21](#) Ordering the razing and removal of the structures at 871 STICKNEY STREET within fifteen (15) days after the June 14, 2023, City Council Public Hearing.

Referred to July 11, 2023 Legislative Hearing

- 46 [RLH AR 23-43](#) Ratifying the assessments for Collection of Vacant Building Registration fees billed during October 14 to December 22, 2022. (File No. VB2308, Assessment No. 238809)

Adopted

- 47 [RLH AR 23-44](#) Ratifying the assessments for Securing and/or Emergency Boarding services during January 2023. (File No. J2308B, Assessment No. 238107)

Adopted

- 48 [RLH AR 23-45](#) Ratifying the assessments for Collection of Fire Certificate of Occupancy fees billed during November 30 to December 23, 2022. (File No. CRT2307, Assessment No. 238206)

Adopted

- 49 [RLH AR 23-46](#) Ratifying the assessments for Excessive Use of Inspection or Abatement services billed during November 22 to December 22, 2022. (File No. J2308E, Assessment No. 238307)

Adopted

- 50 [RLH AR 23-47](#) Ratifying the assessments for Towing of Abandoned Vehicle services billed during January to November 2022. (File No. J2301V, Assessment No. 238000)

Adopted

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting ended at 6:04 PM

City Council meetings are open for in person attendance, but the public may also comment on public hearing items in writing or via voicemail. Any comments and materials submitted by 12:00 pm of the day before the meeting will be attached to the public record and available for review by the City Council. Comments may be submitted as follows:

The public may comment on public hearing items in writing or via voicemail. Any comments and materials submitted by 12:00 pm of the day before the meeting will be attached to the public record and available for review by the City Council. Comments may be submitted as follows:

Written public comment on public hearing items can be submitted to Contact-Council@ci.stpaul.mn.us, CouncilHearing@ci.stpaul.mn.us, or by voicemail at 651-266-6805. Live testimony will be taken in person in the Council Chambers, and by telephone by registering to speak by noon on the day before the meeting. The registration link is located on the City Council website at www.stpaul.gov/council or <https://forms.office.com/g/TD3xN7WHy5>.

Council Meeting Information

The City Council is paperless which saves the environment and reduces expenses. The agendas and Council files are all available on the Web (see below). Council members use mobile devices to review the files during the meeting. Using a mobile device greatly reduces costs since most agendas, including the documents attached to files, are over 1000 pages when printed.

Web

Meetings are available on the Council's website. Email notification and web feeds (RSS) of newly released minutes, agendas, and meetings are available by subscription. Visit www.stpaul.gov/council for meeting videos and updated copies of the agendas, minutes, and supporting documents.

Cable

Meetings are live on St Paul Channel 18 and replayed at various times. Check your local listings.