

He commented that it was not a perfect solution, but it was the only solution he was aware of that could be pursued in the short term for this urgent situation. The slime, grease, and ooze that came out of those of dumpsters made it dangerous to walk in the alley as it was slippery. He could not imagine much worse than falling in it. It was an ugly situation that was crying out for some kind of immediate relief. The dumpster had narrowed the alley tremendously. It had never been wide enough for real vehicle traffic, but it was now impossible to get a lot of vehicles down the alley. He pointed out it was also impossible to close the dumpsters with the way they were aligned against the wall of the building they occupied, and every time it rained, the items in the dumpster got soaked and did not dry out quickly causing it to rot. It was a horrible situation. He pointed out there were more people and businesses in the downtown, and a consequence of that was more trash.

Mayor Treece asked if the dumpsters mentioned would be removed with the purchase of the property and the compactor there. Mr. Sorrell replied yes, and explained everything, i.e., recycling and refuse collection dumpsters, within those two blocks would be relocated to this one common location.

Mr. Thomas understood the concern mentioned about grease leaking out would not be addressed by this change because those placing grease illegally in the dumpsters would likely put the grease illegally in the compactor as well. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct and noted that was a separate issue, which they were working on with the CID and the Public Works Department in hopes of bringing proposed solutions to Council in the future.

Katie Essing, 11 S. Tenth Street, commented that she was with the Downtown CID and noted a quality of life issue that came with a vibrant and full downtown was lots of trash. She thanked the Solid Waste Division for helping them work on this issue over many months, and pointed out the CID Board supported the Master Plan, of which the purchase of this property was a part. She explained the CID Board would like the City to save the historic building so it would maintain the streetscape along Walnut since only the parking lot in the back was needed. She stated she believed that would lower the rate impact to the users in the CID.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Essing if the Downtown CID property owners were comfortable paying higher utility rates to offset the cost of this. Ms. Essing replied it had not been an easy decision, but due to the complaints and volume of trash in the area, it seemed to be critical as mentioned by previous speakers.

Mr. Ruffin asked if the building on Walnut Street was currently occupied. Ms. Essing replied she did not believe it was currently occupied. Ms. Peters commented that part of it was as she had been there yesterday. She explained she thought it had been a 15-foot wide building, but it appeared to be 40 feet wide. The building had two apartments upstairs and a place for business on the first floor. Ms. Peters wondered what they would do with regard to parking for that building if they used the parking lot for trash and recycling. Ms. Essing replied a consideration was parking, but it had been privately held. She understood the owner would give up that parking.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, commented that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) had met the night after this item had appeared on the meeting agenda as an introduction and first reading item. As a result, they had been unaware of it when they had formulated their agenda for their April meeting, and had not been able to discuss it. She expressed her unease as a member of the public with regard to the perils of this purchase. There were two distinct buildings with two distinct addresses. The first floor area, which currently had an organizing office in it, could be used for residential or commercial purposes. Further upstairs were two apartments that could be affordable housing for young people and people of modest means that might work downtown. It was not the luxury housing that tended to be the only option available to students. She commented that in looking at the picture displayed she saw a lot of cars behind the buildings and a lot of space for putting a dumpster on private property when those same

private property owners were earning revenue from leasing their buildings to restaurants and other businesses that generated trash. She stated she recalled a discussion that required a property owner to contribute \$50,000 to a sewer bypass downtown because the existing sewer line, which also served the North Central neighborhood by Hubbell Drive and St. Joseph Street, had continually been blocked with grease. She noted they kept spending money or asking others seemingly unrelated to the problem to solve a problem that was the result of a lack of enforcement. Until they solved the grease problem, they were just providing a bigger and more expensive container in which to dump. She asked the Council to think carefully about taking what seemed to be the more difficult, but perhaps, much less expensive route of enforcement first. The two buildings were old and in need of cosmetic help, but they were also representative of a time when business storefronts looked a certain way. She pointed out Ninth Street, around the corner, was a historic district and all of the structures there were contributing structures to the look and feel of downtown as it existed in the 1920s and 1930s. It represented a cultural heritage of Columbia. When turning the corner from Ninth Street, they continued to see that roofline and those materials indicative of that time. She again asked the Council to think carefully before spending money on something that might be improved by enforcement.

Tootie Burns explained she was representing Orr Street Studios Board and the North Village Arts District Board, and was glad to see the Master Plan, which had been in the works for some time. She viewed it as a plan that would allow everyone to know where dumpsters were placed and where appropriate disposal would occur. She commented that the North Village Arts District and the Orr Street Studios very much supported the Master Plan as a way to organize how trash could be disposed and where dumpsters could be placed. She stated she believed it would also encourage recycling. She explained the dumpster they were concerned about in the alley near Orr Street was a vehicle for illegal dumping and dumping that occurred every day with debris outside of the dumpster, which created a problem for them. She applauded staff for coming up with a Master Plan that would allow people to know where dumpsters were located and with placement that was appropriate for businesses and residents downtown. She believed it would decrease the opportunity for indiscriminate dumping, and asked the Council to support the Master Plan. It made sense, was supported by many businesses, and would help with the trash situation downtown.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Burns how this would help to encourage recycling. Ms. Burns replied she understood the dumpster that was currently in the alley near Orr Street would be moved to the Wabash Station where there were currently recycling dumpsters. This would provide the ability to recycle when placing trash in the dumpster. She explained they already recycled as they would walk the recycling across the street. She thought other businesses would do the same.

Mr. Thomas understood the proposed compactors were not split in half with both recycling and trash capacity. Mr. Hunt stated that was correct. He explained at Orr Street, they were proposing to remove the trash dumpster in the alley and relocate a trash compactor currently on the Wabash property from the southwest corner to the northeast corner along with a recycling bin in a nice enclosure. Mr. Thomas agreed it would be helpful for well-labeled recycling receptacles and the regular trash compactor to be next to each other.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Burns who owned the alley south of Orr Street where the problematic dumpster was located. Ms. Burns replied she thought the City owned it. Mayor Treece asked if that was the City's dumpster as well. Ms. Burns replied yes. Mayor Treece asked for the status of that dumpster. Ms. Burns replied it was the reason she was speaking. Mayor Treece noted he had called twice to have it dumped.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, agreed the situation with the dumpster mentioned by Mr. Viets and Ms. Frier was as bad as they had indicated, but it had been that way for a long time. He understood they had a compactor plan now, but they still did not have a

combined compactor, collection, grease, facility, and enforcement plan. If they did not put all of those things together, he did not believe they would ever make any progress because it was difficult to get people to accept enforcement. He suggested the Council hold off on moving forward until they learned about enforcement options. He commented that he also wanted to know in detail what the CID would pay when only half of the property purchased would be used as he believed the CID had been created to solve and fund issues such as this. He noted he wanted more detail about how this would be funded. Like Ms. Fowler, he also wondered about the rest of the property, i.e., the building, and its role in the downtown. He did not feel the situation would get any better or worse in the next few weeks, and thought the CID should purchase the building allowing the City to lease the necessary space from them. He also thought more specifics were needed in terms of enforcement along with financing.

Mr. Pitzer asked if this property had been listed publically for sale before staff had discussed this option. Mr. Sorrell replied it had been listed for some time, but it was then taken off of the market. The property owner had contacted the City to see if they might be interested in purchasing the south half. Mr. Pitzer asked for its listing price. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not recall.

Mr. Pitzer understood rate increases would not be requested for the next two years in terms of solid waste collection. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct, and explained a lot of rate adjustments had been done based on the most recent cost of service study. This fiscal year had been the last for the rate adjustments across all categories, and they needed a couple of years of data prior to conducting another rate study to determine the costs of providing service. He wanted to include the purchase price of this into it at that time so the costs could be recovered over a 30-year period. Based on current rates over 30 years, he thought the maximum increase that could be attributed to the purchase was five percent. Mr. Pitzer understood there was \$1.5 million in excess reserves in the solid waste fund. Mr. Sorrell stated they had received a larger amount of revenue than had been anticipated at the landfill due to the combustion residuals project resulting in the excess reserves increasing dramatically this fiscal year. Mr. Pitzer commented that it sounded as though they might have been increasing rates too much. Mr. Sorrell explained it was a one-time project. Mayor Treece pointed out it was another City division paying them to dump those residuals. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters asked if they had trash compactors for these locations or if they would have to purchase them. Mr. Sorrell replied they had them. He explained they replaced them on a routine schedule and always had additional available in case a business needed one.

Mr. Ruffin asked if this site was large enough to add recycling bins and for the timeline if this was approved tonight. Mr. Hunt replied the site was large enough for a trash compactor, a compactor for cardboard, and dumpsters for containers and metal. They had plenty of room if they used the parking area of the property. In terms of a timeline, if this was approved, they would have to set up a closing date, and about 30 days after the City had possession of the property, they could place the trash compactor set. He explained they would need to have a meter set for electricity, which was the only thing that required lead time. He pointed out he did not know the current status of the contract the owner had with the people that parked in that lot, so that was something unforeseen that had not been explored with the owner.

Mr. Ruffin asked Ms. Essing if she anticipated any resistance from business owners for removing the dumpsters in the alleys. Ms. Essing replied she thought they would receive complaints if they did not have any trash in that alley at all. It was a dense area with restaurants and businesses and they would have to walk behind this building or across the way, which was a further walk. Mr. Ruffin commented that if they did not remove the dumpsters, the problem would continue to persist. Ms. Essing stated that was correct if they were unable to do the compactor. Mr. Ruffin explained he meant even with the compactor if they did not remove the dumpsters. Ms. Essing stated she thought the

dumpsters would be removed with the compactors. Mr. Ruffin asked Ms. Essing if she thought the local businesses would complain if they had to walk there. Ms. Essing replied no as it was right there within the same alley.

Mr. Skala commented that he understood compactors were at least a partial solution to the trash problem, but was concerned about the integrity of the building they would purchase. He noted he was also particularly troubled by the issue of grease and its enforcement. He wondered if they might want surveille the compactors to determine where the violations were occurring. He thought they needed to view this as a holistic problem. The purchase of this property might help with the trash situation, but it did not do anything to address the grease issue or enforcement.

Mayor Treece asked if staff had looked at the north facing property in terms of its condition. He wondered what kind of liability they might inherit and if the building would even be in compliance with the UDC if they utilized the parking for trash and recycling containers. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought they could replat it so the south side met all of the requirements of the UDC and they could sell the property on the north.

Mayor Treece understood the owner had contacted the City with regard to purchasing only south portion of the property and asked for clarification. Mr. Sorrell replied it had been discussed, and the appraised value was about \$350,000, but the owner had wanted a considerably higher amount. As a result, staff asked for the purchase price for the entire site.

Ms. Peters suggested tabling B72-18, which was the sale of the property, to allow time for the HPC to look this property and for staff to address the other issues, such as whether this would meet the UDC.

Mayor Treece stated he would be in favor of tabling this. He understood one potential solution was to acquire the lot with the intent of subdividing it and taking only the square footage needed. This would allow time to determine if they needed to leave access to that rear parking lot through a passageway and how all of that would look. In addition, they could place restrictive covenants on the title if merited. He also felt they would want to put it back on the market the day it closed as it should not be a part of the City's portfolio. He commented that he still was not sure it was the responsibility of government to provide a site for trash receptacles, but noted he could be persuaded.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a deadline on the offer for the property. Mr. Sorrell replied he was not aware of a deadline on the offer, but he did not know what the property owner would do if this was tabled as he had the option of going elsewhere.

Ms. Peters made a motion to table B72-18 to the May 21, 2018 Council Meeting to allow time for the Historic Preservation Commission to look at this property and to allow staff time to address the outstanding issues mentioned tonight. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas stated he had concerns about purchasing a property that was 40 feet by 140 feet to place a compactor that was only 6 feet by 10 feet on it. They did not know what the property had been listed for when it was on the market, and did not know what arrangements the landlord had with the people that parked cars there. It felt like a poorly thought out plan. He commented that it might be the right thing to do, but he questioned whether all of the due diligence had been done. He understood there was an urgent problem to solve for the residents and business owners in the area, but had some concerns about spending taxpayer or ratepayer money in this way. He also had concerns about the plan, but would comment on that later.

Mayor Treece commented that unless staff had asked all of these questions and had received answers, he was inclined to allow them time to flush it out some more.

Mr. Skala stated he wanted to seek more clarification before proceeding as well.

Mr. Thomas agreed, and noted he wanted to know the condition of the building, what they were buying, etc.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had walked through the building. Mr. Sorrell replied he had not.

Mr. Thomas asked if they had explored other possibilities in terms of leasing an appropriate amount of land. Mr. Hunt replied the compactor had been located on the south side of the alley on private property. The City had a private property lease for that compactor and the owner had terminated the lease and requested it be removed, so it had been removed. They had preliminary discussions with the owner of the parcel they were asking to purchase without any luck. The bank on the west end did not want it either. Mr. Thomas asked about placing it in an on-street parking space at a curb. Mr. Hunt replied it would likely take two parking spaces. Mr. Thomas understood it was 10 feet by 6 feet. Mr. Hunt stated the unit itself was 8 feet wide and 12-13 feet long and space was needed for an enclosure around it and for the truck. He explained they typically asked for a 12-foot wide and 20-foot long space.

Ms. Peters asked if the size was the reason they could not just put it in the alley. Mr. Hunt replied it would fit in the alley, but a vehicle could then not be driven past it. Ms. Peters wondered if they needed to drive vehicles past it in that alley.

**The motion made by Ms. Peters and seconded by Mr. Thomas to table B72-18 to the May 21, 2018 Council Meeting to allow time for the Historic Preservation Commission to look at this property and to allow staff time to address the outstanding issues mentioned tonight was approved unanimously by voice vote.**

Mayor Treece asked if there was any further discussion on the Master Plan. Mr. Thomas replied he would like to see the problems, such as grease, the ability for people to recycle, enforcement, the desire to get rid of dumpsters, the efficiency created by the compactors, etc. along with a map of all of the current facilities, to include recycling, in comparison with the proposal. He did not feel this was a plan. He felt it was just a map. It did not provide any justification for this particular choice, the methodology, how many downtown property owners were involved, etc. He wanted to see a more robust plan for solid waste collection in the CID.

Mayor Treece asked staff if they contemplated the Master Plan as a plan or just as a map. Mr. Sorrell replied it was contemplated mostly as a map showing the locations of the compactors. Mr. Pitzer pointed out it was called the Locator Master Plan.

Ms. Peters commented that the Solid Waste Division staff knew what they were doing, and they had heard from the CID and those that went through the trouble of walking through these alleys and areas. She stated she was not opposed to them moving ahead with this part of the plan, and for them to then provide a report or more comprehensive plan with the information requested by Mr. Thomas and what they could do about everything else. She thought they needed to start somewhere, and this would allow that to happen. It also appeared as though the compactors worked much better than the overflowing dumpsters. Mayor Treece agreed and noted it appeared that most were in the public right-of-way instead of leased space.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with Ms. Peters. He noted explanations with regard to the issues of trash, grease, and enforcement could come to Council when B72-18 was back before the Council. This plan at least showed where the compactors would be located. He commented that he would like to see additional coding on the map as had been suggested by Mr. Thomas, and thought that could also be provided when B72-18 came back before them.

Mayor Treece asked if staff would look at the ordinances for existing enforcement methods in terms of the Office of Neighborhood Services since there were residents in the downtown and the Public Health and Human Services Department with regard to grease, animals, etc. to ameliorate the problem.

Mr. Thomas asked if they approved the plan showing the compactor on 912 E. Walnut Street if it would compel them to purchase the property. Mr. Hunt replied the map actually showed it in the alley in the right-of-way. Mr. Thomas stated he was comfortable voting on the plan then.