

sewer that would be paid for, so he planned to support it.

Mr. Skala stated he was evolving into a fiscal conservative when it came to annexations and urban service areas. He agreed the urban service area line was not inviolable, and depending upon the circumstances they could and should adjust it if they agreed with an annexation. He commented that he agreed with Mr. Clark in this instance in that this was a bit premature as there was not anything driving this decision and that there might be some things mitigating the driving of this decision, such as the discussion with regard to the fire station. He agreed fees would come back to the City to help pay for some of the development in terms of the sewer, but did not feel that was case with electricity and water. He also agreed the infrastructure was in place, but did not see any particular reason to annex this property tonight. He commented that there were good reasons for annexations, but did not feel this property should be annexed, and noted he would vote accordingly.

Ms. Peters asked why this had not been on the consent agenda since it had an 8-0 PZC vote in favor of it. Ms. Amin replied it had been scheduled for the consent agenda, but at the last meeting, Mr. Crockett had indicated he had a presentation next time, and Mr. Thomas and Mr. Skala had made comments. She explained when she had pointed out it was scheduled for consent and asked if they wanted it to be moved to old business instead, they had indicated they did.

Mr. Trapp commented that for an area to be walkable, three things were needed, i.e., rooftops, sidewalk infrastructure, and places to go. If they reviewed the walkability scores of the Thornbrook neighborhood, it would be very low, similar to the Second Ward, because there was not anywhere to go. There was not any commercial development to which someone could walk. The fact they were served by Boone Electric Cooperative and CPWSD No. 1 worked out well for the City because those entities provided the electric and water services, and the City would collect the gross receipts tax on those utilities. In addition, commercial development was a sales tax generator. He believed this annexation would benefit the City and that it made sense at this busy corner with a school nearby. He liked the node concept and planned to support it.

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to support this as well. He commented that he often opposed annexations when it would lead to another enormous area of land to be annexed. In this situation, the City was all around it. This was almost an island of Boone County within the City. He noted the urban service area had not functioned as he thought it would when they were developing the comprehensive plan. He hoped that when they updated the comprehensive plan, they were a lot more thoughtful about planning for the future in terms of where they saw development happening and wanted development to happen. He stated he would argue the Perche Creek should be a hard boundary to the west, and that they should find where the City limits extended to the south to determine logical areas within which to encourage development and outside of which to make a decision they would not bring it into the City. He commented that this was a needed land use form and that it would be mixed-use according to the zoning district. He thought there was a potential for this to be an urban village in a suburban area to south of Columbia. He hoped the specific site design was more urban in nature with buildings and pathways connecting the commercial site to the adjacent neighborhoods. He noted it appeared the roundabout had good pedestrian connectivity for the school kids and across to the daycare and the subdivision in the northeast corner. He hoped the development would not involve a series of boxes surrounded by parking lots. He also hoped the parking requirement in the mixed-use neighborhood district was lower than what it had been for the commercial zoning district. He commented that he would argue that it should be lowered further to make it truly walkable. On the whole, he believed this would be a benefit to the area, and noted he planned to support the annexation and associated zoning.

**B68-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES:**

**PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B72-18**

Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with the Hallie Holland Living Trust for the acquisition of property located at 912 East Walnut Street to be used by the Solid Waste Division for a collection site for refuse, cardboard and container recycling in the Downtown CID; appropriating funds.

Discussion shown with R60-18.

R60-18

Adopting the Downtown CID Compactor Location Master Plan.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had some concerns about this proposal and believed this was tied to the compactor plan that would be discussed later. He wondered if they should consider both at the same time.

Mr. Thomas understood the \$690,000 would be paid from solid waste enterprise funds and asked if that money came from residential, commercial, etc. Mr. Sorrell replied the enterprise fund included all portions of the solid waste utility, and the cost of this purchase would be allocated toward the Downtown CID, and all costs for solid waste services within the boundary of the Downtown CID were charged only to the customers within the CID. When they did the cost of service study and took the purchase price into account, the rates within the CID would have to be adjusted to cover those costs. He noted they could pick a time frame, likely 30 years, to amortize the purchase price. Mr. Thomas understood they separately billed CID customers and this \$690,000 would only be applied to the bills of the customers within the CID. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. The intent was that the cost of providing refuse collection and recycling services within the CID would be covered by the residents and business within the CID. Mr. Thomas asked if it would involve all of the different customer units within the CID or if the CID as an entity pay a single bill for all of this. Mr. Sorrell replied it would be all of the units within the CID. Mr. Thomas understood the area matched the CID taxable area.

Mr. Thomas asked how the Council felt about discussing the compactor plan now or holding this item until they got to that item on the agenda. Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection to bringing R60-18 from new business to this portion of the agenda. No one objected.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Peters asked how they had decided upon the \$690,000 for this piece of property. Mr. Sorrell replied an appraisal had been completed, which he believed had come in at \$700,000, and the property owner had offered to sell it for less than the appraised value. There was also some money that needed to be spent to make the site usable for collection and recycling.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked why the City would be purchasing property for private businesses to put their trash on for the City to collect. Mr. Sorrell replied the downtown area was unique in that it was fully developed for the most part, and when it was developed, everyone was allowed to construct from property line to property line or right-of-way line to right-of-way line. There had not been any requirement in the past to provide for solid waste services inside the structure. They had since changed the ordinances, and if there was enough use in a building, solid waste facilities were required to be located inside the footprint of a new building. In areas where that was not an option, something had to be done to collect materials, and only the right-of-way was available. The purchase of this property would allow for a permanent solution. He pointed out they sometimes leased private properties to place compactors on, and it was a comparable expense.

Mayor Treece asked how this compared to Peachtree, Broadway Bluffs, or other commercial developments. Mr. Sorrell replied those had been developed more recently

and were more modern, so they had planned solid waste collection services as part of the development. This had not occurred in the downtown when it was developed decades and decades ago.

Mayor Treece asked how many of the sites on the compactor location master plan were on municipal owned or leased property versus private footprints. Mr. Thomas asked how many of those were current collection sites and how many were proposed sites. Mr. Hunt responded grid by grid, and noted the yellow squares were compactors.

Mr. Hunt noted Grid 1 had two compactors. The northernmost was an existing compactor and was located in a public right-of-way. The southernmost was located inside the new apartment building at that location. Mr. Thomas understood that one was on private property, but it was required by ordinance. He asked if it was available to users outside of the building. Mr. Hunt replied no. Mr. Thomas understood it was just for the residents of the apartment building. Ms. Peters asked for clarification with regard to the apartment building. Mr. Thomas replied it was located on Elm Street, between Fifth Street and Sixth Street. Ms. Peters understood it was the Brookside 1-2 bedroom apartments.

Mr. Hunt continued to Grid 2 and noted the northernmost site was on City owned property behind the Gentry Building. The one on Sixth Street, next to the My House Bar, would be a new one that did not exist today. It was proposed to place that one at the westernmost end of the alley. The one to the east of that on Seventh Street was in an apartment building. The one further east of it on Eighth Street would be a proposed new compactor in the alley. Mr. Thomas understood that was the Opus building. Mr. Hunt stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked if the one on the west of the building had been required. Mr. Hunt replied he did not know if the ordinance had been in place when that apartment building was constructed, but it would be required today.

Mr. Skala asked if it was safe to assume the ones incorporated due to the ordinance in newer buildings were specifically there for the residents of the building and not for anyone else to use. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought that was a safe assumption. Mr. Thomas stated it might be helpful to delineate that because it was not clear when they were all yellow boxes.

Mr. Hunt moved on to Grid 3, and noted the one at the top left corner was in the alley behind Broadway Brewery. He explained there had been a lease of a piece of property, but the compactor had been removed from that location because the buildings on both the north and south sides of the alley had been damaged when getting the compactor in and out of that location. As a result, they were proposing to put the compactor back in the alley. Mr. Thomas asked if that would block the alley to traffic. Mr. Hunt replied yes. Mr. Thomas asked if it would be blocked to pedestrians as well. Mr. Hunt replied no. He explained directly to the east on the other end of Alley A was another existing compactor behind US Bank. Staying on the east side and going south was another compactor on a City owned parking lot, and next to the compactor were two recycling roll-off containers. The south end of the grid had a compactor in the south end of the alley, and they were working with a property owner to move it to the north end of the alley as it would then be out of the public alley and would involve a private property lease. This move would allow the alley to be open. Mr. Thomas asked what was typically paid per year to lease a piece of land the size of a compactor. Mr. Hunt replied he did not believe there was a typical amount. The lease recently approved for the Wabash Arms compactor was \$6,500 per year with a three percent escalation. He expected this one to be more due to it being closer to campus where property was more valuable.

Mr. Hunt stated both compactors on Grid 4 were existing compactors, and they had actually already discussed them.

Mayor Treece asked for the footprint of trash compactors. Mr. Hunt replied they were approximately 12 feet by 20 feet.

Mr. Pitzer noted Mr. Hunt had indicated there were recycling containers on one of the sites, and understood the others did not have a recycle container. Mr. Hunt stated that

was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked how recycling was handled inside the apartment buildings. He wondered if the recycling was picked up by individual unit inside the apartment buildings. Mr. Hunt replied recycling service within the CID was by and large provided by two yard dumpsters that were located in the alleys. Most of the trash dumpsters were gray or brown, and the green and blue dumpsters were for recycling. The recycling dumpsters were located on City owned property, like the one mentioned. There was also one at the Wabash Station and one north of the Armory. Those were open for anyone's use. Mayor Treece asked if they had considered placing one in the parking garages. Mr. Hunt replied the garages did not have the head room due to the height required to load and unload the containers. Mayor Treece asked if there was not any square footage around the existing parking garages that would be accessible. Mr. Hunt replied he thought the parking garages were built like other downtown buildings in that they were built from property line to property line. He noted they could look at all of the garages, and pointed out they had a compactor in the alley behind the Fifth and Walnut garage.

Mr. Ruffin commented that he had received quite a few concerns regarding dumpsters in the alley between Eighth Street and Ninth Street, as well as dumpsters adjacent to the Hathman building, 15-17 N. Tenth Street, with regard to trash, grease, etc. He understood this plan would eliminate all of the dumpsters and force the businesses to use the compactor and asked if that was correct. Mr. Hunt replied in general, yes. The concept was to reduce the number of trash dumpsters and to have more trash compactors. The compactors, while not perfect, provided a lot more storage than a dumpster as one compactor could replace about 30 two-yard trash dumpsters. Rather than servicing the dumpsters six days a week, they could service the trash compactor once or twice a week. It was less trips, less noise, and less traffic. He noted he was not sure there was a good solution for the grease. Mr. Ruffin explained he was particularly concerned about the removal of the dumpsters in the alley between Eighth Street and Ninth Street because of the width of the alley. He understood buildings had been damaged by the trucks and there had been issues as a result. Mr. Hunt stated an option would be to remove all trash service from that alley, and those with businesses and tenants there would have to take their trash to a different location further away. It was not something they were proposing because it was not the most convenient for the most number of people. Mr. Ruffin commented that he thought they were concerned about the lack of sanitation the dumpsters created as it made the alleys unwelcoming to those that wanted to walk through it. He stated he would like to see that become a part of this plan. He wanted to assure the businesses and others who were in the area that they would either remove the dumpsters or find a more effective way of ensuring the businesses used the dumpsters properly.

Mayor Treece asked how much the grease abuse was an enforcement issue versus an access issue. He wondered if one could dump grease in a City dumpster. Mr. Hunt replied City ordinance specified trash should be as free as possible of liquid so liquid grease would be a violation of the ordinance. Mayor Treece commented that there appeared to be an equity issue as well because a lot of restaurants had spent a lot of money to have a grease containment system for the grease to be evacuated, recycled, or sold. The dumping of grease in the alley seemed to be an expensive solution for the City. Mr. Hunt explained they were currently working with the Public Works Department to come up with a solution for the grease, i.e., the used cooking oil from deep fryers. He pointed out there was not an easy solution as most of the buildings in the CID were built from property line to property line, and unless the restaurant could find adequate space within the building to store used cooking oil, they would not have any place to put it. The downtown trash and recycling was a common use system whereby any resident or business in the CID could use any dumpster they chose to use so there was not any accountability for any mess.

Mr. Skala stated he had seen a private company removing some grease one morning behind the KOPN radio station and they had missed the lip of the truck, which effectively

dumped most of a 55 gallon drum of grease in the alley. He thought they might want to consider a better approach to enforcement and monitoring.

Mr. Thomas understood that in addition to these 30 or so locations that had compactors or would soon have a compactor, there were also a number of dumpsters sited in the area and asked how many. Mr. Hunt replied close to 100. Mr. Thomas understood those were serviced daily because they were fairly small in capacity, and asked if most or all of them would be eliminated through this plan. Mr. Hunt replied the ones that would be eliminated would be the ones where they would add a compactor. Mr. Thomas stated it would have been helpful to have all of that information in the plan to really understand what was being proposed. Mr. Hunt explained they had intended to include everything, but as they went through the process, the group had decided to only address the compactors because the dumpsters were mobile. The concern was that if they had the trash dumpster on the master plan, they would not be able to move it without coming back to the Council. Mr. Thomas thought they could have included it as a background for the plan to show the current situation and the definite plan for the future along with other options. Mayor Treece asked if those dumpsters were on private or public property. Mr. Hunt replied they were in public rights-of-way.

Melissa Frier, 17 N. Tenth Street, explained she was speaking for Aardvarks and displayed some photos of the mess in the alley between Ninth Street and Tenth Street. She pointed out the sludge that ran out from under the dumpsters ran down Tenth Street toward Broadway and into the storm drain system. In her almost 15 years of working at Aardvarks, she had never seen a mess like this. She understood a compactor had been removed several months ago for reasons unknown to her, but since then, the mess was like never before. It included rotten food and leaks from unsealed trash bags. From a business standpoint, she did not want her customers to have to see this as they approached her business. She commented that she understood 51 percent of purchases were now made online, which directly affected the sales tax brought into the City, and believed that if they would provide a more pleasant atmosphere, it might be a way to convince people to shop locally. She felt the rotten food and the increase in insect and rodent activity was a result of this and needed to be resolved. She pointed out it going into the storm sewer was a health hazard and environmental concern as well. She commented that she believed purchasing the property at 912 E. Walnut would be a real benefit to the entire downtown area. She understood it would not address all of the issues, but the mess was vastly more contained when there had been a compactor. She understood there was some opposition due to the cost and the desire of the City to not become a landlord. She thought it was feasible for the City to purchase the property, delineate the small amount needed for the compactor, and sell the remainder of the property. She noted she could name at least five landlords that would jump at the opportunity to purchase such a desirable location, even with the compactor located nearby. She stated she hoped the Council would approve the purchase of this property.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Frier if she rented or owned her building. Ms. Frier replied they rented the building. Mayor Treece asked her if she was comfortable paying higher trash fees to offset the cost of the property. Ms. Frier replied she was not the owner, and only the manager, so she could not say for sure, but she thought the owner would be happy to do that in order to have a better atmosphere. She pointed out their property had also been damaged as a result of a semi-truck running into and destroying both of their air conditioning units between Ninth Street and Tenth Street.

Dan Viets, 15 N. Tenth Street, stated he agreed with the comments of Ms. Frier and noted they lived with this every day. It stunk very badly when walking in that alley, and the food spillover was not healthy as it was attracting rats, vermin, and insects. He commented that summer would come, and it would get worse with the heat. It was a very bad situation. He noted he was sympathetic of others that had lived with similar situations for quite some time and was glad the City was taking a comprehensive approach in trying to solve this problem. He hoped the City would purchase the property.

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 surveil 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.

The vote on R60-18 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B82-18

Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Utility Customer Services Fund, Community Relations Department and Information Technology Department; amending the FY 2018 Classification and Pay Plan by adding, closing and consolidating classifications and changing a classification title; transferring funds; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked how these changes would improve the customer service experience. Mr. Sapp replied they had looked at three different things that had happened with utility billing, i.e., the marriage between process and ordinance, the technology behind it, and the human factor. He explained one of the things they had discussed doing was examining their process from the very basics of what they did every day to create a utility bill from the time a customer came in for service all of the way through receiving a bill and being able to make payment. He commented that they had put a number of teams together to ensure they were addressing all of the issues they had so clearly heard about from customers and the Council. They felt by moving these team members into these appropriate areas, they would be better equipped to look at these processes and make changes to ordinances when needed and be better able to ensure the technology was working as it should or change their processes to marry into the technology. He pointed out they also felt the experience of the Contact Center and the Community Relations Department brought to a customer experience the ability to articulate well with customers through written and verbal communication. He explained they held regular team meetings with a variety of different departments throughout the City to ensure they were addressing all of the issues. Once they were able to determine what the process was today, which they were working to map, they would be able to look at it as a holistic approach and tweak any processes to better serve customers. Mayor Treece stated he was grateful to hear about their approach and general attitude along with the team that had been put together to address this. He pointed out utility billing might be the only or first interaction residents of Columbia had with City government, and if they did not have a good experience, they would likely not trust them to do other things. He loved the fact they would start by looking at how the bill looked and how they received the bill. He appreciated the attitude and the whole customer service experience.

Mr. Pitzer understood Mr. Glascock had indicated sixteen positions would be transferred. Mr. Glascock stated sixteen full time employees and three temporary employees would be transferred.

Mr. Pitzer understood classification closed meant the position would be eliminated after the people were transferred. Mr. Sapp stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification with regard to classification consolidation. Mr. Sapp replied they would change the Utility Customer Service Supervisor to just a Customer Service Supervisor. At this time, they had two different types of supervisors that were doing the same thing, the Contact Center supervisor and the Utility Customer Service supervisor. Instead of having two classifications, they would only have one. Mr. Glascock explained they had been in two different divisions, but were now being consolidated. Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification regarding a classification that was reassigned. Mr. Sapp replied the Customer Service Representative II would be converted to a Senior Administrative Support Assistant to handle payroll, be a human resources liaison, etc. since the department would grow with this change. Mr. Pitzer understood it was a job role that would change for that individual. Mr. Sapp stated that was correct. He explained the Customer Service Representative II position was actually on they had in the Contact Center now that was vacant, and since it was the same pay grade, they would just change it to the Senior

Administrative Support Assistant position. He noted it would not affect the budget.

Mr. Pitzer stated Section 4 of the ordinance had a transfer of \$38,026 from Utility Customer Service to Information Technology, but that was not referenced in the memo unlike the other numbers in the ordinance. Mr. Chapdelaine explained that was a current position that was moving into the Information Technology Department, and those funds were moving with them. Since it was an existing position it did not have to be highlighted separately.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Sapp about his assessment of the current staffing in the new accounts, bill payments, drive-through lane, etc. areas. Mr. Sapp replied those were things they would continue to review. He explained the drive-through lane and the cashiers office was operated by Treasury, which was a division of the Finance Department. Utility Customer Service was what they would move to the Community Relations Department. He noted he and Stephanie Brown were looking at the staffing levels in Utility Customer Service, and they were comfortable with where those were at now. He pointed out they experienced a fair amount of turnover so they would focus on having good policies, training programs, etc. in place to ensure any new person would develop the culture they wanted.

Mayor Treece asked who answered the phone when someone called the number on the bill due to a problem with the bill. Mr. Sapp replied it was answered by a Utility Customer Service representative. Mayor Treece asked if they were housed within the Community Relations Department. Mr. Sapp replied yes, pending approval from Council tonight. Mayor Treece understood they would then receive the same new approach Mr. Sapp had mentioned tonight. Mr. Sapp stated that was correct. He explained they wanted to bring them on board this cultural change to ensure they were serving and enhancing the customer experience. When someone called, they wanted that person to receive a good explanation for any billing question. He noted the goal was for that Utility Customer Service representative to be able to address issues at ease. He pointed out the Council would have to bear with them for a little while because it would require training.

Mayor Treece asked if customers that physically walked into the building would work with Treasury employees or Utility Customer Service employees. Mr. Sapp replied the Utility Customer Service had people available to address walk up customers along with people who called. He noted they were located on the west side of the historic Daniel Boone lobby. Mayor Treece asked if they would be directed to that room. Mr. Sapp replied yes, and explained they had a full-time Contact Center employee at a temporary desk in the historic Daniel Boone lobby most of the time to direct people to the appropriate office.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a reason for those to be two separate functions of two separate departments. He understood someone paying a bill would go to Treasury, but if there was a problem with the bill, that person would have to go to Utility Customer Service. He wondered why it could not be a one stop shop. Mr. Sapp stated that was a fair question and something they would need to work through with the Finance Department. At the very least, they would need to ensure they were crystal clear on communications back and forth.

Mr. Skala explained he had been a participant of budget billing for several years and an almost \$600 bill had come due recently. He noted adequate notice had been provided that this was forthcoming, and when he had called to ask questions, they could not explain the exact reasons, but had extended options in paying that larger bill. His interaction had been positive and felt improvements were being made.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, thanked Mr. Pitzer for his questions earlier with regard to this. He understood a budget had been adopted with a number of positions, and asked if the closing of a classification was equivalent to an actual reduction in the budget. Mr. Sapp replied they had a Contact Center Manager currently and that classification would be closed and changed to an Assistant Director for the classification added. They would essentially close the Contact Center Manager and add it as a classification of Assistant Director of Community Relations. Mr. Clark understood it was management